



**REPORT**  
**OF**  
**THE SECURITY COUNCIL**

---

**16 July 1968—15 July 1969**

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS : TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION**  
**SUPPLEMENT No. 2 (A/7602)**

**UNITED NATIONS**

( 123 p. )



**REPORT**  
**OF**  
**THE SECURITY COUNCIL**

---

**16 July 1968 – 15 July 1969**

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS : TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION**  
**SUPPLEMENT No. 2 (A/7602)**



**UNITED NATIONS**  
*New York, 1969*

#### 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.

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION .....	1

### *Part I*

#### **Questions considered by the Security Council under its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security**

##### *Chapter*

1. THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST	
A. Communications, reports of the Chief of Staff and discussion by the Council concerning the status of the cease-fire .....	3
B. Question concerning the treatment of civilian populations in Israel-occupied territories and related matters .....	44
C. Communications concerning the situation in and around Jerusalem and its Holy Places .....	52
D. Other matters brought to the attention of the Security Council in connexion with the situation in the Middle East .....	59
E. Reports of the Secretary-General on the progress of the efforts of his Special Representative to the Middle East .....	61
2. LETTER DATED 26 DECEMBER 1963 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF CYPRUS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL	
A. Communications and reports received between 16 July and 31 December 1968 .....	61
B. Consideration at the 1459th meeting (10 December 1968) .....	61
C. Communications and reports received between 1 January and 15 July 1969 .....	63
D. Consideration at the 1474th meeting (10 June 1969) .....	64
3. LETTER DATED 21 AUGUST 1968 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF CANADA, DENMARK, FRANCE, PARAGUAY, THE UNITED KINGDOM AND THE UNITED STATES ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/8758)	66
4. THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA: LETTER DATED 14 MARCH 1969 ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF FORTY-SIX MEMBER STATES (S/9090)	
A. Communications to the Security Council and request for a meeting ....	75
B. Consideration at the 1464th and 1465th meetings (20 March 1969) ....	76
C. Subsequent communications to the Council.....	80
5. QUESTION CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA: LETTER DATED 6 JULY 1969 ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF SIXTY MEMBER STATES; REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED IN PURSUANCE OF SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 253 (1968)	
A. Communications and reports to the Security Council and request for a meeting .....	80
B. Consideration by the Council at its 1475th to 1481st meetings (held between 13 June and 24 June).....	83

# CONTENTS (continued)

## Part II

### Other matters considered by the Council

Chapter	Page
6. ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS	
A. Application of Swaziland .....	91
B. Application of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea .....	91
C. Other communication concerning the admission of new Members .....	91
7. QUESTION OF THE WORKING LANGUAGES OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL: LETTER DATED 9 JANUARY 1969 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL TRANSMITTING THE TEXT OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 2479 (XXIII) OF 21 DECEMBER 1968 (S/8962); <i>note verbale</i> DATED 16 JANUARY 1969 FROM THE PERMANENT MISSION OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/8967) AND <i>note verbale</i> DATED 16 JANUARY 1969 FROM THE PERMANENT MISSION OF SPAIN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/8968) .....	91

## Part III

### The Military Staff Committee

8. WORK OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE .....	94
---	----

## Part IV

### Matters brought to the attention of the Security Council but not discussed in the Council during the period covered

9. THE QUESTION OF RACE CONFLICT IN SOUTH AFRICA RESULTING FROM THE POLICIES OF <i>apartheid</i> OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA	
A. Report of 4 October 1968 from the Special Committee on the Policies of <i>Apartheid</i> of the Government of the Republic of South Africa .....	95
B. Resolution 2396 (XXIII) adopted by the General Assembly on 2 December 1968 .....	95
C. Other communications .....	95
10. COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING RELATIONS BETWEEN ZAMBIA AND PORTUGAL	96
11. COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN TERRITORIES UNDER PORTUGUESE ADMINISTRATION .....	97
12. COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN EQUATORIAL GUINEA AND REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL .....	97
13. COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO COMPLAINTS BY CAMBODIA CONCERNING ACTS OF AGGRESSION AGAINST THE TERRITORY AND CIVILIAN POPULATION OF CAMBODIA .....	101
14. COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING RELATIONS BETWEEN CAMBODIA AND THAILAND .....	104
15. COMMUNICATION CONCERNING VIET-NAM .....	106
16. REPORTS ON THE STRATEGIC TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS ...	106
17. COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE KOREAN QUESTION .....	106
18. COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE INDIA-PAKISTAN QUESTION .....	107

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
19. LETTER DATED 18 JUNE 1969 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF HAITI .....	108
20. COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE IRAQI-IRANIAN BOUNDARY TREATY OF 1937 .....	108
21. COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING RELATIONS BETWEEN EL SALVADOR AND HONDURAS .....	109
22. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS AND THE EFFECTS OF THEIR POSSIBLE USE .....	110
23. ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA .....	111

### *APPENDICES*

I. Representatives and deputy, alternate and acting representatives accredited to the Security Council .....	113
II. Presidents of the Security Council .....	114
III. Meetings of the Security Council during the period from 16 July 1968 to 15 July 1969 .....	114
IV. Representatives, chairmen and principal secretaries of the Military Staff Committee .....	116





## INTRODUCTION

The present report<sup>1</sup> is submitted to the General Assembly by the Security Council in accordance with Article 24, paragraph 3, and Article 15, paragraph 1, of the Charter.

Essentially a summary and guide reflecting the broad lines of the debates, the report is not intended as a substitute for the records of the Security Council, which constitute the only comprehensive and authoritative account of its deliberations.

With respect to the membership of the Security Council during the period covered, it will be recalled that the General Assembly at its 1709th plenary meeting on 1 November 1968, elected Colombia, Finland, Nepal, Spain and Zambia as non-permanent members of the Security Council to fill the vacancies resulting from the expiration, on 31 December 1968, of the terms of office of Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Ethiopia and India.

The period covered in the present report is from 16 July 1968 to 15 July 1969. The Council held fifty-two meetings during that period.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the twenty-fourth annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly. The previous reports were submitted under the symbols A/93, A/366, A/620, A/945, A/1361, A/1873, A/2167, A/2437, A/2712, A/2935, A/3157, A/3648, A/3901, A/4190, A/4494, A/4867, A/5202, A/5502, A/5802, A/6002, A/6302, A/6702 and A/7202.



## Part I

# QUESTIONS CONSIDERED BY THE SECURITY COUNCIL UNDER ITS RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

## Chapter 1

### THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

#### A. Communications, reports of the Chief of Staff and discussion by the Council concerning the status of the cease-fire

##### 1. COMPLAINTS BY JORDAN AND ISRAEL

##### (a) *Communications to the Council from 16 July to 5 August 1968 and requests for a meeting*

1. In a letter dated 17 July 1968 (S/8683), Israel replied to a Jordanian letter of 8 July (S/8674) charging Israel with an attack on 4 June against concentrations of civilians on the East Bank of the Jordan. The reply stated that Jordan could not continue its attacks against Israel villages and civilians and at the same time claim immunity for military positions and bases that were purposely established close to inhabited areas.

2. In a letter dated 29 July (S/8698), Jordan charged that Israel, in attempting to force the expulsion of busloads of Arab refugees from Gaza across the King Hussein Bridge to the East Bank of the Jordan River (see section B, below), had fired on Jordanian observation posts, which had foiled the attempt. Later, Israel had conducted an operation under the supervision of the Military Governor of Jericho District and supported by tanks and military units; that mass expulsion, in defiance of Security Council resolutions, was a grave threat to peace and security. In a letter of 31 July (S/8701) Israel replied that Jordan had distorted the facts and that the Jordanian forces had opened fire on Israel military positions on the West Bank without provocation.

3. In a letter dated 2 August (S/8716) Israel submitted to the Security Council charges of continued violation of the cease-fire from Jordanian territory, both by regular Jordanian troops and by paramilitary terror units with the co-operation and encouragement of the Jordanian authorities. Israel enclosed a list of 104 cease-fire violations that it charged had taken place from Jordanian territory between 23 June and 1 August.

4. In a letter dated 4 August (S/8719) Jordan complained to the Security Council that Israel forces had committed another act of aggression on that date when Israel aircraft had bombed areas west and south of the city of Salt, nineteen miles from Amman. In a letter of the same date (S/8720), Israel stated that in view of persistent attacks against Israel from Jordanian territory, it had become necessary for Israel to act in self-defence. Its air attack had been directed exclusively against two terrorist bases in the Salt area, including the central headquarters of the El Fatah organization, stores of ammunition and sabotage equipment, training facilities and barracks. In a subsequent

letter of 8 August (S/8739), Jordan charged that Israel aircraft had used napalm bombs in its attack and attached pictures to show that the Israel attack had been aimed at civilians.

5. In a letter dated 5 August (S/8721), Jordan requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation "resulting from the continued Israeli acts of aggression".

6. In a letter dated 5 August (S/8724), Israel also requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to resume consideration of the previous Israel complaint regarding "the grave and continued violations of the cease-fire by Jordan" which had been submitted by his delegation on 5 June 1968 (S/8617).

##### (b) *Consideration by the Council at the 1434th to 1440th meetings (5 to 16 August 1968)*

7. At the 1434th meeting, on 5 August, the President of the Council stated that the meeting was convened at the urgent requests of Jordan and Israel and that their previous requests (S/8616 and S/8617), which had been on the provisional agenda on 5 June 1968 when the Council had adjourned its meeting in tribute to the late Senator Robert Kennedy, were also included on the provisional agenda. The provisional agenda of the 1434th meeting was then adopted.

8. The representatives of Jordan, Israel, the United Arab Republic, Iraq and subsequently the representatives of Syria and Saudi Arabia were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without vote.

9. The representative of Jordan stated that Israel's premeditated attack on the previous day, which had included air bombardment and shelling, had been carefully directed against the civilian population of the areas around the city of Salt and had been similar in nature to Israel's earlier attack on 4 June 1968 against civilian centres in Irbid and neighbouring villages. Incomplete reports indicated that thirty-four Jordanians had been killed and eight-two seriously wounded in Israel's latest attack. There could be no doubt that it had been planned at the highest level and Israel officials had been issuing dire warnings to Jordan. It was also clear that the attack was primarily directed against the civilian population, as shown by the large number of civilian casualties and the extensive damage to civilian property. Israel wished to destroy the agriculture of the East Bank of the Jordan River and to terrorize the people of that area. The attack was part of the effort to intimidate Jordan. Having already turned more than 450,000 people into homeless refugees, Israel was trying to do the same to the residents of the northern part of the Jordan Valley on the East

Bank. The areas attacked were Jordan's most productive region upon which the country depended for a great part of its agricultural needs. In the past the Security Council, while warning Israel against actions of military reprisal, had at the same time promised to consider more effective measures as envisaged in the Charter. It was therefore incumbent upon the Council to take more effective measures to cope with the problem, otherwise more Israel attacks were to be expected.

10. The representative of Israel said that despite the cease-fire obligations undertaken by the parties warfare against Israel was being continued from Jordanian territory. Israel had repeatedly asked the Council to take effective action to stop Jordanian violations of the cease-fire, and had explained that the cease-fire could not be a screen for Arab aggression and that Israel had to take measures to defend itself. It had also emphasized the impact of Security Council deliberations on the region and had repeatedly stated that the adoption of resolutions lacking in equity would increase intransigence and breed additional violence. The Council's resolution 248 (1968) of 24 March 1968, in spite of its denunciations of cease-fire violations, had promptly been interpreted by Jordan as non-applicable to Arab acts of hostility against Israel. On 4 April, the Security Council had expressed its concern at the deteriorating situation. Since then, military attacks and armed incursions from Jordanian territory had continued unabated. Jordan had become the principal base for Arab aggression against Israel. Special military camps had been established there to train saboteurs and recruiting centres had been opened in Amman. Officers and men of regular Egyptian and Syrian army units had been transferred to Jordan and assigned to terror operations, while Iraqi troops had been given full freedom to operate as they wished. Two types of warfare were being conducted from Jordanian territory: terror raids and armed attacks from military positions, and both were being carried out from across the cease-fire line. Those two methods had been developed because the Arab Governments had been unable to use Arab inhabitants in the areas under Israel control as instruments of war. The shelling of Israel villages had reached a climax in May and June. On 4 June, a large-scale assault had been launched by Jordanian artillery resulting in extensive damage to the villages and to the central part of Beit Shean, as well as civilian casualties. It had therefore become necessary for Israel aircraft to take action. Since Jordan had used inhabited centres, such as Irbid, as locations for its artillery positions, civilian casualties on the Jordanian side had become inevitable. Since then, there had been a change in the Arab warfare tactics. It was currently being carried out more and more by terrorist and sabotage raids which had steadily increased in intensity and had become a daily occurrence. In July alone, ninety-eight acts of aggression had been committed. Israel had repeatedly emphasized Jordan's responsibility for that unabated warfare and had called on its Government to put an end to those attacks, but to no avail. Since Israel's security was in danger and its people were under constant threat, it had no alternative but to take action in self-defence. It was for that reason that on 4 August Israel aircraft had taken action exclusively against two terrorist bases in the Salt area, which included the central headquarters of the El Fatah organization, stores of ammunition and sabotage equipment, training facilities and barracks. Only faithful and reciprocal observ-

ance of the cease-fire and an effort by the parties to reason together and work together towards a peaceful agreement could break the vicious circle of the twenty-year war. The Security Council could also help by impressing on Jordan the vital necessity to abide by the cease-fire obligations and to terminate all acts of aggression from its territory against Israel.

11. At the same meeting, the representative of Iraq, after expressing the concern of his Government and people over the continued violation of the cease-fire and its effect on the prospects of the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, stated that Israel had advanced the same excuses and justifications for its acts of aggression as it had done in March 1968. The Security Council had then rejected those arguments and, on 24 March, had unanimously adopted resolution 248 (1968) stating that Israel's military action in Jordanian territory had been of a large-scale and carefully planned nature. Israel's latest aggression fell entirely within the scope of the 24 March resolution and confronted the Council with a situation in which it had to act in accordance with its past decisions.

12. The representative of Algeria stated that the basic problem of the Middle East was the conflict between an aggressive Power which was supported by imperialist interests, and the Palestinian nation which was determined to regain its rights. Any real solution must lie in the implementation of pertinent United Nations resolutions and the general principles of law. The Council's attention had been drawn to the probable intentions of Israel concerning the territories east of the Jordan River and fear had been expressed that in the light of the international situation and the active complicity which Israel could count on, it might show additional greed concerning further territorial acquisitions. Certain friendly nations were currently more concerned with bringing peace to the Middle East in a way that would leave Israel most of the fruits of its conquest than in helping the Security Council to fulfill the mission entrusted to it. Those Powers had stated that a solution must be found, but they now said it must be one that would satisfy all interests at stake. That attitude, based on eternal compromise, could not serve as a guideline for the United Nations or its Members. The United Nations owed it to itself to return to the application of its basic principles and avoid confusion whereby the complaint of the victim and the statements of the aggressor were placed on an equal footing. Israel's latest act of aggression was aimed at the destruction of the Jordanian region which was its major source of grain supply, thus forcing Jordan to bow to Israel's orders. It was therefore all the more necessary that the Security Council should insist on full implementation of its previous decisions, which could not be implemented under military occupation or under threat of destruction or famine.

13. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recalled that in its resolution 248 (1968) of 24 March 1968 the Security Council had stated that it would be obliged to consider more effective steps in accordance with the Charter in order to ensure that acts of military reprisals did not take place. Israel's latest act of aggression made clear its attitude to Security Council resolutions and its disregard for principles of international law. Israel's new act of aggression was in effect a continuation of Tel Aviv's policy which was to achieve its imperialist aims in the Middle East, use military blackmail to intimidate neighbouring Arab countries and force them to become reconciled to the

results of Israel's military aggression by making cynical use of military strength and flouting all standards of international law. Israel's continued occupation of Arab territories constituted a standing violation of all the principles of the Charter and the people of those territories had every right to resist that occupation. Besides continuing its aggressive acts, Israel had also continued creating obstacles to a political settlement in the Middle East and preventing implementation of the 22 November 1967 resolution. Israel's latest act of aggression had come precisely at a time when the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, was carrying out the next stage in a series of consultations regarding a peaceful settlement of the Middle East situation. That could only be regarded as a deliberate attempt to disrupt the Jarring mission. The Soviet delegation emphatically urged the Security Council to condemn Israel for its criminal acts against the Arab States and, in accordance with the principles of the Charter, to take such measures to halt and punish the aggressor as would deter the high-handed warriors of Tel Aviv from continuing their military provocations. No one must doubt the Soviet Union's determination to put an end, in collaboration with other peace-loving countries, to Israel aggression, to eliminate all its results, to return to their lawful owners the territories seized as a result of the aggression of 1967, and to bring about the necessary political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence in that region.

14. The representative of the United States of America said that his Government did not condone the major military attack of the previous day by Israel against Jordan but neither did it condone the terrorism and sabotage which had been launched with increasing frequency from Jordan in the past weeks. Those acts should not be judged as isolated events, they were a concerted effort that could not help but have a cumulative impact. The incidents had violated the Security Council's cease-fire resolutions, killed not only military personnel, but also civilians and had fed the tension and fear that had frustrated the search for a peaceful settlement. The Council once again found itself confronted not with facts but with charges and counter-charges, making it impossible for it to fulfil its role with objectivity. That again underlined the need for some mechanism that could enable the Council to act in a truly informed manner when events such as the current incident occurred. It would be helpful if the parties were to reconsider their positions and agree to the presence of United Nations observers in the area. Their presence, while not prejudicing the rights or claims of either side, would serve as a deterrent to further incidents. A solution to the Middle East situation could be found only through the instruments and processes of accommodation and agreement, which were readily available, particularly in the person of Ambassador Jarring.

15. The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stated that his delegation had previously stressed that all acts of violence must be deplored wherever they occurred and in whatever circumstances. His Government strongly deplored the latest serious and deliberate attack, just as it had deplored the acts of violence preceding it. The United Kingdom Government believed that resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 and Ambassador Jarring's mission still offered the best basis for a settlement. Currently the Council's efforts must be directed

towards breaking the vicious circle of violence and counter-violence and advancing gradually towards a settlement which could be accepted by all.

16. The representative of Jordan said that whenever Jordan had submitted to the Council a situation dangerous to peace in the area, Israel had always attempted to confuse the issue by making counter-charges. Some members of the Council were trying to raise the question of observers. In that respect it might be recalled that there was already machinery in the area, the Mixed Armistice Commission, which should prove effective. One could not ask for observers only on the cease-fire lines while ignoring violations in the occupied territories. If observers were to be appointed, they should be all along the entire Armistice Demarcation Line, including the Gaza Strip, the West Bank, the Syria-Israel Armistice Demarcation Line and Jerusalem. Jordan would favour such deployment of observers.

17. At the 1435th meeting, on 6 August, the representative of the United Arab Republic stated that Israel had put a remarkable emphasis on the cease-fire and its observance. The circumstances that had led to the adoption of resolution 235 (1967) showed that the cease-fire was only a temporary measure. At that time the representative of the United States had clearly stated that his Government considered the cease-fire as a first step towards the establishment of peace in the area. With the adoption of the Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, a second step had been also taken towards that goal. Containing the basic elements of a permanent settlement, that resolution was based on fundamental principles of the United Nations and its Charter. But there was no official indication that Israel had accepted it and was prepared to implement it. A planned military attack by one country against another, whether under a cease-fire régime or not, was clearly a case of aggression. Israel's defiance of the Security Council resolutions undoubtedly constituted a serious threat to international peace and security. Since 24 March, when the Security Council had unanimously adopted resolution 248 (1968), Israel had twice engaged in retaliation and massive reprisals. The time had come, therefore, when it was necessary to consider taking more effective measures as envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter to avoid recurrence of further violations.

18. The representative of France said that his Government had learned with deep concern of the bombing of Salt by the Israel Air Force and deplored the loss of human life and damage to property. It was also seriously alarmed by the repetition of such incidents in spite of the appeals and decisions of the Security Council. The attack on Salt and the earlier attack on Irbid could not be justified by claims of legitimate defence, since they were reprisals, and the very idea of military reprisals was unacceptable to the French Government. It was equally condemned by the United Nations and its Charter. The opposite road to military reprisals—that leading to a peaceful settlement—was shown by resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 which must serve as the basis for a settlement in the Middle East. The French delegation had followed closely the laudable efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, in the fulfilment of his mission. At a moment when Ambassador Jarring was doing his best to accomplish the task entrusted to him, military operations, such as the bombing of Salt, could only render it more difficult. The Security Council, while condemning such actions, should

try to prevent their recurrence by ensuring the effective application of the 22 November 1967 resolution.

19. The representative of Canada said that his delegation regretted the military operation in Jordan on 4 August and any loss of life involved in that operation. It appealed to all concerned to observe scrupulously the cease-fire and to avoid positions or undertakings likely to make more unstable the fragile peace which was precariously maintained in the Near East. Such acts of violence, as reported to the Council, could not foster a propitious atmosphere for the task entrusted to the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring. The decision of the Security Council might well have a far-reaching impact on his vital work, which was currently the only hope for a peaceful solution.

20. The representative of Pakistan said that the latest attack of Israel was the fourth large-scale aggression by Israel against Jordan since March 1968 when the Security Council had adopted resolution 248 (1968). While there was general condemnation for that act, one could, however, discern two trends in the discussion which might impede the Council's objectivity and render its deliberations totally fruitless. The first was the tendency to be over-impressed by the fact that the Council was faced with charges and counter-charges and had no independent knowledge of the truth. In the case at hand, confusion was unwarranted, however, as Israel itself had admitted its military action. The second trend was the tendency to equate the military actions of Israel with all other violations of the cease-fire and, in so doing, to strike a posture of justice and even-handedness in disregard of the human realities of the area. To equate the small, sporadic and spontaneous acts of resistance of the people of the occupied territories with the carefully planned and large-scale military operations of the armed forces of Israel was to ignore a startling disparity of magnitude and quality and to confer equal rights on the aggressor and its victim. In the current instance, that would amount to condoning military reprisals. Moreover, it was unrealistic to think that there was a vicious circle of violence and counter-violence between Jordan and Israel for which both parties were equally responsible. There was no means for Jordan, short of waging a war against its own people, to prevent the so-called violations of the cease-fire. To make progress towards a solution of the situation in the Middle East it was necessary that a measure of balance be introduced by first checking Israel's aggressive actions. Pakistan also shared the anxiety of other members of the Council that the latest developments in the area should not adversely affect the progress of the efforts of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring.

21. At the 1436th meeting, on 7 August, the representative of Jordan repeated that as long as Israel remained in the Arab territories, there would be resistance, struggle and sacrifices for freedom, as was to be expected in the circumstances. Resistance against occupation had precedents in every country ever occupied. The situation in Angola, Rhodesia and South Africa was no different from the struggle of the Arabs of Palestine. Europeans had resisted Nazi occupation in a similar manner and lost millions of lives in the struggle to regain their homelands.

22. The representative of Syria said that the latest Israel attack against Jordan was not an isolated incident but a link in a long chain of violence against Arab States. Three important things directly related to

the Jordanian complaint and the question of Palestine in general needed to be emphasized. First, that if Israel had not driven out the Arabs of Palestine through terrorism and massacre, it could not have been the exclusive Jewish State its leaders wanted it to be, for the Arab and Jewish populations would have been equal in number. Secondly, that, in accordance with the last report of the Mandatory Power to the United Nations in 1947, Jewish ownership in Palestine had amounted to only 5.66 per cent. The Arab people of Palestine were still the legal owners of the land of Palestine from which they had been forcibly expelled. Thirdly, that the term belligerence could not be applied to a people who were defending their legal rights against a brutal conquest.

23. The representative of Denmark said that his delegation considered that all violations of cease-fire must be deplored unreservedly as such violations, besides resulting in loss of human life, also impeded progress towards peace. The case before the Council was not likely to be solved unless one faced the fact that certain actions by either party might result in counter-action by the other party to the detriment of peace and reason and in contravention of the efforts of the Council and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. It should be brought home to the parties concerned that the Security Council expected them to adhere scrupulously to the cease-fire because further violence in the area might well bring in its train disastrous consequences going far beyond the area. It was necessary that all concerned support the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, because it offered the best hope for a just and lasting peace based on an accepted settlement, as called for in the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967.

24. The representative of Iraq stated that in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations the Security Council had unanimously condemned acts of military reprisal. It could not but condemn another act of reprisal. However, the Council must determine once and for all that the activities of the so-called infiltrators could not be equated with those of the Israel armed forces. The dangerous implications of equal treatment could not escape anyone, especially the rulers of Israel who would interpret it as a vindication of their stand. There could not but be sympathy and support for a people struggling for their freedom, and their actions could not be compared with the large-scale military action by the regular armed forces of a State. The Security Council could not abdicate its responsibility for taking effective action. Such action alone could meet the needs of the current situation.

25. The representative of Hungary stated that there was no justification for the serious violation of the United Nations Charter which had occurred when Israel military aircraft and shells bombed the territory of Jordan. Israel had advanced the pretext of "self-defence"; however, that argument could not hide the fact that the so-called terror raids were the direct consequence of the illegal occupation of Arab lands and that resistance to that occupation did not entitle Israel to attack its neighbours. The latest act of aggression of the Israel policy-makers and the expulsion of 50,000 Arabs from the Gaza Strip clearly showed that they had no interest in decreasing tension. As to the idea of deploying United Nations observers along a certain line, when Israel felt free to send its aircraft deep inside its neighbour's territory, observers would not

be able to fulfil their mission, and to send them in the existing circumstances would only prolong Israel occupation of Arab territories.

26. The representative of Senegal said that a mistaken concept of self-defence could lead to a world conflagration. Leaders in Portugal, Rhodesia and South Africa were watching the Security Council's reaction to the Israel interpretation of the concept of self-defence. As his delegation saw it, the victim of aggression must respond immediately and on the same location and with all the means at its disposal. In the light of its delegation's conception of self-defence, Israel's action in bombing two of Jordan's towns could not be interpreted as self-defence. Jordan had been attacked and therefore it was not the aggressor. The basic problem, however, was the settlement of the destiny of the Palestinian refugees and the evacuation by Israel of the territory that it had occupied by force. Senegal placed great hope in Ambassador Jarring's mission for securing implementation of the resolution of 22 November 1967, and condemned the raids and military operations which could only jeopardize his efforts.

27. The representative of Saudi Arabia stated that the rulers of Israel were using religion for political ends. The Zionists had taken Palestine, and the people of Palestine had risen against that occupation. The Palestinians, though displaced and living in refugee camps, were a people with a separate identity of their own. Neither the United Nations nor anybody else, including the Arab Governments, had any right to tell them to forget about their homeland and live elsewhere. There were some 16 million Jews in the world, over 1,000 million Christians and about 600 million Moslems. The Christians and the Moslems held the land as holy to their religion, as did the Jews. The Zionists' claim for exclusive rights to Palestine was unacceptable. Under no circumstances would the people of Saudi Arabia accept Zionist domination of Jerusalem. The situation could be settled only if the Zionists were to agree to live in the State of Palestine, containing both Arab and Jews, without Israel domination, as citizens of the Holy Land under a Palestine banner.

28. At the 1437th meeting, on 9 August, the representative of Paraguay said that strict observance of the Security Council resolutions of 1967 on cease-fire was the minimum condition required to ensure the success of the efforts of the Secretary-General and Ambassador Jarring. No peace could be built on the use of force or the threat of force and the acquisition of territory. The Paraguayan delegation had previously deplored the fact that there was no United Nations presence in the sector where the cease-fire had most often been violated. Such a presence might be helpful in avoiding the recurrence of new acts of violence and in providing the Council with impartial evidence. Whatever decision the Council might adopt, it must appeal to the parties to avoid new violations of the cease-fire.

29. The representative of China said that the Israel action was contrary to the spirit of the Charter and that in the past the Security Council had censured it. At the same time, the Chinese delegation saw no justification for such acts of violence from the other side, since they only led to more violence. The first order of business was therefore to stop violence. The cease-fire must be scrupulously maintained and steps taken to prevent the recurrence of violence. His delegation had previously urged that United Nations observers be deployed in the Israel-Jordan sector. Inasmuch as Security Council resolution 242 (1967) had stressed the

"inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war" and the eventual "withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict", their presence should not have the effect of freezing a temporary situation or hardening the cease-fire lines. On the contrary, the lack of United Nations presence would make it difficult to bring about a climate conducive to a peaceful settlement in conformity with resolution 242 (1967).

30. The representative of India, after expressing his delegation's concern over the bombing of the city of Salt and the heavy loss of life, stated that the incident clearly showed the precarious nature of the cease-fire in the area. Since the adoption of its cease-fire resolution, the Council had had to meet on a number of occasions to consider acts violating those resolutions and to condemn them. The current incident, which was similar to the one that the Council had condemned in March by its resolution 248 (1968), must be similarly condemned. India had held the view that there could be no peace in west Asia until Israel withdrew its armed forces from the occupied territories. That was one of the fundamental principles contained in the 22 November 1967 resolution of the Security Council. The international community should make every effort to see that that resolution was fully implemented. The United Arab Republic and Jordan had already indicated their willingness to implement that resolution in full. Israel was expected to make a similar commitment. In the view of his delegation, the representative of India concluded, the Security Council must condemn violations of its cease-fire resolutions 236 (1967) and 248 (1968) and demand their strict observance. At the same time, it should insist that all parties in the area extend their full and active co-operation to Ambassador Jarring's mission.

31. The President, speaking as the representative of Brazil, stated that his Government viewed the recent incidents with the utmost concern. Those developments were clear and undisguised violations of the cease-fire which, at the same time, showed complete disregard for the Security Council's authority and constituted constant violations of the cease-fire by both sides. The Security Council should place its full weight and prestige behind the efforts of Ambassador Jarring to secure agreement for the implementation of its resolution 242 (1967), which was one of the most positive actions taken by the Council to restore peace and order in the Middle East. Short of enforcement action, the Security Council had gone as far as it could and had laid down the basis for a just and lasting peace. A better political climate would be created if the major Powers harmonized their actions and interests in the area through an understanding on the supply of armaments, either through total cessation of military assistance or through an accorded regulation and balanced limitation on supplies of defensive equipment.

32. At the 1438th meeting, on 12 August, the representative of Jordan said that Israel had often asserted that its military operations and air attacks were directed against what it described as "terrorist bases" and not against civilian installations. That, however, was not the real position. After giving details of Israel's attack of 4 August 1968, the representative of Jordan said that the bombings of a public works camp, coffee shops and farmers and their crops and trucks could not be said to have been directed against the so-called terrorist bases. With regard to Israel's allegations that Jordan had become the principal base for attacks against

Israel, he had been instructed by his Government to state that no recruitment centres had ever been opened in Amman, that there were no *fedayeen* bases or special training camps in his country and that Iraqi army units were in Jordan for defensive purposes against any Israel aggression and that they did not help or train *fedayeen*. There was also no truth in the Israel allegation that there was co-ordination among the Governments of Jordan, the United Arab Republic, Syria and Iraq, on the one hand, and the *fedayeen* on the other, or that El Fatah had Iraqi officers. Israel had wanted to convince the world and the Security Council that Palestinians were happy with its usurpation of their rights and their homes and that there was no resistance from them but only from the Arab States.

33. The representative of Israel stated that his Government had decided to release confidential information illustrating the involvement of the Jordan Government in the terror warfare against Israel. This showed that the Jordanian authorities had not limited themselves to general support of the terror operations but had participated directly in those operations. There was full operational co-ordination between the Jordanian Army and the raider commandos to prevent clashes as a result of mistaken identity and for that purpose the commandos were given special guidance concerning the location of Jordanian mine-fields on the East Bank and of Jordanian Army ambushes. The Jordanian Army Command had also issued instructions to its forces to assist the raider units in determining the best timing and route for crossing the cease-fire line as well as military intelligence with regard to Israel mine-fields, defence installations, patrols and posts and by giving them covering fire. Moreover, a supreme co-ordination committee of the Jordanian Army and the terror organizations had recently been established. The raiders were well-trained military commandos, sometimes of Egyptian, Syrian and Iraqi origin, frequently transferred to terror operations from the regular army units of the Arab States. Those organizations were artificially maintained and encouraged by the Arab Governments as an expression of their belligerency and would crumble the moment the Arab Governments decided to abide by their cease-fire obligations.

34. The representative of Jordan said that there was no agreement between Jordan and Israel which could be described as a "cease-fire agreement". There was, however, an international agreement, the Mixed Armistice Agreement, that had created the armistice machinery, which the United Nations jurisprudence continued to regard as valid and binding on both Israel and Jordan. With regard to the cease-fire, there was a decision by the Security Council, and Jordan was abiding by that decision. However, Jordan could not be held responsible for the rise of liberation movements inside the occupied territories. The violation of the cease-fire came from Israel's actions in occupied territories.

35. At the 1439th meeting, on 15 August, the representative of Ethiopia said that no appreciable progress had been made since the unanimous adoption of the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967, despite the dedicated efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring, to reach an agreement for the implementation of that resolution. In fact, the situation remained as dangerous as ever, with the prospect of another conflict beginning to loom large. The deplorable and repeated incidents of the previous ten months were the inevitable conse-

quences of the deadlock that had been reached in the progress of those efforts, and the only way to get out of the vicious circle of violence and conflict was for the Security Council to see that its 22 November 1967 decision was faithfully and effectively acted upon. All members should support the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative; the special responsibility of the permanent members in the peace-making efforts was too obvious to require detailed elaboration. Meanwhile, the Council must call for the strictest observance of the cease-fire and censure all violations of it. It should also warn that repeated violations of the cease-fire would call unavoidably for its action under the relevant Chapter of the United Nations Charter.

36. The representative of Israel said that during the current discussion of the Middle East situation resulting from Jordan's aggression and his country's defence action, attacks from Jordan had continued. During the period 5-14 August there was almost daily mortar fire and shelling from Jordanian military positions. In spite of those military actions, the Arab representatives and their supporters had suggested that the Security Council should address itself only to Israel's defence action and provide immunity to the Arab States for their acts of aggression. Such a course would be a miscarriage of justice, and Israel, in the exercise of its sovereign rights, would not accept it. After citing further evidence to show the involvement of Jordan and other Arab States in the activities of the commandos, the representative of Israel said that the situation in the Middle East was likely to become even more grave unless warfare against Israel from Jordanian territory ceased and Jordan ensured the strict observance of the cease-fire.

37. The representative of Jordan said that the representative of Israel had once again described the resistance movement to Israel occupation as acts of terrorism and cited certain so-called evidence to show the involvement of Arab States. In that respect the truth could easily be found by letting the Secretary-General's representative visit the Israel-occupied territories. The implementation of resolution 237 (1967) so far had been held up by Israel.

38. The representative of Israel said that a representative was welcome to come to Israel but that the Arab Governments themselves were barring such a representative from investigating the question of oppression and discrimination to which the Jews in the Arab lands were being subjected.

39. At the 1440th meeting, on 16 August, the President announced that as a result of consultations, agreement had been reached on the text of the following draft resolution:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having heard the statements of the representatives of Jordan and Israel,*

*"Having noted the contents of the letters of the representatives of Jordan and Israel in documents S/8616, S/8617, S/8721 and S/8724,*

*"Recalling its previous resolution 248 (1968) condemning the military action launched by Israel in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions and deploring all violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire,*

*"Considering that all violations of the cease-fire should be prevented,*



"*Observing* that both massive air attacks by Israel on Jordanian territory were of a large scale and carefully planned nature in violation of resolution 248 (1968),

"*Gravely concerned* about the deteriorating situation resulting therefrom,

"1. *Reaffirms* its resolution 248 (1968) which, *inter alia*, declares that 'grave violations of the cease-fire cannot be tolerated and that the Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts';

"2. *Deploras* the loss of life and heavy damage to property;

"3. *Considers* that premeditated and repeated military attacks endanger the maintenance of the peace;

"4. *Condemns* the further military attacks launched by Israel in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and resolution 248 (1968) and warns that if such attacks were to be repeated the Council would duly take account of the failure to comply with the present resolution."

**Decision:** *At the 1440th meeting on 16 August 1968, the draft resolution was adopted unanimously (resolution 256 (1968)).*

40. After the vote, the President of the Council took note of the widespread support that had been expressed for the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Gunnar Jarring, in the mission entrusted to him. With the consent of the Council, he requested the Secretary-General to convey to Ambassador Jarring that expression of support.

41. The representative of the United States said that while his Government could appreciate the difficulties of restraining terrorist elements in the emotional climate that prevailed in the area, every Government there was, nevertheless, responsible for maintaining the cease-fire. Moreover, acts of violence inevitably gave rise to retaliation and repression. The main thrust of the resolution just adopted by the Council was directed against those excessive acts of retaliation undertaken in disregard of its resolution 248 (1968). The Council had also considered that acts of violence and specifically such repeated air attacks endangered peace in the area; this was an expression of concern couched in the language of Chapter VI of the Charter. The United States Government hoped that the parties would do their utmost to abide by the resolution. The way to peace, however, lay through agreement of the parties to implement the resolution of 22 November 1967, which the Council had adopted unanimously.

42. The representative of Algeria said that his delegation regretted that the Council, in balancing the grievances brought before it with so-called counter-grievances, was failing to live up to its obligations under the Charter. The Security Council thus could not respond to the question of Israel aggression with the firmness required of it. That was due to the fact that there were forces whose interests were directly threatened by the national liberation movements, not only in the Middle East but in South-East Asia, Africa and even Latin America. Nevertheless, the Council's unanimous resolution had warned Israel that if those attacks were repeated, the Council would have to contemplate more effective additional steps in accordance with the Charter.

43. The representative of Denmark said that the resolution just adopted by the Council was very explicit in the assessment of Israel's military action and left no doubt that those actions should not be repeated. It was equally clear that all violations of the cease-fire should be prevented. The resolution, however, did not contain any reference to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the important mission which had been entrusted to him. It was, therefore, a great satisfaction to his delegation that the President of the Council had taken note of the support that was extended to the Special Representative in the Council. That expression of support made it clear that it was imperative upon the parties to extend their full and unconditional co-operation to Ambassador Jarring. Only in this context could the Danish delegation support the resolution, which did not meet with all its wishes. It was to be hoped that the vicious circle of violence would be broken so that an atmosphere might prevail conducive to real progress for the efforts to achieve a peaceful and acceptable settlement in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

44. The representative of Pakistan said that the resolution just adopted was a compromise text resulting from intensive consultations and, therefore, not entirely satisfactory to all delegations. His own delegation had expected a resolution which would have been the logical sequel to resolution 248 (1968), in which the Council had pledged itself to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter, to ensure against repetition of premeditated and massive military attacks. Pakistan had, nevertheless, voted for the current resolution because it condemned Israel's military attacks on Jordan and also warned Israel against repeating those attacks. The Security Council considered that their repetition constituted a danger to the maintenance of peace. The Council's responsibilities in that respect had been spelled out in the Charter.

45. The representative of Canada welcomed the fact that the Security Council was sending a message to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General expressing widespread support for his efforts. The full co-operation of all the parties concerned was essential to the success of Ambassador Jarring who could help them to attain a settlement in accordance with resolution 242 (1967). The main responsibility for such a settlement lay, however, with the parties directly concerned; the present gravity of the Middle East situation resulted from breaches of the cease-fire on both sides.

46. The representative of the United Kingdom stated that all members of the Council wished to see immediate advance on the basis of the purposes and principles of the resolution unanimously adopted in November 1967; the urgency for pressing ahead with that initiative was made all the more compelling by the recent events.

47. The representative of France said that the French delegation had followed with great interest the activities of Ambassador Jarring under resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. The French delegation paid tribute to Ambassador Jarring's patience and perseverance in the performance of his duties, and hoped that his mission would receive the full support of the Security Council, especially its permanent members.

48. The representative of Senegal said that the resolution just adopted showed that the Council was even more resolved not to tolerate incidents of that

sort in the future. In the opinion of his delegation, the Arab delegations had exhibited moderation during the negotiations over the text of the resolution. Israel should realize that it was dangerous to depend on concepts like that of "legitimate defence".

49. The representative of Paraguay observed that the resolution was a compromise which did not entirely coincide with the views of his delegation. Paraguay had voted for the resolution in favour of unanimity. It considered that in prevailing conditions the only real possibilities of a lasting peace in the Middle East were based on the fulfilment of resolution 242 (1967). An essential condition for this was the co-operation of the parties and, as a prerequisite, all the parties must obey the cease-fire ordered by the Council in 1967. The reciprocal respect and respect for the decisions of the Council would give the minimum basis for the success of Ambassador Jarring's mission.

50. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the resolution contained the minimum conditions required. The Soviet delegation had supported the resolution because unanimity in the Council might serve as a barrier to Israel aggression. The resolution, however, lacked a number of important provisions which might have strengthened it and enhanced its significance. The possibility of reaching a political settlement on the basis of the resolution of 22 November 1967 depended on Israel, since the Arab States for their part had stated clearly that they were prepared to accept and fulfil all the provisions of that resolution and to set up a timetable for its implementation. Those States which continued to support Israel and which had even condoned its aggressive actions also bore responsibility for any lack of progress in the implementation of that resolution. The Soviet Union was convinced of the need for a swift settlement to the Middle East problem on the basis of the 22 November resolution and supported the mission of Ambassador Jarring.

51. The President, speaking as the representative of Brazil, observed that the Security Council resolution deplored all violations of the cease-fire while laying stress on the premeditated military attacks of Israel against Jordan. After expressing full support for the efforts of Ambassador Jarring, he added that his delegation wished to reiterate its appeal of 9 August 1968 to the major Powers to reach an understanding on the question of supply of armaments to the parties involved in the crisis of the Middle East.

52. The representative of Iraq expressed the hope that the Security Council resolution would be the last warning to Israel. He noted that the Council had refused to equate the actions of the so-called infiltrators with those of Israel's armed forces. The activities of the Palestinian patriots, which had never been controlled by any Arab Government, could not fall under the cease-fire resolution, which was addressed to Governments. By its actions in the occupied territories, Israel had left the Palestinians no alternative but to fight and resist. They were fighting to preserve their identity as a distinct national Arab community.

53. The representative of Israel said that the debate had shown that the attitude of the Arab States to Israel remained one of intransigence and belligerency and left no doubt of their direct responsibility for the terror warfare. The resolution adopted showed the inadequacy of the Council's handling of the situation.

Israel had the inalienable right to defend itself against the continued warfare waged by the Arab States and would discharge its responsibility for the security of the population in territory under its control. If the Arab Governments took action to terminate all military attacks, by regular or irregular forces, against Israel, the cease-fire would be effectively maintained. Israel would pursue its efforts to attain a just and lasting peace through negotiations and agreement and would co-operate with Ambassador Jarring towards that objective. It expected the Arab States to do the same.

54. The representative of Jordan expressed satisfaction at the constructive approach of members of the Council, all of whom had condemned the Israel premeditated large-scale military attacks. As to the question of observers, emphasis should be placed on the withdrawal of Israel forces from the occupied territories not on any idea which might help to freeze the situation. The continued Israel presence and the arbitrary measures being taken in the occupied territories were a grave violation of the cease-fire, which was a temporary arrangement. Moreover, there was no evidence implicating the Government of Jordan in terrorist attacks against Israel but Jordan could not be expected to protect Israel against resistance. Jordan had hoped that the Council this time, besides condemning Israel, would have faced Israel aggression with the only effective remedy—sanctions, especially since the latest attacks were aimed at civilian centres. Leniency by the Council could only encourage Israel and lead to a further deterioration of the situation and a loss of faith in the Security Council. Jordan had co-operated with Ambassador Jarring and would continue to do so. It would continue to accept the 22 November 1967 resolution, while Israel had not accepted that resolution in its entirety.

(c) *Communications to the Council between 5 August 1968 and 26 March 1969*

55. During August, Jordan continued to make charges of Israel attacks against Jordanian villages and farms. A letter dated 9 August (S/8741) contained a list of twenty-seven such attacks since 17 June 1968. In letters of 21 and 26 August (S/8755 and S/8773), Jordan charged that Israel had, on 20 and 25 August, shelled villages and centres of civilians in the northern part of the Jordan valley resulting in civilian casualties and destruction of a school, a mosque, part of the East Ghor Irrigation Canal and houses in a number of villages. These attacks, it was stated, had taken place only a few days after the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 256 (1968).

56. In a letter dated 26 August (S/8774), Israel charged that a large-scale military attack with mortars and small arms had been carried out on 25 August from Jordanian territory against Israel villages in the Beit Shean and Jordan valleys, and that Israel forces had returned fire. The letter listed fifteen cases of alleged cease-fire violations preceding this attack which had been carried out between 18 and 23 August both by regular and irregular forces from Jordanian territory.

57. In a letter dated 28 August (S/8787), Jordan advised the Security Council that Israel was contemplating and preparing for a large-scale attack against it. Israel on 30 August (S/8793) rejected that charge,

stating that it was designed to divert attention from the continued attacks from Jordan's own territory.

58. In a letter dated 17 September (S/8817), Jordan stated that the city of Irbid had been shelled again by Israel heavy artillery; and Israel, in a letter of the same date (S/8818), stated that Jordanian forces had opened fire on Israel forces in the Beit Shean valley which had replied in self-defence. Israel charged that 103 attacks had been made against it from Jordanian territory in the period between 18 August and 17 September, involving small-arms fire, bazookas, mine laying and rocket shellings.

59. In a letter dated 10 October (S/8845), Jordan complained that Israel was embarking on changing the Armistice Demarcation Line in the Aqaba area and was continuing to encroach on Jordanian territory. Moreover, it had refused to attend the emergency meeting requested by Jordan of the Jordan-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission on the ground that "it does not recognize the continued validity of the General Armistice Agreement of 1949". That, it was stated, showed Israel's disrespect for international agreements. On 21 October Israel replied (S/3862) that there was no factual basis to the Jordanian complaint and that it was incongruous for the Jordanian Government to invoke the Armistice Agreement of 1949, which collapsed when that country had initiated hostilities against Israel on 5 June 1967.

60. In a letter dated 15 October (S/8856), Jordan listed fifty-one military attacks by Israel, most of them directed against Jordanian villages and farms, from 5 August to 29 September.

61. On 23 October Israel complained (S/8865) of more attacks from Jordanian territory on the Israel civilian population and on Israel defence forces, partly by Jordanian forces and partly by terror warfare organizations, and listed 108 Jordanian violations of the cease-fire since 16 September 1968. In a further communication dated 3 November (S/8884) Israel stated that those incidents had culminated on 2 November in the shelling of the city of Elath from across the cease-fire lines. Israel also submitted a list of thirty-six violations of the cease-fire since 23 October.

62. In a letter dated 5 November (S/8886), Israel stated that examination of the area of Ashdot-Yaacov following an attack on 16/17 October had revealed that the shells had been fired by artillery of Iraqi army units on the East Bank of the Jordan. In a letter dated 8 November (S/8894), Iraq categorically denied the involvement of the Iraqi forces stationed in Jordan in the shelling of the Israel-occupied territory on the night of 16/17 October. Iraqi forces, it was stated, were stationed far from the cease-fire lines, and it was Israel which had been firing long-range artillery shells on the Iraqi positions as had happened on the night of 27/28 October. The Iraqi troops were in Jordan at the request of the Government of Jordan and were under the joint command, whose attitude to the cease-fire was governed by the position of both the Governments of Jordan and the United Arab Republic. In a letter dated 18 November (S/8902), Israel replied that the Iraqi letter showed the evasive attitude of the Government of Iraq towards the cease-fire, concerning which the Council's resolution had been officially communicated to it.

63. On 2 December, Jordan complained (S/8911) of several attacks by Israel on the previous day in the

north and south of the Jordan valley, that had resulted in casualties, and in particular of an air attack on a Saudi Arabian convoy of six trucks near Al-Hasa on the Amman-Aqaba route, that had resulted in the killing of two and wounding of three Saudi nationals and the destruction of two bridges. In a letter of the same date (S/8912), Israel stated that an Israel commando had blown up two Jordanian bridges because one of its industrial establishments, the Sodom Potash Works, had been shelled on the previous night. The letter complained of continuous attacks from Jordanian territory.

64. In letters dated 3 December (S/8916 and S/8917), both Jordan and Israel submitted further charges and counter-charges relating to cease-fire violations on that day. Jordan charged that Israel shelling of the villages of Kum, Kufor Asad and Samma had spread to cover the whole northern part of the Jordan valley and that an Israel air attack on Kufor Asad had resulted in loss of life and damage to property. Israel charged that artillery fire had been opened from Jordanian territory on the night of 2-3 December against nine Israel villages in the Beit Shean and Jordan valleys and stated that Israel had had to act in self-defence by returning the fire and employing aircraft.

65. In a letter dated 4 December (S/8918), Jordan stated that the situation had grown more serious as Israel aircraft had on 4 December attacked the positions of Iraqi troops stationed in the Mafraq area as well as Jordanian posts in the northern area, and that the air raids had extended to densely populated villages in the north. Israel replied on the same day (S/8919) that its aircraft had acted in self-defence against Iraqi military positions which had shelled Israel villages the night before.

66. On 18 December Jordan submitted (S/8935) a list of sixty-nine alleged attacks by Israel against centres of civilian population in its territory from 2 October to 15 December. Many of these, it was stated, had been carried out by Israel armed units, some of which had penetrated deep into Jordanian territory. On 3 December, it was charged, more than thirty elderly men, women and children had been killed in the village of Kufor Asad alone as a result of indiscriminate Israel bombing and shelling, and forty houses had been destroyed. On 15 December Israel forces had shelled centres of civilians in Ghor Al Safi, with resulting casualties and destruction of houses. On 30 December Jordan charged (S/8951) that on the previous day Israel had again launched a four-hour artillery attack on Jordanian territory, from which casualties had resulted.

67. In a letter dated 12 February (S/9006), Jordan complained that on the previous day Israel armed forces had shelled the villages of Safi and Fotah, south of the Dead Sea, and that on the same day Israel aircraft had bombed Ghor Al Safi, using napalm bombs and killing six soldiers and wounding ten.

68. In a letter dated 4 March, Jordan further submitted to the Security Council (S/9039) a list of seventy-six Israel attacks against its territory from 11 December to 14 February and charged that Israel jet fighters and helicopters had continued to bomb and strafe Jordanian villages, using missiles and napalm bombs. Israel rejected the Jordanian charge in a letter dated 10 March (S/9065) and stated that in the past

two months numerous attacks had been launched from the Jordanian territory by regular and irregular forces and that Israel forces had had to take action in self-defence.

69. Further charges were made by Jordan on 16 and 17 March (S/9083 and Corr.1, S/9085) of air raids by Israel jets on 15, 16 and 17 March on a number of Jordanian villages and civilian centres deep in Jordan territory, resulting in civilian casualties and damage to property. On 17 March Israel replied (S/9089) that the persistent armed attacks against Israel by regular and irregular forces from Jordan had necessitated actions on 15, 16 and 17 March from Israel in self-defence against terror organization camps and bases situated in Jordan territory but outside the centres of population.

(d) *Requests for a meeting and consideration by the Council at its 1466th to 1473rd meetings (27 March to 1 April 1969)*

70. By a letter dated 26 March (S/9113), Jordan complained of an attack that day by Israel jet fighters on Jordanian villages and certain centres in the area of Salt, as a result of which seventeen civilians were killed and twenty-five were wounded. The attack had also caused heavy damage to property and to the main roads linking the villages of the city of Salt. In its letter, Jordan requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider that grave and serious violation of the cease-fire and to take more effective measures to check Israel's acts of aggression. Later, on 31 March, Jordan transmitted (S/9121) to the Council a series of photographs showing civilian casualties and trucks carrying vegetables and fruit damaged as a result of the Israel attack on 26 March.

71. By a letter dated 27 March (S/9114), Israel also requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider grave and continual violations by Jordan of the cease-fire, including armed attacks, armed infiltration and acts of murder and violence by terrorist groups operating from Jordan territory with official support, and also firing across the cease-fire lines by Jordanian forces, including shelling of Israel villages.

72. At the 1466th meeting of the Council, on 27 March 1969, the President, before the adoption of the agenda, stated that the meeting had been convened at the request of the representative of Jordan, whose letter appeared as item 2 on the provisional agenda. However, a few minutes before the meeting, a communication from the representative of Israel had also been received which could be inscribed as item 3 on the provisional agenda.

73. The representative of the United States suggested that in view of the Council's practice since 1967 to inscribe the various communications relating to the various aspects of the Middle East situation under the over-all heading "The situation in the Middle East", the two communications before the Council could be noted under the same heading.

74. The President pointed out that the practice of the Security Council had varied in that respect; for example, on the last such occasion on 29 December 1968 the two items had been dealt with separately. He had therefore suggested that the communication from Israel be noted as item 3 on the provisional agenda.

75. The representative of Algeria stated that as regards the suggestion of combining the two items, he considered that by so doing the Council would be putting on an equal footing the legitimate complaint of Jordan against an act of aggression and Israel's counter-complaint.

76. After some further procedural discussion in which the President and the representatives of Algeria, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States participated, the Council agreed to a suggestion of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that the agenda of the Council should consist of the following three items:

"1. Adoption of the agenda

"2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 26 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9113)

"3. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 27 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9114)."

77. The President stated that it was understood that in their statements speakers could refer to any aspect of the items on the agenda so far as was relevant to the meaningful examination of the problem.

**Decision:** *The agenda, as amended, was adopted.*

78. The representatives of Jordan and Israel and, subsequently, of Saudi Arabia were invited to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

79. The representative of Jordan stated that his Government would have brought Israel's continuous acts of aggression to the attention of the Security Council much earlier but for its desire to create conditions conducive to the success of efforts to find a peaceful solution. Israel, however, was not deterred by that attitude. Its shellings of Jordanian villages in the north had become a daily practice that was often escalated by Israel jet fighters carrying out raids deep into Jordanian territory. In previous documents (S/8911, S/8916, S/8935, S/9039, S/9083, S/9085), Jordan had reported to the Council Israel attacks on its territory since the beginning of December. Many of these attacks against civilian targets resulted in severe loss of life and damage to property. They had lately been intensified. The occasion of the current discussion in the Council was Israel's air raid by four jet fighters on rest homes and winter resorts in Ein Hazar, frequently visited by civilian Jordanian citizens and where travellers between the East Bank and West Bank stopped for refreshments before crossing the Jordan River. The raid had killed taxi drivers and many of their passengers, besides destroying several taxis and trucks and six houses in the area. A report in *The New York Times* had stated that there had been no military installation in the immediate area and that no anti-aircraft fire had been directed against the Israel planes. It appeared that the severe international condemnation of Israel following its raid on Beirut Airport (see section 3, below) had prompted its leaders to think of a new policy under which it could continue its aggression without, however, drawing world public attention to those acts. Israel had found that new policy in the so-called active self-defence. Under that new policy of aggression, Israel

would send a few of its jet fighter bombers deep inside Jordanian territory to hit civilian targets in the shortest possible time, ending their indiscriminate bombing by dropping time-bombs that exploded when civilians gathered to carry away their dead. The new Israel attacks had covered almost all populated areas on the East Bank of Jordan, in the north and in the south. In spite of that policy of aggression, Jordan had wished to avoid submitting a new complaint to the Security Council in order not to prejudice the peace efforts of the four permanent members of the Security Council. Jordan had all along supported all efforts towards finding a peaceful solution of the situation in the Middle East and in that respect had co-operated with all representatives of the Secretary-General. Israel, on the other hand, had done everything to frustrate those efforts. That being the case, it was the duty of the Security Council, particularly of its four permanent members, to take measures so that Israel's acts of aggression were discontinued and all its attempts towards frustrating a peaceful solution were checked. It was clear that if the Security Council failed to take effective measures it would have to face more conflicts in the area, because unless adequate measures under Chapter VII were taken, more and more acts of aggression from Israel would follow.

80. The representative of Israel stated that in spite of the Security Council cease-fire resolution calling for an end to "all military actions in the area", Arab military aggression had continued unabated. In the absence of effective United Nations action Israel had no choice but to defend itself, as it had done on 26 March when it took action to disable terrorist bases in Jordanian territory. Since 20 January there had been a marked upsurge in terror warfare against Israel. More than 200 sabotage raids and firing attacks across the cease-fire line had been recorded. The majority of those terror acts had been carried out by El Fatah. During February 1969 alone, those attacks had resulted in eight Israelis being killed and sixty-one being wounded. One United Nations observer had also been injured in the explosion in a supermarket in Jerusalem. Jordan's role in warfare by terror against the people of Israel was a major one, since Jordanian territory served as the main base for attacks against Israel. The main terrorist organizations had their headquarters in Jordan, and their camps, which were located close to the camps of the Jordanian army, were administered and policed by the Jordanian authorities. An agreement had been reached regulating relations between Jordan and the commando organizations, which implicated Jordan in the activities of the commandos to such an extent that its responsibility for violations of the cease-fire could not be denied. The Jordanian papers themselves had reported details about co-ordination between the Jordanian army and the terror organizations. In accordance with its policy of attacking terrorist bases, Israel's action of 26 March had been directed against an El Fatah base at Ein Hazar about three kilometres south of the town of Salt which, he said, was an isolated site quite far from the settlements of the civil population. In Ein Hazar there was a road-block manned by the terrorist squads at which travellers from the West Bank were stopped for control, questioning and instruction. There were also canteens and recreational facilities. Those were the so-called cafés, and in them the persons whom the representative of Jordan had referred to as civilians. Alongside, many vehicles belonging to terrorist

organizations were always parked. It was against these centres of terror that Israel had taken action on 26 March. When an end was put to that terror warfare and the Arab States scrupulously maintained the cease-fire to which they had pledged themselves, there would no longer be need for Israel's defence actions. Until then, Israel's right to self-defence remained inalienable and could not be questioned by labelling it reprisal, a concept which had no application to the current Middle East situation.

81. The representative of Israel went on to state that official communiqués concerning the operations of the terror organizations published by Arab States as well as documents which had come into the possession of Israel had given sufficient proof of the direct responsibility of the different Arab Governments for the activity of the terrorists operating from territories under their control since 1955. The terror warfare was generally begun and ended according to the decisions taken by the Arab Governments. This same policy had been followed by the Arab Governments since June 1967, and a decision to this effect had been taken at the Khartoum Conference of the Heads of Arab States in September 1967. Pursuing this policy, Jordan, Egypt and Syria had set up training camps for terror units in which instruction was given by officers of the regular armies of those countries. Training bases also existed in Algeria, and recruitment centres were established in various capitals of the Arab States. The most gruesome aspect of their activity was that it was directed against civilians. Arab terror warfare was a criminal policy, had continually violated the cease-fire and had undermined the peace-making efforts. The Arab Governments must realize that sabotage and killing had not weakened Israel during the last twenty years and was not going to weaken its determination to attain a just and lasting peace.

82. At the 1467th meeting of the Council on 27 March, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the Council had been called once again to consider Israel's latest act of aggression against Jordanian villages, rest homes and other civilian objectives in the Salt area. That act had been taken in clear violation of the cease-fire and the relevant Security Council resolutions. It was this aggressive policy of Israel which had stood in the way of achieving a peaceful settlement of the Middle East situation. The attack of 26 March was the latest in the chain of Israel attempts to continue taking Arab territories by force and strengthening its position there. Quite naturally, there was a resistance and liberation movement against Israel's occupation and appropriation of Arab territories. As the movement grew, Israel had begun launching new military actions which could not be distinguished from naked aggression and could in no way be described as "self-defence". Israel must, however, realize that acts of aggression could not go unpunished and that the struggle of peoples against the aggressors was not only legitimate on the basis of international law but also invincible, deserving support and sympathy on the part of all peace-loving countries. Israel was trying to give the impression to the world, particularly through the statements of its Foreign Minister, that the incidents of cease-fire violations were minor incidents and that, generally speaking, calm and quiet prevailed in the area. In other words, Israel wanted a free hand to assimilate the Arab territories con-

quered by it. The latest Israel aggression was committed precisely at the time when new efforts were being made to find ways and means to settle the Middle East problem on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. It indicated that Israel wanted to undermine the international efforts towards restoring peace in the Middle East and that its professed declaration of peaceful intent had no basis. In the face of such a challenge, the Security Council could not but condemn Israel's new act of aggression, demand that it observe the Council's previous resolutions concerning the cease-fire and cease any activities designed to subvert efforts towards finding a peaceful settlement.

83. The representative of Nepal stated that it was dismaying to note that the new tensions in the Middle East had occurred at a time when some positive signs of progress had been noticed. His delegation was encouraged by the return to the area of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, by the projected mission of King Hussein of Jordan and by the preparations for the Big Four talks. All those hopeful signs would no doubt receive a setback from the recent premeditated act of violence which was wholly inconsistent with the requirements of self-defence. His delegation deplored all acts of violence and all violations of the cease-fire and expressed its sympathy to the victims. The solution to the Middle East problem did not lie in finding a new formula but in implementing the one contained in the unanimously adopted Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. Nepal believed that a lasting peace in the Middle East was possible only through a settlement, negotiated either bilaterally or within the framework of the United Nations, which should include the withdrawal of troops from occupied territories, termination of all claims of belligerency, respect for the sovereignty and integrity of all States in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

84. The representative of the United States stated that his Government deeply deplored the loss of civilian life in the reported Israel air attack and would make clear once again its firm opposition to attacks of that kind, which formed a flagrant violation of the cease-fire. It would once again urge Israel to avoid such indiscriminate actions involving violations of the Security Council resolutions concerning the cease-fire. However, his Government was well aware that that attack must be seen in the total context of the continuing absence of peace in the Middle East. There had been other equally serious incidents. Thus, while condemning the current Israel air attack, the Security Council could not refrain from condemning the other grave violations from the other side. There were various incidents for which the Arab *fedayeen* had proclaimed their responsibility. The United States equally deplored those actions, and the Arab Governments could not completely escape responsibility for them. In such a pattern of violence it was therefore all the more necessary that all Governments concerned should scrupulously observe the cease-fire. While considering the current situation concerning cease-fire violations, the Council should not, however, lose sight of some of the hopeful developments. The Secretary-General's Special Representative, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, was in the area and was holding consultations with the Governments con-

cerned. In addition, some of the permanent members of the Security Council were also having talks on ways and means whereby Ambassador Jarring's efforts could best be assisted. To continue with those encouraging developments, it was urgently required that the parties, besides co-operating with Ambassador Jarring, should make every effort to see that all violations of the cease-fire were prevented.

85. The representative of Saudi Arabia stated that in spite of numerous condemnations of Israel, incidents involving violations of the cease-fire had continued and he feared that their continuance might lead to a world-wide conflict. One of the main reasons for those incidents and unrest in the Middle East was that an act of injustice had been done to the people of Palestine when they were denied the right of self-determination in contravention of Article 1, paragraph 1, of the Charter. That was the crux of the problem in the Middle East. A people living in their own homeland had been driven away and denied the right of self-determination by another group of people coming from outside, mostly from eastern Europe, with the help of their supporters in the United Kingdom and the United States. It was wrong to say that the Jewish peoples from all parts of the world had a claim over Palestine simply because a Jewish tribe had lived there some 2,000 years ago. The fact was that Zionism was using Judaism for its political and economic ends to exploit the Middle East. The Palestine question, therefore, was not a dispute between the Arab Governments and Israel. It was a struggle of the Palestinian people to regain their lost homeland. The trouble in the Middle East would not be solved until a solution satisfactory to them was found. In all their efforts, the major Powers must keep that factor in mind, because a miscalculation in that respect could result in a great catastrophe involving the whole world.

86. The representative of Israel stated that he would like to submit to the Council additional information which would throw further light on the nature of terrorist bases at Ein Hazar. In the course of Israel action on the previous day, at least fifteen members of a terrorist organization, including two of its commanders, were injured and were hospitalized in the Salt hospital. One of the terrorists belonging to the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine and captured by an Israel patrol on 27 February 1969, had told his interrogators that he had spent some time in one of the houses in Ein Hazar and that there were thirty other saboteurs there who were dressed in uniforms of the terror organization and were armed with rifles. These places could not be described as mere rest houses or cafés. In accordance with the tenets of international law, which were fundamental and did not depend on the policies of individual Governments, Jordan, having given assistance and encouragement to terror organizations, could not be absolved of responsibility for continued aggression against Israel. As early as 1948, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, at a meeting of the Security Council, had asked that each party should be held responsible for actions of individuals or groups on its territory to ensure that their actions did not violate the truce. Israel maintained that the assistance and encouragement given by Arab Governments to terrorist organizations fell within the terms under which the Soviet representative's statement would hold the Arab

Governments responsible for their action. The Soviet Union could help in the search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East by denouncing the actions of the terrorists and, in accordance with its earlier stand, by holding the States from whose territory those acts were committed responsible for them.

87. The representative of Jordan said that the representative of Israel had expressed doubts with regard to his description of the places bombed by Israeli aircraft as "rest homes" and "cafés". However, reporters for *The New York Times* and the CBS had stated clearly that the raid by Israel jets had killed a number of taxi drivers and their passengers and that there were no signs of commandos in that area. Those were eye-witness accounts and could not be denied. The Government of Jordan had already invited representatives of the Red Cross and of all members with embassies accredited to Jordan to ascertain for themselves the true facts relating to Israel's air attack on Salt.

88. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that after the representative of Israel's statement it was clearer than ever that Israel's air attack and Israel's position in the Security Council were intended to disrupt the efforts that were being made to find a peaceful solution of the situation in the Middle East. Furthermore, there was never any formula either in international law or in the commentaries of the most authoritative jurists prohibiting the population of occupied territories from resisting the invader. No principle of international law could justify the aggressive acts and terror perpetrated by Israel in the Arab territories occupied by it.

89. At the 1468th meeting, held on 28 March, the representative of Algeria stated that the Israel attack on Ein Hazar was only one of the violent manifestations of the explosive situation prevailing in the Middle East. It was part of a carefully prepared strategy which was intended to destroy the economic resources of the Arab countries and to compel them to accept an imposed solution. Having been put in the midst of the Arab world by the colonialists and inspired by their ideology, Israel was using their tactics to carry out its expansionist ambitions. For twenty years Israel had unjustly deprived a people of their right to self-determination and national existence. Currently, that people was resolutely claiming recognition and resisting oppression and occupation. In order to undermine that struggle, Israel was carrying out repeated attacks against Arab countries neighbouring Palestine under its so-called policy of self-defence. Faced with such an undisguised act of aggression, the Security Council must condemn Israel and must envisage the necessary measures in accordance with the Charter.

90. The representative of Finland, after referring to the charges and countercharges concerning the attack on Ein Hazar, stated that the Security Council could not accept as valid any arguments put forward to justify unilateral military actions that constituted a breach of the cease-fire. Nor could it consider the current incident or the many others the Security Council had dealt with previously in isolation, as they must be seen as part of the unbroken cycle of violence that was undermining the cease-fire arrangements. The fighting had continued intermittently along the cease-fire lines and inside the countries involved as well, adding to the tragic losses suffered by the civilian

populations. The Council must insist, therefore, on strict observance of the cease-fire by the parties, which should refrain from any action which was likely to increase tension in the area. The cease-fire was, however, a temporary arrangement and only a first step towards making peace. It was necessary, therefore, to take the next step and to remove from the area the state of insecurity which gave rise to acts of violence. The Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 had set out the principles on which a just and lasting peace could be established. The Secretary-General's Special Representative was continuing his efforts to promote agreement on the basis of that resolution. At the same time the four permanent members of the Security Council were also moving towards joint talks, which should be welcomed by the international community. In its current discussion the Council should not proceed in such a manner as to make the forthcoming negotiations more difficult. The overriding interest of the Security Council was to promote unity among its members, and particularly among the four major Powers, in the search for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

91. The representative of the United Kingdom stated that for almost two years the Council had had brought to its notice an appalling list of violent acts committed in the Middle East, resulting in the killing of innocent persons and causing widespread destruction of property. His delegation condemned all acts of violence and breaches of the cease-fire. The Security Council would, however, be tinkering with the problem if it were to concentrate on individual incidents, as the time had come when action to settle the fundamental problem could no longer be delayed. In view of the dangers involved, the outside world could not afford to stand by and treat the Middle East situation as a local quarrel. The parties had had long enough time to try and resolve it on their own. It was proper that there should be new initiatives for peace involving, in particular, the four permanent members of the Council. It was encouraging to learn that the four-Power talks were expected to begin soon, and the Council must condemn any action which damaged the prospects of their success. Therefore, while appreciating the concern and feelings of Jordan with regard to the victims of the recent attack on its territory, the United Kingdom delegation would wish it also to reflect on the need for unanimity in the Council in order to advance the cause of peace in the Middle East.

92. The representative of France stated that the recent Israel attack on Ein Hazar, resulting in the death of innocent persons, which was not an isolated bombing, had brought destruction to a country which already had suffered cruelly. Israel's declaration that its repeated aerial attacks were aimed at commando bases and were of the nature of "preventive attacks" could not justify operations which constituted a new escalation of military action about which the Security Council should be duly concerned. On several occasions the French Government had stated that it condemned all violations of the cease-fire and demanded its strict observance. The French Government also believed that the aerial bombings, instead of crushing the terrorist acts as Israel had claimed, tended to increase the animosity among the populations which suffered from those attacks and strengthened the reaction of which the *fedayeen* were a manifestation. By

widening the gap between Arabs and Israelis, those attacks delayed, if not dispelled, the possibility of a settlement which Israel itself sought. He then recalled that in May and June 1967 the French Government had done everything within its power to have the States concerned avoid the outbreak of an armed conflict, but to its regret those efforts had not been successful. In the months that followed, France again tried to limit the consequences of that conflict and have conditions for pacification prevail. It was for that reason that the French delegation had continued to stress that as long as there was no settlement and occupation lasted, incidents were likely to multiply. It therefore asked for rapid implementation of the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967. In that respect the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, had not so far produced the expected results. On several occasions he had been told that the best means of reaching a settlement was through direct talks between the parties. However, in the current circumstances it appeared that direct talks were not feasible and such a procedure was not realistic. Faced with that situation, the French Government had suggested that the four permanent members of the Security Council should unite their efforts to seek ways and means for the implementation of the 22 November resolution.

93. The representative of Pakistan stated that even if Israel's air attack on rest homes and winter resorts in Ein Hazar had been an isolated incident, it would have, by itself, called for condemnation by the Security Council. But the abundant evidence before the Council, as shown by Israel attacks reported to the Council since the previous December, made it clear that it was part of a systematic pattern of acts by Israel which, exploiting its air superiority in the region, had been inflicting heavy destruction on the neighbouring States. During the Council's discussions of previous military actions, Israel had pleaded the right of reprisal. The Council had, however, rejected that plea because it considered that the acceptance of the theory advanced by Israel would destroy the rule of law embodied in the Charter. In its resolutions 248 (1968), 256 (1968) and 262 (1968), the Security Council had condemned Israel's military attacks, and in its resolution 248 (1968) it had explicitly stated that it would have to consider further and more effective steps if actions of military reprisal and other grave violations of the cease-fire continued. It was obvious that a much more forceful stand by the Security Council was called for in a case where even a pretext to so-called retaliation could not be advanced. The significant feature of the recent Israel attack was that its target was a place having no military installations and where no anti-aircraft fire had been directed against the planes. The recent proclamation by the Israel Government of the doctrine of "active defence" showed that the occurrence was not fortuitous. This doctrine was nothing but the assertion of an unlimited right to attack the territories of Arab States for having given refuge to the uprooted people of Palestine. Israel's military action was not likely to prevent the increase in strength and activities of the resistance movement, which was the inevitable result of and response to occupation. It was likely, however, to hamper efforts towards finding an agreement. The current attack had come precisely at the time when some hope had been aroused by the efforts of the four permanent

members of the Security Council to promote a just solution. The Security Council should condemn the attack of 26 March as a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions and issue a final warning to Israel that any repetition of such attacks would result in the adoption of necessary measures under the Charter.

94. The representative of Israel stated that the validity of the views of Member States were dependent on their relationship to the fundamental concepts of international law, the United Nations Charter, equity and justice. Thus, the political views of certain Governments could not affect the basic right of self-defence. Nor could the methods of self-defence used by Israel be prescribed by the aggressor States or their supporters. Israel had every right to defend itself against open and relentless Arab warfare. If a cease-fire implied reciprocal and scrupulous observance by both sides, Israel could not but insist on such observance on the part of the Arab Governments. Similarly, Israel could not be denied the right to live in peace and security. Israel believed that the only way to attain a peaceful solution to the Middle East conflict was to ensure the faithful observance of the cease-fire and promote agreement by the parties on a just and lasting peace.

95. The representative of Jordan stated that the representative of Israel had asserted that the views of the members of the Council could not affect the basic right of self-defence, but the conception of self-defence that the representative of Israel had in mind was not the one defined by the jurisprudence of the United Nations but was one of his own definition. The statements by Israel and its attacks on the Security Council should not, however, divert the attention of the Council from the dictates of the Charter and its own previous decisions. The Council had on a number of occasions condemned Israel's acts of aggression, and it was time for it to take effective measures to put an end to Israel's continued and arrogant defiance.

96. At the 1469th meeting of the Council, on the same day, the representative of Spain stated that Israel's attack against civilian centres in Jordan, besides constituting a violation of the Council's cease-fire resolutions, also threatened peace and security not only in the Middle East but in the world at large. That situation had resulted directly from the aggression of 5 June 1967, the subsequent occupation of the territory and the non-compliance with resolution 242 (1967). Without prejudice to the fact that that resolution must be completely implemented, it was obvious that the United Nations Charter did not allow for the occupation of territory by force. The Spanish delegation believed that the violent acts about which Israel had complained could be avoided if it were to withdraw immediately from the territory occupied by it. After Israel's withdrawal, the cause for resistance would disappear. If there were as many *fedayeen* camps and bases as the representative of Israel had described, one would have to conclude that those were not terrorists but an entire people who had been expelled from their territory and who had revolted against the injustice done to them. However, the most recent Israel military action had been taken at a time when no act of violence had been committed from the other side and also when the four major Powers were endeavouring to find a solution. Quite apart from the general problem of the Middle East, the United Nations could not



allow one of its Member States repeatedly to take the law into its own hands, commit aggression and occupy territories in violation of all basic United Nations principles, and must take the most appropriate measures to arrest such a situation and prevent a Member State from continuing its defiance of the Council's resolutions.

97. The representative of Senegal stated that his delegation deplored Israel's military action against civilian populations in the area of the town of Salt at the very time when active consultations were taking place with a view to finding a solution of the Middle East situation. Senegal would urge strict observance of cease-fire so that efforts towards a settlement might meet with success.

98. The representative of Colombia stated that the recent attack by Israel formed part of a tactic of reprisals which was contrary to the principles of the Charter and an act with which no State could associate itself. At the same time, his delegation condemned all violations of the cease-fire and terrorist acts irrespective of their source. In view of the recent violent occurrences in the region, it was all the more necessary that every effort should be made to create an atmosphere conducive to the peaceful solution of the conflict in the Middle East. The principles embodied in resolution 242 (1967) were still valid and their full implementation was the only sure guarantee for restoration of peace in the area. In that respect the efforts of Ambassador Jarring had so far proved fruitful. The four permanent members of the Security Council, with their influence in the region, might be able to obtain the active co-operation of Israel and the Arab States necessary for the implementation of that resolution. Colombia still considered as valid the formula for the Middle East peace that the Latin American Group had first submitted at the emergency session of the General Assembly in June 1967 and which later had formed the basis of resolution 242 (1967). It provided for an over-all solution, taking into account the tragic plight of the Palestinian refugees, the withdrawal of the Israel forces from the Arab territories, the recognition of Israel and the ending of the state of belligerency. The Colombian delegation believed that, without neglecting isolated cases of violence, it was necessary to deal with the situation as a whole. It also urged the parties to break the vicious circle of reprisals which was blocking the road to peace.

99. The representative of Zambia stated that while his delegation deplored violence of any kind and regretted the loss of life and property that might have occurred in Israel as a result of the activities of the guerrillas, there did not appear to have been any incident at that time to spur Israel to request a meeting of the Council. Jordan, on the other hand, had been the victim of a premeditated act of aggression executed by the regular forces of Israel. His delegation deplored that attack and urged Israel to refrain from acts that might hamper the efforts of the four major Powers towards peace. It also associated itself with those who believed that the territory of a Member State was inviolable and might not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, and that such territorial acquisition obtained by force could not be recognized.

100. The President, speaking as the representative of Hungary, stated that Israel, by its attack on Jordan on 26 March, had once again violated the sovereignty of that country and the Council's cease-fire resolutions. Israel had maintained that its military action had been defensive in character and was aimed at the maintenance of Israel's security. However, those assertions were not corroborated by Israel's actions. Israel, having occupied militarily large sections of Arab territories, could not demand submission by the people of those territories. The cease-fire ordered by the Security Council could not be used to consolidate Israel's occupation. Its main purpose was to stop further territorial incursions by Israel. The attacks by Israel's armed forces violated not only the laws of peace but also the laws of war, for belligerents were not entitled to attack civilian targets and use against them weapons of mass destruction and chemical weapons like napalm. It was not the security of Israel but that of its Arab neighbours that was threatened by Israel's occupation of their territory. The deteriorating situation in the Middle East was a matter of great concern to the United Nations, particularly the permanent members of the Security Council, who, because of that concern, had agreed to hold talks with a view to contributing to the implementation of resolution 242 (1967). Hungary would support every initiative that might lead to a political settlement by a full implementation of that resolution.

101. The representative of Saudi Arabia stated that the main cause of war in Palestine was the uprooting of its indigenous people by the Zionist movement which was alien to the land of Palestine. Until three years ago, the people of Palestine had hoped that countries contiguous with Israel would be able to find a solution to their problem, but those States had failed. The Palestinian people then decided to continue the fight themselves, and even their children were imbued with that spirit. Some of the Palestinian young men were returning to join that fight. It was, therefore, imperative that during the consideration of the question relating to Palestine, the people of Palestine must also be consulted. The core of the situation lay in the realization of the right of self-determination for the people of Palestine. What was needed, therefore, was a new orientation to the problem, not only through the four big Powers but also through a change of heart on the part of the leaders of Israel. As a result of that change of policy, a new Palestine could emerge in which the Arabs and the Israelis could live side by side in a binational state.

102. The representative of the United States stated that in its statements before the Council each side had accused the other of a long series of premeditated acts of violence and had justified its own acts as necessary measures of self-defence. For its part, the United States could not accept as valid any of those acts of violence and believed that the Council should conclude its deliberations by condemning the immediate act of violence submitted to it as well as all other acts which had violated the cease-fire. Such a decision by the Council would preserve a spirit of impartiality which would be most conducive to the success of its efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement.

103. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that up until then the Security Council had made a distinction between the aggressor and its victim. It was important to keep that distinc-

tion in mind and to consider that the new act of aggression had been committed at a time when many had thought that new initiatives were possible for a peaceful settlement of the problem of the Middle East.

104. At the 1470th meeting of the Council, on 29 March, the representative of Jordan stated that his Government regretted the tendency on the part of some of the members of the Council to find some justification for Israel's act of aggression against civilian targets and to preoccupy themselves with side issues injected into the debate by Israel with the intention of perpetuating current cease-fire arrangements which of course were temporary in nature. In order to make the four-Power talks fruitful, the Council must check Israel attacks. Any hesitation on the part of the Council in taking effective measures would only result in further deterioration of the situation and would only encourage Israel to continue its aggression.

105. The representative of Paraguay stated that his delegation regretted the loss of life resulting from violations of cease-fire, and also the material damage, particularly since that damage had been inflicted on a developing country like Jordan. It meant greater sacrifices for a people which had been handicapped already by its under-development and by the consequences of a recent war. Paraguay could not condone the violent incidents involving serious violations of the cease-fire; at the same time, it could not accept the theory of the exercise of reprisals whereby a State could arrogate to itself the right to carry out military operations of the kind being considered by the Council. It further regretted that those incidents had taken place at a time when the four permanent members of the Security Council were establishing contacts to intensify the efforts for a just and stable peace on the basis of resolution 242 (1967). It was for that reason that his delegation would urge the parties to comply strictly with the cease-fire resolutions and to help in creating an atmosphere for the success of the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring, and also those of the four permanent members of the Security Council.

106. The representative of China stated that while Israel had not denied its attack on Salt, it had claimed that the targets of its attacks were not civilians but centres of armed elements hostile to it. Whatever might be the case, his delegation considered the air raid across national boundaries to be a clear violation of the cease-fire and one to be condemned by the Council. Israel's action could not be characterized as a measure of self-defence, as recognized under Article 51, but rather a punitive action which showed that Israel believed in the effectiveness of armed actions rather than in pursuing conciliatory policies. The Chinese delegation was, however, aware of the fact that acts of violence had become a daily routine, particularly in the Suez Canal area, and considered that all forms of violence were to be deplored. It would urge the parties to give every assistance to the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring, in his search for peace in the Middle East.

107. The representative of Israel stated that the Arab States, while continuing their warfare against his country, wished at the same time that it should not take any action in self-defence. A resolution by the Council which would ignore Israel's right of self-defence would be one-sided and inequitable and would

only increase tension in the area. The Council already had adopted numerous resolutions of that nature, and they had in no way contributed to a solution of the Middle East problem. Only understanding between the parties themselves could bring about such a solution.

108. The representative of Jordan stated that Israel would wish the Security Council to take its decisions in accordance with Israel's wishes. However, the Council had already adopted numerous resolutions unambiguously condemning Israel's aggression. What was needed was that Israel should withdraw its armed forces from the occupied territories. As long as Israel's occupation continued, there would be resistance, which was a natural act on the part of the people who were oppressed.

109. The representative of Saudi Arabia said that the tragedies in Palestine were caused by the incursion of alien Zionists who had occupied the land. The current Israel action was aimed at dividing the great Powers on the eve of their discussions aimed at finding some solution. Israel had flouted all the United Nations resolutions, and it was incumbent upon the big Powers to see that these resolutions were obeyed. There could never be peace in the Middle East with an exclusive and aggressive Zionist society.

110. At the 1471st meeting of the Council, on the same day, the President announced that as a result of consultations among members of the Council, a draft resolution had been worked out. However, the sponsors, out of respect for the day of national mourning in the United States (for General Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President of the United States, on 31 March 1969), had decided to introduce it at the Council's next meeting.

111. At the 1472nd meeting, on 1 April, the representative of Pakistan introduced the following draft resolution (S/9120) which was co-sponsored by Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having considered the agenda contained in document S/Agenda/1466,*

*"Having heard the statements made before the Council,*

*"Reaffirming resolution 236 (1967) calling for respect for the cease-fire and resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968), condemning the air attacks by Israel on the Jordanian territory in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions,*

*"Observing that numerous premeditated violations of the cease-fire have occurred,*

*"Viewing with deep concern that the recent air attacks on Jordanian villages and other populated areas were of a pre-planned nature, in violation of resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968),*

*"Gravely concerned about the deteriorating situation which endangers peace and security in the area,*

*"1. Deplores the loss of civilian life and damage to property;*

*"2. Condemns the recent premeditated air attacks launched by Israel on Jordanian villages and populated areas in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions and warns once again that if such attacks were to be*

repeated the Council would have to meet to consider further more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such attacks."

112. The representative of Pakistan stated that the draft resolution represented a compromise resulting from prolonged consultations among members of the Council, including the permanent members. His own delegation's view, with which many other members of the Council had agreed, was that the Council, taking into consideration Israel's latest act of aggression, should have followed the logic of its previous resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968) and have taken more effective measures. However, in the interest of agreement and mindful of the necessity of preventing a division among the permanent members of the Council on the eve of the projected four-Power talks, the sponsors had not insisted on their original text. The sponsors, however, could not, as some permanent members had desired in the name of what they considered to be a balance, give equal emphasis to premeditated attacks launched by a Government and sporadic violent acts by a resistance movement directed against foreign military occupation.

113. The representative of Zambia stated that while an air attack on civilian targets was certainly deplorable, the Council should look to the future and try to ensure that further violence was not committed against either side. His delegation would wish the Council to take steps to have the rights of the indigenous people of Palestine restored to them, to see that the State of Israel was allowed to exist in peace and that the boundaries of the States in the region should be the same as they existed before 5 June 1967. Unless those goals were attained there could not be peace in the Middle East. Because of its belief that territorial aggrandizement was not conducive to peace and its concern for the welfare and restitution of the rights of the Palestine refugees, Zambia could not but condemn the recent Israel air attack on Jordan, and it hoped that the adoption of the three-Power joint draft resolution (S/9120) would bring about the restraint which was so necessary for efforts towards finding a peaceful solution of the Middle East situation.

114. The representative of the United States, in explanation of his delegation's vote, stated that the three-Power joint draft resolution had concentrated in its operative part exclusively on one kind of violence, ignoring the one which had provoked it. The draft resolution had thus become unbalanced and was unlikely to move the parties towards a peaceful solution. Had its sponsors been willing to add another operative paragraph condemning or deploring all violations of the cease-fire, his delegation would have been able to support it. The United States abstention, however, should not be interpreted as condoning the kind of violence which the three-Power draft resolution condemned any more than it could condone any other violations of the Council's cease-fire resolutions.

115. The representative of the United Kingdom stated that his delegation would have wished to express its strong disapproval of indiscriminate air bombing by voting for a strong condemnatory resolution. However, every action should be judged by its contribution towards forwarding the cause of peace. Consequently, his delegation had considered it necessary that the Council should maintain its unanimity, which was of

vital importance at that juncture, and also keep in mind the over-all situation, in the context of which the Council considered individual incidents. In order to avoid a split in the Council, it would have been desirable for the draft to have deplored all violations of the cease-fire. Failing such an addition to the three-Power draft resolution, his delegation would not be in a position to support it.

116. The representative of Jordan recalled that in December 1968 the Security Council had warned that if Israel attacks were repeated, it would consider applying more effective measures to give effect to its decisions. Jordan had expected that this time the Council would, in fact, adopt more effective measures to prevent a repetition of such attacks by applying Chapter VII of the Charter, but in a spirit of compromise it had not insisted on this. It welcomed the initiative leading to the discussions of the Big Four on the Middle East, but their success would depend on their determination to uphold the basic principles of justice in their search for a settlement. The first objective should be the complete elimination of armed aggression; and Jordan doubted if the draft resolution would lead to that result, since Israel opposed any efforts for peace either by the Security Council or by the four Powers.

117. The representative of Israel stated that as long as Jordan continued to glamourize murder by the terrorists and initiated, organized and supported terror warfare against Israel, it must be considered responsible for a continual violation of international law and a crime against humanity. He reiterated that Ein Hazar had been an encampment of the terror organizations. The one-sided draft resolution, by its perversion of the nature of Israel's defence action, its misrepresentation of that action's targets, its disregard of continuing Arab aggression and its distortion of the contents of previous Security Council resolutions, was contrary to truth and equity.

118. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the main conclusion to be drawn from the Council's current consideration was its unanimous condemnation of Israel's policy of aggression against its neighbours, since no member of the Council had spoken out in justification of Israel's policy. Certain members of the Council had, however, attempted to put together questions which were basically different and also to put the aggressor and its victim on the same level. It was also clear that Israel had no serious desire to participate in efforts towards finding a peaceful solution. In fact, its aggression had meant to undermine those efforts. That was the only possible explanation for its latest act of aggression. Some members of the Council had expressed their misgivings with regard to the adoption of the Asian-African draft resolution by stating that it might create division. His delegation did not share those misgivings and felt that the draft resolution should serve as a further warning to those who were attempting to undermine the efforts for a peaceful solution in implementation of Security Council resolution 242 of 22 November 1967. He emphasized that the item before the Security Council was in effect the problem of the struggle for national liberation of the Arab peoples, who were fighting against foreign rule and foreign occupation, and were waging a struggle of liberation against foreign aggressors who had seized their territories, and enslaved—though only temporarily—their

population. Israel had, in fact, proved to be the instrument used against the Arab world by those endeavouring to arrest the natural process of revolutions for national liberation in the Middle East. But that attempt would be of no avail. He also referred to reports of the deliberate destruction for "preventive" purposes of homes belonging to Arabs in the territory occupied by Israel, and drew attention in that connexion to General Assembly resolution 2443 (XXIII) in which Israel was called upon to desist from acts of destroying homes of the Arab civilian population in areas occupied by it and which provided for the establishment of a Special Committee to investigate Israeli practices affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, composed of three Member States.

119. At the 1473rd meeting of the Council on the same day, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the sponsors, introduced a revised text (S/9120/Rev.1) of the three-Power draft resolution. In the revised text the third preambular paragraph read: "Recalling resolution 236 (1967)" and a new operative paragraph 1 was inserted which read: "*Reaffirms* resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968)". The former operative paragraphs 1 and 2 were accordingly renumbered as paragraphs 2 and 3.

120. The representative of Paraguay stated that his delegation had supported the Council's earlier resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968), but as the revised text of the three-Power draft resolution (S/9120/Rev.1) had omitted certain parts of those resolutions in which reference had been made to all acts of violation of the cease-fire, his delegation would abstain on the three-Power draft resolution.

121. The representative of France stated that his delegation had wished that the draft resolution before the Council would have commanded unanimous support, particularly of the four permanent members of the Council. The efforts in that respect, in which his delegation had participated, had not succeeded. In the absence of an agreed text, his delegation would vote in favour of the three-Power revised draft resolution (S/9120/Rev.1).

122. The representative of Saudi Arabia stated that the Security Council, in its two earlier resolutions, 248 (1968) and 256 (1968), had condemned Israel's military actions. Those resolutions had been adopted unanimously. The Arab delegations failed to understand the reason for the reluctance to support the new text of the three-Power draft resolution. The United States representative had stated that his delegation would be able to vote for the draft if the guerrilla warfare were taken into consideration in the text. That question of equation was a new usage in the United Nations. However, the destiny of a people could not be weighed in the scales. Justice had to be done to the people of Palestine, and an equation between an aggressor and its victim could not be established.

123. The representative of Colombia stated that his delegation regretted that the efforts to have a generally agreed text of the draft resolution had not succeeded and that its sponsors were not prepared to include a paragraph deploring all other violations of the cease-fire. To his delegation that was indeed a vital point since it believed that the Council was duty-bound to condemn all violations, regardless of their point of origin.

124. The representative of Finland stated that the revised text of the three-Power draft resolution (S/9120/Rev.1) had met to a great extent some of the suggestions made by his delegation to the sponsors of that draft. By reaffirming resolution 248 (1968) in the first operative paragraph, the Council would deplore by implication all incidents violating the cease-fire, as had been done in the past resolutions unanimously adopted by the Council. His delegation regretted that the revised text had not met with the approval of all members of the Council, since that could not but weaken the impact of Council pronouncements on the course of events in the area. That was all the more regrettable in view of the projected four-Power talks.

125. The representative of Hungary stated that, in view of the continued defiance by Israel of the Council's previous decisions, the Council currently should have taken effective measures against further defiance by Israel. However, some members of the Council were still reluctant to adopt those measures, and it was for that reason that the text of the revised draft resolution, although it no doubt condemned the Israel air attack, did not include measures which were necessary.

**Decision:** *At the 1473rd meeting of the Council on 1 April 1969, the three-Power draft resolution (S/9120/Rev.1) was put to the vote and was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 4 abstentions (Colombia, Paraguay, United Kingdom and United States) as resolution 265 (1969).*

126. Following the vote, the representative of the United Kingdom expressed his regret that unanimity had not been reached when the Council had been so close to agreement. Because of the omission of any statement deploring all violations of the cease-fire, the United Kingdom had reluctantly abstained in the vote.

127. The representative of Israel complained that the resolution was one-sided, inequitable and ignored basic established facts and was therefore not a contribution to the advance of peace in the area. Arab terror warfare must be condemned with full force. Israel's policy would remain based on: readiness to conduct negotiations with each of the neighbouring States for the purpose of concluding peace treaties; co-operation with Ambassador Jarring, within the framework of the 22 November 1967 resolution; observance of the cease-fire on the basis of reciprocity; and self-defence against armed attacks.

128. The representative of Jordan expressed gratitude to the Council members for condemning in clear terms the most recent premeditated attack by Israel on Jordan villages and populated areas and for rejecting the Israel allegations and counter-complaint which were intended to confuse the issue. Jordan hoped that this would be the last warning given to Israel. The way to peace was for Israel to abide by its old commitments to the Security Council, but its behaviour had been one of war, in which it had received some accommodation from its friends. Members of the United Nations had undertaken to abide by the will of the majority.

(e) *Communications to the Council between 1 April and 15 July 1969*

129. In a letter dated 8 April (S/9137), Israel complained to the Security Council that on that day a Katyucha rocket attack had been launched against the city of Elath, resulting in the wounding of thirteen Israeli civilians, and that in self-defence Israel had taken

air action to stop the attack which had originated from the area of the city of Aqaba.

130. On the same day Jordan charged (S/9138) that Israel aircraft had raided the city of Aqaba with rockets and bombs and that the raid had resulted in the death of eight civilians and the wounding of several others. Many buildings, including a Catholic church, a girls' high school and the police headquarters were also damaged.

131. In a letter dated 20 April (S/9166 and Corr.1), Israel complained to the Security Council of a series of cease-fire violations by the armed forces of Jordan on 19 and 20 April, including firing attacks on Israel positions in the Golan Heights and on the Jordan and Beit Shean valleys, as well as the interception of saboteur units. Fire had been returned to silence the source of the attacks.

132. In letters dated 21 and 22 April (S/9167, S/9170, S/9173), Jordan called to the attention of the Council intensive Israel attacks against civilian targets in Jordan on 19, 20 and 21 April, including shelling and bombing of villages throughout the northern area and the suburbs of Irbid, causing casualties among civilians and heavy damage to property.

133. In a letter dated 28 April (S/9180), Israel stated that because of the attacks launched on 19 April by regular and irregular forces from Jordan, with the participation of Iraqi artillery and United Arab Republic military bases in Jordan, Israel had been forced in self-defence to take measures against saboteur centres, Jordanian and Iraqi military positions and two United Arab Republic operated radar stations in Jordan.

134. In a letter dated 1 May (S/9187), Jordan complained that on 29 April Israel aircraft had bombed and strafed the areas of Tel Shubeil and Wadi Yabis causing the death of four civilians, and that Israel forces had also shelled the area of Shuna Shamaliya.

135. In a letter dated 16 May (S/9211), Jordan charged that on 14 May Israel aircraft had bombed and strafed the Irbid district, causing the death of six civilians, and that on 9 May an Israel unit had crossed the Jordan River, dynamited five houses and mined the area of Wadi Yabis, causing three civilian casualties. The letter also listed eighty-six cease-fire violations by Israel in the period from 17 February to 9 May. In a further letter of 16 May (S/9212), Jordan charged that Israel forces had been using the farm of an Arab orphanage in the Jericho area to shell Jordanian positions on the other side of the Jordan River and that Jordan forces had had to return fire in self-defence. In its reply, dated 21 May (S/9217), Israel rejected these charges, stating that they were a pretext for Jordanian shelling of civilian targets in the Jericho area and that Israel had no military positions in the area.

136. In letters dated 22 and 23 May (S/9218 and S/9219), Jordan charged that on 21 May two Israel companies supported by fighters and helicopters had attacked the villages of Safi and Feifa and that on 22 May four Israel jet aircraft had also shelled and strafed the area of Dair Alla in the north. As a result civilians had been killed and wounded, and houses, schools and other buildings destroyed.

137. In a letter dated 24 May (S/9221), Israel charged that on 24 May fire had been opened from Jordan territory on the Ethiopian monastery south of the Allenby Bridge, and that on 23 May an Israel village in the Beit Shean Valley had been shelled from

Jordan and an Israel patrol in the same area had come under Jordanian fire. After stating that between 11 and 17 May there had been fifty-seven attacks from Jordan against Israel, the letter added that on the night of 17 May irregular units from Jordan had attacked Israel positions in the central Jordan Valley. It also charged that on 19 May Jordanian forces had attacked Israel patrols between the Dead Sea and Allenby Bridge, and on the same night the potash plant near Sodom had been attacked by Katyucha rocket from Jordan.

138. In a letter dated 28 May (S/9228), Israel charged that the orphanage of the Arab Development Society, its school and farm near Jericho had again been shelled from Jordan. Israel charged that those attacks were part of a series of pre-planned assaults from Jordan on civilian centres, including Arab inhabited localities, as shown by the shelling of the city of Jericho on the night of 27/28 May and again on the night of 28 May.

139. In a letter dated 19 June (S/9271), Jordan charged that on the previous day Israel jets had conducted attacks for seven hours against numerous sites in Jordan, using bombs, strafing, firing rockets and dropping napalm, and that twice on the same date Israel forces had shelled Jordanian positions. In the course of those attacks, it added, nine soldiers had been killed and twenty-three wounded.

140. In a letter dated 23 June (S/9274), Israel charged that the campaign of aggression waged against it by Jordanian regular and irregular forces, as well as by Iraqi troops stationed on Jordanian territory, had been dangerously intensified, as was illustrated by a sharp rise in the number of artillery attacks initiated by regular Jordanian and Iraqi forces independently of operations by terror organizations. The letter stated that during 1969 there had been 600 acts of aggression committed from Jordanian territory, including attacks by artillery, mortars, tanks, rockets and anti-tank and recoilless guns, as well as incidents of mining and attempts to cross the cease-fire line, adding that most of them were directed against civilian targets.

141. In a letter dated 23 June (S/9275), Jordan charged that on the previous day waves of Israel jets had raided several areas on the East Bank of Jordan and added that those indiscriminate raids had resulted in the death of one civilian and the injury of seventeen persons, six of them soldiers.

142. In a further letter of 23 June (S/9277), Israel charged that Jordan was responsible for a breach of the cease-fire in Jerusalem on 20 June, in which three bombs had been exploded in a narrow street leading to the Western (Wailing) Wall, injuring three Arab and one Israel inhabitants. As proof of Jordan's responsibility, the letter stated that on 21 June the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, with headquarters in Amman, had published a communiqué admitting responsibility for the attack and that it had been disseminated by Jordan's official media of information.

143. In a letter dated 26 June (S/9285), Jordan complained of several attacks by Israel on the previous day, during which, it stated, the Israel army opened fire on Jordanian positions using machine-guns and tank artillery, and Israel jets had strafed the same area, overflowed Amman, and bombed and strafed several other areas in the northern part of the Jordan Valley with rockets and machine-guns. The letter added that as a result of those attacks eleven Jordanian soldiers were dead and six others seriously wounded.

## 2. COMPLAINTS BY ISRAEL AND THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

### (a) *Communications to the Council and reports of the Secretary-General from 16 July to 4 September 1968 and request for a meeting*

144. In a letter dated 16 July (S/8681), Israel stated, in reply to a complaint by the United Arab Republic on 10 July (S/8677 and Corr.1) of Israel shelling of the city of Suez on 8 July, that the Israel forces had acted in self-defence, with considerable restraint, and that the United Arab Republic forces had initiated the fire.

145. In a letter dated 28 August (S/8788), Israel stated that on 26 August two Israel jeeps had been ambushed while on patrol along the Suez Canal. As a result of the explosion of mines laid on the patrol route and the subsequent firing on the jeeps, two Israeli soldiers had been killed and a third, probably wounded, had been kidnapped by the Egyptian soldiers. In a further letter dated 2 September (S/8794), Israel requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the "deliberate and planned military attack by the United Arab Republic against Israel forces on 26 August 1968, in flagrant violation of the cease-fire". It added that the seriousness of that attack had been aggravated by the negative reply of the United Arab Republic to representations made by Israel through General Odd Bull for the return of the kidnapped soldier.

146. Supplemental information concerning the incident of 26 August was received from the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), General Odd Bull, and made available to the Council by the Secretary-General in two reports. The first, dated 29 August (S/7930/Add.74 and Corr.1), stated that United Nations military observers had reported hearing explosions and observing firing from the west side of the Canal towards the east. Israel on 27 August had complained that on 26 August a patrol car had been ambushed and mined by United Arab Republic forces which had crossed the Canal. An inquiry conducted by United Nations military observers on 27 August had found that an Israel Defence Force patrol had been mined and the physical evidence had indicated that it had been ambushed. Israel had requested the immediate return of the kidnapped soldier, but the United Arab Republic authorities stated that no United Arab Republic forces had taken part in any action on the Israel side of the Suez Canal sector and they had no knowledge of any missing Israel soldier. The second report, dated 4 September (S/7930/Add.76), stated that during the inquiry on 27 August, the observers had asked to see the bodies of the two Israel soldiers reported to have been killed during the incident but had been told that the bodies had been removed from the area for burial that day. The observers could not therefore verify that two Israel soldiers had been killed. However, blood stains and three damaged steel helmets had been seen by the observers at the scene of the incident, and photographs of them had been taken.

### (b) *Consideration at the 1446th and 1447th meetings (4 and 5 September 1968)*

147. At the 1446th meeting, on 4 September, the agenda was adopted without objection. The representatives of Israel and the United Arab Republic were invited at their request to participate, without the right

to vote, in the discussion of the question. The President drew attention to the information circulated by the Secretary-General in documents S/7930/Add.74 and Corr.1 and Add.76.

148. The representative of Israel stated that his Government had decided to bring before the Security Council the incident of 26 August 1968 because the United Arab Republic had denied to General Bull any knowledge of the matter. The facts, however, are quite clear. In violation of the cease-fire and in breach of the arrangements prohibiting military activities in the Canal, a well-planned military attack had been carried out against Israel by Egyptian forces operating from the west bank. That was the first time that Egyptian units had crossed the Canal and attacked the Israel forces stationed along its east bank, and that development was fraught with the gravest dangers for the maintenance of the cease-fire. No attempts to disclaim responsibility or to confuse the problem by introducing irrelevant allegations could alter the basic fact that Egypt could have prevented that attack as it had been able to do so until then. As Israel had informed General Bull, it might be inferred from the nature of the operation that it was not meant to be an isolated incident but the initiation of a new policy of military aggression in the area. In bringing this matter before the Security Council, Israel expected that the Council would take steps to arrest further deterioration of the situation, to condemn the military attack carried out in violation of the cease-fire and to secure the return of the captured Israel soldier.

149. The representative of the United Arab Republic stated that his Government had ordered an inquiry as soon as news of the alleged incident had reached it. The findings of that inquiry, which had also been conveyed officially to the Chief of Staff of UNTSO, had shown that no United Arab Republic forces had taken part in any action in the territories east of the Suez Canal. At the same time, the United Arab Republic had assured the Chief of Staff of its continued observance of the cease-fire in conformity with the Security Council resolutions. As regards the missing soldier, his Government had had no knowledge of the matter. The Israel charges concerning involvement of the United Arab Republic armed forces in the incident had not been substantiated by the United Nations observers in the area, as shown in the information furnished by General Bull (S/7930/Add.74). It should also be recalled that there had been a lapse of time separating the alleged event from the request addressed to General Bull to undertake the inquiry. The statement of the Israel second lieutenant at that inquiry did not bear close scrutiny, since, if he had been there, he would surely have reacted to save his kidnapped colleague. Moreover, the bodies of the two soldiers had not been examined in time by the United Nations observers. It was clear that in submitting its charges about the alleged incident to the Security Council, Israel was indulging, as previously, in its diversionary tactics. Indeed, any violations in the Suez Canal sector had always been committed by Israel. Since its act of aggression in June 1967, it had consistently followed a brutal and aggressive policy in that area, causing heavy losses in civilian life and massive destruction of civilian buildings. The attempts of Israel to hold every Arab Government responsible for acts of patriotism on the part of the oppressed population in the occupied territories could not convince anybody. The Government of the United Arab Republic had steadfastly supported all liberation movements in Africa and Asia. It was there-

fore ironic that that Government was now being asked by Israel to negate its policy of supporting freedom fighters and help Israel in suppressing a genuine and rightful liberation movement.

150. The representative of Israel said that the Council was discussing a simple though extremely grave matter which required a simple response. In accordance with its obligations under the cease-fire, Egypt was responsible for the prevention of any incursions or attacks from its side against Israel forces or civilians and for observance of the arrangements prohibiting movements of personnel and of military activity in the Canal. His Government would like to know whether Egypt was ready to take the necessary measures to prevent attacks of that nature in the future and whether it was prepared to free the Israel soldier abducted in the course of the attack that occurred on 26 August. Israel was defending itself against attacks from military positions established inside the cities along the west bank of the Canal.

151. At the 1447th meeting of the Council, on 5 September, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that his Government, which had always condemned violence and reprisal, considered Israel's decision to bring the matter to the Security Council as the right course. In the case at hand, the Council had the advantage of having reports on which it could rely because of its confidence in General Bull and his observers. The Council could accept their findings that the Israel patrol had been mined and that physical evidence had indicated that the patrol had been ambushed. It should deplore and condemn any such acts of violence. At the same time, it was unfortunate that no report of the incident had been made to the United Nations authorities until the morning after the event. Had an immediate report been made, the evidence before the Council would have been fuller and more valuable. On the other hand, the contention of the United Arab Republic that it had neither knowledge nor responsibility in the matter could not be accepted, as it was the positive responsibility of the United Arab Republic to maintain the cease-fire. However, the assurance given to the Chief of Staff of UNTSO that the United Arab Republic would continue to give its unqualified support to the cease-fire and to the agreed practical arrangements to give effect to it on the Canal was most valuable and welcome. The Council had been called to deal with one event, the attack on the Israel patrol, and for the time being it could concentrate on and reach a conclusion in a simple and clear resolution. Nevertheless, every time that the Council met to discuss the situation in the Middle East, it was essential to recall certain wider considerations. The Council had agreed unanimously on the principles of a final settlement which had been accepted by the parties concerned. It therefore followed that, above all, it was necessary to concentrate, through the Secretary-General's Special Representative, on the substance of the principles and purposes to which all had subscribed and on a new urgent effort to prepare practical proposals to implement the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967.

152. The representative of Denmark stated that his delegation deplored all violations of the cease-fire, which made progress towards peace more difficult. It was incumbent upon all parties to ensure that the climate of calm should continue in order to further the aims of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). General Bull had presented a report according to which United Nations observers had found that an Israel

patrol had been mined and that physical evidence indicated that the patrol had been ambushed. Denmark welcomed the fact that Israel had chosen to bring before the Council the incident of 26 August, and it hoped that the debate in the Council would help towards putting an end to the vicious circle of attack and counter-attack. The Danish Government was convinced that all efforts must henceforth be concentrated on facilitating the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, and, in that respect, the representative of Denmark referred to a communiqué issued on 4 September 1968 at the Nordic Foreign Ministers' meeting in Stockholm which had appealed to all parties to the Middle East dispute to ensure that Ambassador Jarring's mission led to results conducive to peace.

153. The representative of the United States said that, taking into account the three elements of the matter before the Council, i.e., the allegations of the Israel Government, the substantial circumstantial support for those allegations provided by the investigation of the United Nations military observers and the limited denial by the Government of the United Arab Republic, the Council would be entirely justified in accepting Israel's statement, substantially confirmed by the Chief of Staff, while at the same time taking account of the limited denial of the United Arab Republic. The evidence clearly pointed to a wholly unprovoked attack by a substantial number of armed men with the acquiescence of the Government of the United Arab Republic. Every Government was responsible for the control of its own population, and that responsibility was not limited to the actions of its regular armed forces. The United States Government therefore strongly deplored the incident and felt that the Government of the United Arab Republic was to be held strictly accountable for observing the requirements of the cease-fire, which it had asserted it continued to support. Moreover, it was incumbent on the Council to express its position clearly in an appropriate resolution. The Council had repeatedly and properly taken a strong line against acts of military reprisal, and it should therefore equally condemn acts of terror and violence, as otherwise it would leave no alternative to a policy of reprisal. Finally, the parties to the dispute should avail themselves of the instrumentality represented by Ambassador Jarring, Special Representative of the Secretary-General, to start a dialogue which might ultimately lead to a peaceful solution of the Middle East problem.

154. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the Council was meeting to consider a complaint by a country which itself had committed armed aggression against the United Arab Republic and was occupying a considerable portion of its territory. Before submitting its complaint, Israel first should have indicated its intention to abide by the previous decisions of the Security Council, in particular its resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, including the withdrawal of its troops from the occupied Arab territories. Naturally, the question arose as to why Israel had had recourse to the Security Council for such a minor incident, which allegedly had taken place on 26 August 1968 on the territory of the United Arab Republic currently occupied by Israel troops. Moreover, it was quite clear that the complaint was unfounded, as evidenced also by information furnished by the Chief of Staff of UNTSO, which had not once mentioned the United Arab Republic as a

country against which claims could be made in connexion with the incident reported by Israel. Serious doubts about the reliability and plausibility of the Israel assertions had been cast by the supplementary report, which had clearly shown that Israel had refused to provide the United Nations observers with the opportunity to see the corpses of the two Israel soldiers allegedly killed during the incident. However, even if the incident was not a deliberate fabrication but had actually taken place as a result of action by the Arab freedom fighters, the United Arab Republic could not be held responsible for incidents in Israel-occupied territory. The Soviet Union could not agree with the United States view that the Arab States were responsible for events in the territory under Israel occupation. Resentment against the actions of the occupying forces would inevitably lead to an intensification of the Arab population's struggle for liberation against the aggressor. Israel's aggressive policy was fraught with the most serious dangers for its own people. While the Arab States had accepted the resolution of 22 November 1967 and were ready to work for a political settlement, Israel had refused to do the same and was putting forward unrealistic demands in an effort to cover up its aggressive and expansionist policies. Israel was in practice paralysing the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, the main purpose of which was to promote the implementation of the 22 November resolution.

155. The representative of the United States, exercising his right of reply, declared that he had not stated that the United Arab Republic or any other Arab State should be held responsible for events which had taken place on territory that was currently occupied by Israel. Rather, he had suggested that it seemed only elementary that every Government should be held responsible for events which resulted from the actions of its citizens and which were mounted from its territory. He reiterated that according to the statement of the Government of Israel and the evidence that was adduced by the United Nations observers, though it did not fully corroborate Israel's statement in every detail, it was clear that the United Arab Republic had some responsibility for the attack reported to the Council.

156. The representative of Israel stated that the United Arab Republic had taken a highly cynical attitude towards serious discussion in the Security Council of the need to avert the deterioration of the cease-fire. The relations between Israel and the Arab States were regulated by the cease-fire established by the Security Council. Although the cease-fire was not Israel's choice, Israel was prepared at any time to conclude peace with Egypt and to establish secure and recognized boundaries. However, as long as Egypt refused to abandon the Khartoum decision and rejected peace with Israel, the cease-fire was the only basis for relations between the two countries. Israel had turned to the Council for the purpose of finding in it support for strengthening the fabric of the cease-fire.

157. The President, in adjourning the meeting, declared that the next meeting would be held after members of the Council had had an opportunity to hold consultations among themselves on the matter on the Council's agenda.

(c) *Communications to the Council on 8 September 1968 and requests for a meeting*

158. In a letter dated 8 September (S/8805), Israel charged that the United Arab Republic armed forces

had violated the cease-fire on that date in the Suez Canal sector and, in the light of that violation, requested an immediate resumption of the meetings of the Security Council adjourned on 5 September. In a letter of the same date (S/8806), the United Arab Republic charged that Israel had shelled the cities of Port Tawfiq, Suez, Ismailia and Kantara and, in view of the gravity of the situation, requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council.

(d) *Consideration at the 1448th, 1449th, 1451st and 1452nd meetings (8 to 18 September 1968)*

159. At the 1448th meeting of the Council, on 8 September 1968, the President stated that he had convened the meeting in response to requests for an urgent meeting received by him that day from the representatives of Israel (S/8805) and the United Arab Republic (S/8806).

160. The representatives of Algeria and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considered that the agenda should contain only the letter from the United Arab Republic (S/8806), as this referred to a new question. The President replied that he had been guided by the rules of procedure, which provided that any item whose consideration had not been completed at a meeting of the Council should, unless it was decided otherwise, be included in the agenda of the next meeting. The agenda as proposed by the President, containing the letters from Israel of 2 and 8 September (S/8794 and S/8805), as well as the letter of 8 September from the United Arab Republic (S/8806), was adopted without further discussion, and the representatives of Israel and the United Arab Republic were invited, pursuant to their requests, to participate without vote in the discussion.

161. The Secretary-General stated that in three brief cable messages, in the course of that afternoon, the Chief of Staff of UNTSO had informed him of the heavy and prolonged exchange of fire that day across the Suez Canal. The third of those messages stated that exchange of fire in the Canal area had ceased. In view of the fact that no messages about further firing had been received, it was safe to conclude that the cease-fire arranged by the United Nations observers had been holding since it became effective at 1650 hours GMT on 8 September. The Secretary-General also read out the text of a report just then received from the Chief of Staff of UNTSO, which gave details of the exchange of fire observed by the United Nations military observers at different posts along the Canal, the weapons used and the attempts made at securing cease-fire. The report also contained accounts of damage to UNTSO installations and the wounding of a United Nations military observer. (The report was subsequently issued as document S/7930/Add.78.)

162. The representative of Israel stated that the fact that the Egyptian forces had on 8 September opened fire a few minutes after the detonation of a mine and that very soon thereafter the Egyptian artillery had begun an attack along the entire front from Kantara to Port Tawfiq clearly indicated that the 8 September attack was a premeditated and large-scale one in flagrant violation of the cease-fire. He recalled that in his statement to the Council on 4 September he had expressed his Government's concern that the Egyptian attack of 26 August might be a prelude to a renewed campaign of violence along the cease-fire line. That concern had been strengthened by the repeated planting of anti-vehicle mines in the same place,



within sight of Egyptian army positions distant only 200 to 300 metres. From these developments it was obvious that the United Arab Republic was trying to undermine the cease-fire and create a situation of grave danger in the area. It was incumbent upon the Security Council that it should take steps to halt Egypt's acts of aggression and help maintain the cease-fire.

163. The representative of the United Arab Republic, after recalling his statement to the Council on 4 September when he had observed that in the past Israel had preferred to use force rather than bring its case to the Security Council, stated that Israel had returned to its normal routine of first using force and then submitting its complaint to the Security Council. On 8 September, Israel had opened fire in the area of Port Tawfiq and had continued it by extending the shelling to the cities of Ismailia and Kantara. There were grounds for believing that missiles had been used by Israel. The United Arab Republic forces were obliged to return the fire in self-defence and to ensure the safety of its civilian population, whose casualty toll had amounted to 332 killed and 767 injured.

164. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that it would have been more appropriate for Israel to have informed the United Nations observers when a mine had been discovered. The explosion of that mine had started off the cross-firing by both sides on 8 September. If the Israel forces had acted appropriately, the incident and its distressing consequences, for which Israel must bear the responsibility, could have been avoided.

165. The representative of the United Kingdom proposed that in view of the urgency of the matter and the gravity of the situation, the Council might recess for a brief period in order to hold consultations on what immediate action it could take.

166. The representative of the United States, supporting the United Kingdom proposal, formally moved, under rule 33 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, that the Council adjourn for a brief period for purposes of consultation.

167. The United States motion was approved without vote.

168. When the Council resumed its meeting the same night, the President of the Council stated that after extensive consultations he was authorized to make the following declaration:

"The Security Council, having met urgently to consider the item on its agenda contained in document S/Agenda/1448/Rev.1, having heard the reports of General Odd Bull presented by the Secretary-General and having heard the statements of the representatives of Israel and of the United Arab Republic, deeply regrets the loss of life, and requires the parties strictly to observe the cease-fire called for by the Security Council's resolutions."

169. At the 1449th meeting of the Council, on 10 September, the President of the Council drew its attention to the further supplemental information received from the Chief of Staff of UNTSO (S/7930/Add.79). The Chief of Staff stated that he had not been informed on 8 September of a mine to be exploded by the Israel forces, but that in a report received at the UNTSO headquarters on 9 September, the Israel Liaison Officer had reported the discovery of three anti-vehicle mines on 5 September and one anti-vehicle mine on 8 September, which was exploded some two hours later, as it could not be safely removed.

170. The representative of Israel stated that a double standard was being employed by some members of the Council towards Israel. While approving Israel's recourse to the Council, they were at the same time seeking to thwart a just decision by the Council on Israel's complaint. Israel had presented complaints of genuine attacks against it by the Egyptian forces on 26 August and 8 September, whereas the United Arab Republic had merely given traditional and qualified denials, which had been invariably disproved by facts. A careful analysis of the reports submitted by General Bull would confirm the Egyptian responsibility. The initiation of the attack and its immediate extension along a wide front with the co-ordinated use of artillery, mortars, tanks and machine-guns left no doubt about the premeditated and well-prepared character of the operation.

171. The representative of Ethiopia stated that the interminable recurrences of cease-fire violations were jeopardizing the delicate peace mission in progress and if not checked could result in large-scale warfare. The Council should, however, be prepared to look beyond those incidents and focus its attention on the important questions of the maintenance of the cease-fire in all sectors and the peace-making efforts of the Secretary-General's Special Representative. In the spirit of its unanimous resolution 242 (1967), the Council should appeal to the parties to exercise the utmost restraint, to observe scrupulously the cease-fire resolutions and to co-operate with the United Nations representative in the area. It was necessary to create a favourable climate for the success of the peace-making mission of Ambassador Jarring, Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

172. The representative of Brazil said that the Council should not ignore the report of the inquiry by UNTSO, which had stated in clear terms that, from physical evidence observed, an Israel patrol had been mined and ambushed. However, the Council could not go on indefinitely limiting itself merely to fact-finding exercises on complaints submitted to it, or even to a routine allotment of blame, while the vital questions affecting the situation there, such as the arms race between the parties, remained untackled. If both parties were to show an equal degree of adherence to resolution 242 (1967) and co-operate unreservedly with the Secretary-General's Special Representative, an equitable solution of the Middle East situation could be found.

173. The representative of the United Arab Republic said that his delegation had requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council on 8 September in order to have prompt and effective action by the Council against Israel's act of aggression. The report of the Chief of Staff of UNTSO had clearly indicated that Israel had initiated firing on 8 September. Israel's action was not only a flagrant violation of the cease-fire but indicated its ominous designs for the future in the area. The latest Israel aggression had resulted in considerable loss of human life and damage to installations and property on the west bank of the Suez Canal and should be severely condemned by the Council. His Government regretted that the United States, in its enthusiastic support for Israel, should uphold the notion that the Governments of the Arab States were responsible for the actions of the Arab population living under Israel occupation. The representative of the United Arab Republic referred to the Israel statement of 5 September that the cease-fire was the only basis for

relations between the two countries. That was a distortion of facts, since the cease-fire was never envisaged as a framework for governing future relations. In fact, in resolution 234 (1967) the Council had called, as a first step, for all measures for an immediate cease-fire and the cessation of military activities in the area. Hence, the cease-fire was only a preliminary step towards the cessation of hostilities. Further steps should have been taken for the prompt liquidation of all traces and consequences of aggression, particularly of the military occupation. The United Arab Republic had repeatedly declared its acceptance and readiness to implement fully resolution 242 (1967) which had been unanimously adopted by the Council on 22 November 1967. Israel, however, continued to evade a direct acceptance of its implementation. Israel's deliberate policy of omitting all references to the Armistice Agreements was a grave matter which deserved the Council's attention. Those Agreements were still valid and must be adhered to meticulously. The United Nations considered those Agreements still valid and applicable, as was clear from the Secretary-General's reference to them in his introduction to his annual report to the twenty-second session of the General Assembly (A/6701/Add.1, paragraph 43).

174. The representative of Hungary stated that the reports of the United Nations military observers (S/7930/Add.74 and Add.76) had not confirmed the Israel accusation that the United Arab Republic forces had violated the cease-fire. In fact, the United Arab Republic, in spite of the long occupation of its territories, the misappropriation of its natural resources, the systematic destruction of its cities and industries and the blocking of the Suez Canal, had rigorously adhered to the cease-fire and had steadfastly worked in favour of a political solution of the Middle East crisis based on Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. His delegation deplored attempts which were being made in the name of even-handedness to have the Council adopt a stand totally unrelated to the facts of the issue before it. The fact of the matter was that there was an abnormal situation prevailing in the Middle East. The Security Council had adopted a unanimous resolution laying down the basis for a political solution and stipulating the withdrawal of Israel forces from occupied Arab territories, which had not yet been accepted, let alone implemented, by Israel.

175. The representative of Algeria said that Israel's real objective in resorting to the Council with a baseless complaint was to create a façade of peaceful intentions before the world, while hiding its real designs for future aggression. However, as long as the Arab territories remained occupied by enemy forces, the duty of the inhabitants was to fight by all the means available to them, and that resistance had to be pursued on all fronts. The tolerance shown by the Council to Israel's continual occupation of the Arab territories had encouraged that country to continue its aggressive policy towards the Arab States. The Council, therefore, ought to condemn Israel in order to emphasize its disapproval of the use of force, particularly against civilian installations.

176. The representative of France regretted that Israel's commendable decision to appeal to the Security Council on 2 September, instead of resorting to unilateral retaliation, had been marred by the deplorable incident of 8 September, when both sides had exchanged heavy machine-gun and artillery fire. The proximity of important localities on the west bank of

the Canal made its consequences even graver. Those recent developments pointed to the urgent need for restoration of peace in the Middle East. His delegation continued to believe that only a political solution could end the incidents, the repetition of which had raised the possibility of a new conflagration in that region. The resolution of 22 November 1967 still remained the only basis for a settlement that members of the Council were seeking, and all clauses of that resolution must be implemented without reservation.

177. The President, speaking as the representative of Canada, said that the incidents of 26 August and 8 September 1968 had given rise to grave concern not only because of the increase of tension in the area but because they had involved grievous loss of life and damage to property on both sides. The Security Council must ask the parties concerned to observe the cease-fire most scrupulously until the goal of a peaceful and accepted settlement was reached. The goal of a peaceful and accepted settlement was the only way out of the vicious circle of violence.

178. The representative of Israel agreed with the representative of the United Arab Republic that the basis for relations between Israel and the Arab countries should be more than the cease-fire, which was only a first step. But as long as the United Arab Republic adhered to the Khartoum decision of "no peace, no negotiations, no recognition of Israel", it was wilfully preventing progress towards a lasting peace.

179. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the representative of the United Arab Republic called upon the representative of Israel to clarify in precise terms the position of the Government of Israel regarding acceptance and implementation of the Security Council resolution of 22 November.

180. The representative of Israel, in reply to the representative of the USSR, said that his Government's position with regard to the resolution of 22 November had been made very clear at the Security Council meeting on 1 May and could be found in the record of that meeting.

181. At the 1451st meeting of the Council, on 11 September, the President drew the Council's attention to supplemental information (S/7930/Add.80) received from the Chief of Staff of UNTSO relating to incidents in the Suez Canal sector on the previous day. The Chief of Staff reported an Israel complaint of a mining incident in which one soldier had been wounded. An explosion had been seen and heard on the east side of the Canal by United Nations observation posts and an inquiry was being conducted. Later, he reported a further Israel complaint that an Israel soldier had been wounded by fire by a United Arab Republic sniper. An observation post had reported a single rifle shot fired by the United Arab Republic across the Canal.

182. The representative of Pakistan said that the Council did not have an agreed version even of the basic facts of the incident of 26 August, but that the evidence for the incident of 8 September was comparatively fuller and clearer. According to General Bull's report, the fire was initiated by Israel forces after certain explosions had been observed on both sides of the Canal. Sustained firing from both sides seemed to have followed until the cease-fire was arranged. The two issues involved in the situation should not be confused, namely, incidents pertaining to cease-fire violations and incidents arising from the natural consequences of

foreign occupation. It was well known that foreign occupation gave rise to resistance. His Government believed that restoration of peace and stability in the area depended on the implementation of the Council's resolution 242 (1967) and on a successful completion of the mission of Ambassador Gunnar Jarring.

183. The representative of Senegal said that the information available to the Council did not make it possible to establish the degree of responsibility for the incidents on each side. In those circumstances, the United Arab Republic could in no way be held responsible for incidents which had occurred in areas it no longer controlled and were under military occupation by Israel. His Government believed that forthright co-operation with Ambassador Jarring on the basis of strict implementation of all the provisions of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 was the only way that could lead to the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

184. The representative of the United States said that it was encouraging to note that the two Governments concerned had indicated their intention to continue to adhere scrupulously to the cease-fire. To implement these statements of intent fully and without qualification was now clearly their responsibility. The Council must insist not only that both States adhere to the cease-fire but, to that end, that they should issue strict orders to their local commanders against violations or unilateral action that could endanger the cease-fire. At the same time, the States concerned should, as a matter of urgency, give full co-operation at all levels to UNTSO. Cease-fire should not, however, be confused with peace. The resolution of 22 November had provided a set of principles on which a just peace could be erected. Yet Ambassador Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, in spite of his skillful and tireless efforts, had not been able to translate those principles into perceptible progress towards peace. Under those circumstances, the Council must examine what more needed to be done.

185. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the event of 8 September was a new act of provocation by Israel armed forces. It presented a new threat to peace in the Near East and was a gross violation of decisions of the Security Council concerning the cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities in that part of the world. The meaning of the events which had occurred on 8 September in the Suez Canal area went far beyond simple violation of the cease-fire. The recent sequence of military and political events showed that the Security Council was faced with a premeditated aggressive policy intended to inflame the situation in the Near East through acts of provocation by Israel against the United Arab Republic. Israel's responsibility in that respect had been fully confirmed by the report of the Chief of Staff of UNTSO. The Security Council should note that the aggressor, who had invaded the territory of the United Arab Republic, blocked the Suez Canal and stopped international navigation on that highly important waterway of world significance, was intentionally and deliberately going so far as to aggravate the situation in the area still further. In those conditions the United Arab Republic, whose vitally important centres and densely populated areas were in immediate danger and within range of artillery fire and other means of attack by the aggressor, could not help taking legitimate defensive measures to repel possible new acts of provocation by Israel armed forces. It was the duty of

the Council to put an end to Israel's acts of aggression and secure a political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of full implementation of the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967, which provided as a first principle of settlement that Israel forces must withdraw from all territories occupied in the summer of 1967.

186. The President drew the attention of the members of the Council to further supplemental information from the Chief of Staff of UNTSO (S/7930/Add.81), which contained a summary of an inquiry into an explosion on the east bank of the Canal on 10 September. United Nations military observers had seen a damaged half-track, a crater at the scene of the incident and four anti-tank mines in the track and various bootmarks on the embankment. In a further report dated 11 September (S/7930/Add.82) the Chief of Staff reported further firing incidents, two initiated by United Arab Republic forces and one from the south-east.

187. At the 1452nd meeting of the Council on 18 September, the President drew the attention of the members of the Council to further supplemental information submitted by the Chief of Staff of UNTSO. The first of these reports, dated 13 September (S/7930/Add.83), gave information received from the United Arab Republic authorities concerning casualties and material damage on the west side of the Canal, as well as damage to UNTSO installations and property resulting from the firing on 8 September. Information had not yet been received from the Israel authorities concerning casualties and material damage on the east side of the Canal resulting from that firing. A further communication of 17 September (S/7930/Add.86) gave the texts of letters addressed to the Israel and United Arab Republic authorities protesting the damage to UNTSO installations and property in that incident (the replies from the two Governments were included in supplemental information dated 25 September (S/7930/Add.89)). Firing incidents were also reported on 13 September, when observation posts reported firing initiated by United Arab Republic forces across the Canal and at Israel jet aircraft (S/7930/Add.84 and Add.87).

188. The President then read out the text of the following draft resolution which, he said, had been the result of intensive consultations among members of the Council:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling the declaration of the President of the Security Council of 9 September 1968, as made at the 1448th meeting of the Council,*

*"Gravely concerned with the deteriorating situation in the Middle East,*

*"Convinced that all Members of the United Nations should co-operate towards a peaceful settlement in the Middle East,*

*"1. Insists that the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council in its resolutions must be rigorously respected;*

*"2. Reaffirms its resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, and urges all the parties to extend their fullest co-operation to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the speedy fulfilment of the mandate entrusted to him under that resolution."*

**Decision:** At the 1452nd meeting of the Council, on 18 September 1968, the draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention (Algeria), as resolution 258 (1968).

189. The representative of the United Kingdom said that the obvious and primary duty of the Council was to bring the discussion of the current matter to an early end and open the way to progress towards settlement by concentrating on the immediate aim of restoring and maintaining the cease-fire in the Suez Canal sector. For that reason his delegation had no hesitation in supporting the resolution that the Council had just adopted. It was a matter of satisfaction that the Council had received assurances from both sides to respect the cease-fire. The maintenance of cease-fire, in which the United Nations military observers had played a commendable part, was a necessary step if the way were to be clear to go forward without delay to transform declared principles and purposes into the realities of a peaceful settlement.

190. The representative of the United Arab Republic stated that it had become clear that the policies carried out by Israel had two main objectives: the first was to irflame the already tense situation in the area by embarking on a series of pre-planned attacks which, coupled with the continued occupation of Arab territories, could only aggravate the situation further; the second was a tactical campaign with the avowed aim of confusing the issues and distorting the facts. Under those circumstances, it was incumbent on the Security Council to discharge its responsibilities and request forthwith compliance by Israel with resolution 242 (1967). The resolution adopted on 15 September by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity requesting the withdrawal of foreign troops from Arab territories occupied by Israel since 5 June 1967 showed that the world community was becoming apprehensive about the continued occupation.

191. The representative of Paraguay stated that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it believed that any appeal to ensure compliance with the cease-fire and to prevent further acts of violence would create a more favourable atmosphere for the productive exchange of ideas which might lead to an end of the conflict. His delegation could not but condemn the incident brought to the attention of the Council by the representative of Israel in his letter of 2 September, which had formed the basis of the Council's deliberations.

192. The representative of Denmark said that his delegation had already emphasized that the cease-fire should be strictly maintained by all concerned, not only in order to avoid loss of lives, human suffering and material damages but because any violation of the cease-fire had an adverse effect upon the efforts to bring about a peaceful solution of the problems of the Middle East. His delegation understood operative paragraph 1 to mean that the parties in the Suez Canal Sector should strengthen their co-operation with General Bull and his observers; and it whole-heartedly welcomed the reaffirmation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the call on the parties to extend their fullest co-operation to Ambassador Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

193. The representative of Pakistan said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution although it reflected only a part of the action which his delega-

tion would have liked the Council to take. It was in the full, effective and speedy implementation of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 that the best hope of bringing a durable peace to the Middle East lay. Each time that the Council failed to insist on a speedy implementation of that resolution, it only prolonged the agony of the Arab inhabitants of occupied territories. Respect for the observance of the cease-fire, however important, was not an end in itself. In fact, peace-keeping and peace-making were inseparably linked. It was the conspicuous absence of a rational juxtaposition of these two essential elements from the cease-fire resolutions of June 1967 that had led to the existing situation.

194. The representative of Algeria said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because of its conviction that no real solution to the tragedy of the Middle East could be found so long as the Council refrained from tackling the root of the evil and contented itself only with provisional solutions. The real source of tension in the Middle East was Israel's expansionist policy and not the incidents which were only a manifestation of that policy. The time had come for the Council to demand an immediate end to Israel occupation of the Arab territories and to seek the restoration to the Palestinian people of their legitimate rights.

195. The representative of Brazil said that his delegation had voted for the resolution although it would have preferred a more detailed analysis of the complaints submitted to the Council by the parties, a more stringent requirement for respect of the cease-fire and a strengthening of UNTSO under General Odd Bull. However, his delegation hoped that the positive aspects of the resolution would support the task entrusted to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. He stated that his delegation considered that the third preambular paragraph of the resolution adopted entailed, *inter alia*, an implicit appeal to the major Powers to strive towards a mutual understanding on the all-important question of the supply of armaments and implements of war to the parties of the conflict and that it should serve as basis for further action by the Council on this particular question.

196. The representative of the United States stated that his delegation had considered it essential that the Council must insist, as it did in the resolution just adopted, upon rigorous observance of the cease-fire. The need to arrest a further deterioration in the Middle East through rigorous respect for the cease-fire had become all the more critical and urgent in view of Ambassador Jarring's return to New York and the continuation of his peace-making efforts. The Council could well expect the parties concerned to extend their fullest co-operation to Ambassador Jarring.

197. The President, speaking as the representative of Canada, said that the goal of the Council and of the States concerned in the area was surely to further the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Progress towards that goal through the mission entrusted to the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring, was impeded by outbreaks of violence which also increased tension in the area. The cease-fire resolutions adopted by the Council required the prevention by the parties of any and all violations of the cease-fire. It was also incumbent upon the parties to extend the fullest co-operation to the Chief of Staff of UNTSO, under whose guidance the United Nations military observers were

working with dedication. The reaffirmation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) should be regarded as a renewal by the Security Council of its support for the provisions and principles so carefully outlined in that resolution.

198. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the resolution just adopted by the Council basically met the requirements of the moment. However, there had been an attempt to present the situation as if it were not Israel but the United Arab Republic that bore the primary responsibility for the incidents that had, in fact, been provoked by Israel. It was the duty of the Security Council not only to emphasize the need for strict compliance with the cease-fire decisions but also to place particular stress on the need for the earliest possible implementation of its resolution of 22 November 1967. The most significant aspect of the decision just adopted by the Security Council was that the Council had called for speedy implementation of that resolution. He pointed out that implementation of that resolution, which called for the immediate withdrawal of Israel armed forces from the Arab territories occupied as a result of the June 1967 aggression, was the only way of reducing tension and bringing about the necessary conditions for a political settlement in the Middle East. He said that the earliest possible liquidation of the consequences of the Israel aggression against the Arab States, through the immediate implementation of the Security Council's resolution 242 (1967), was called for by the overwhelming majority of countries of the world. The responsibility for the lack of progress in the implementation of that resolution rested not only with Israel but with those countries which were supporting Israel. They too were prepared to help bring about a political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967, such a settlement could become a real fact. The Soviet Union was prepared to do everything possible to that end.

199. The representative of Israel said that his delegation had come to the Council on 2 September with a simple and modest request: to condemn the military attacks on Israel, to call on the United Arab Republic to prevent their recurrence and to ascertain the fate of the abducted Israel soldier. He regretted that the resolution just adopted did not reflect the gravity of the United Arab Republic's attacks and their consequences, in spite of the clear facts of the situation. He declared that Israel would continue to co-operate with Ambassador Jarring and at the same time, it would continue to fulfil its obligations towards its citizens and the territories under its control.

(e) *Communications to the Council and reports of the Secretary-General between 18 September and 1 November and requests for a meeting*

200. In a letter dated 23 September (S/8830), Israel charged that on 22 September an Egyptian unit had crossed the Canal and attacked an Israel force south of the Bitter Lake, hitting a military truck and wounding two soldiers. The Secretary-General submitted supplemental information, dated 24 and 25 September (S/7930/Add.88 and Add.91), from the Chief of Staff, reporting that the observation posts closest to the alleged scene of the incident had heard explosions and that during the subsequent inquiry United Nations military observers had seen mines and other ammunition, a damaged truck and footprints to and from the scene of the incident and the Canal bank.

201. In a letter dated 25 September (S/8831), Israel stated that an Israel half-track had been blown up by an anti-vehicle mine on that day on a track about one kilometre east of the Canal in the Little Bitter Lake area. In supplemental information dated 26 September (S/7930/Add.92), the Chief of Staff reported that, in an inquiry conducted on that day, United Nations military observers had seen the damaged half-track, newly cut barbed wire and footprints to and from the bank of the Bitter Lake.

202. In supplemental information dated 25 September, 1 October and 29 November (S/7930/Add.90 and Corr.1 and 2), the Secretary-General furnished up-to-date information concerning the renaming and relocation of the observation posts established by UNTSO for its cease-fire observation in the Suez Canal sector.

203. In supplemental information dated 23 October (S/7930/Add.94), the Chief of Staff reported that on that day planes had been observed crossing the Canal in both directions and that an aerial battle between three Israel and three United Arab Republic planes had been observed over Ismailia.

204. In a letter dated 26 October (S/8868), Israel complained that on that day United Arab Republic forces had opened artillery fire across the entire length of the Canal on Israel positions on the east bank, and added that a cease-fire had been arranged following two unsuccessful attempts in which cease-fire proposals by United Nations military observers had been observed by Israel but not by the United Arab Republic. In a further letter of the same date (S/8869), Israel complained of two attempts by United Arab Republic forces to cross the Canal, one south of Little Bitter Lake and one in the vicinity of Port Tawfiq. Fire had been exchanged. In a letter of 29 October (S/8875), Israel called attention to the report that the Algerian forces stationed in the Suez Canal zone had participated in the attacks against Israel on 26 October and said that this information was particularly grave because Algeria had ignored the cease-fire resolution and was, on its own admission, pursuing an active role against Israel. On 30 October, Israel charged (S/8877) that the attack of 26 October, which had resulted in fifteen Israel soldiers killed and thirty-four wounded, was the climax of a series of premeditated attacks by the United Arab Republic forces in pursuance of announced United Arab Republic policy of so-called preventive military operations.

205. In a letter dated 26 October (S/8870), the United Arab Republic charged that on that date Israel forces in the Suez Canal area had launched a rocket attack against the city of Tawfiq, resulting in the loss of lives and damage to property. Fire had been returned.

206. A summary of the exchange of fire on 26 October was contained in a report from the Chief of Staff issued on 27 October (S/7930/Add.95 and Corr.1). The Chief of Staff also reported further incidents on 27 October, including ground explosions and over-flying by jet aircraft. In a subsequent report issued on 1 November (S/7930/Add.99), the Chief of Staff stated that on 27 October the United Arab Republic authorities had shown United Nations military observers a weapon at Port Tawfiq which they alleged was one of the missiles fired by Israel on 26 October. The weapon was described as being made of heavy metal, cylindrical and containing high explosive.

207. In further supplemental information issued on 28, 30 and 31 October and 1 November (S/7930/Add.96-98 and Add.100), the Chief of Staff reported on investigations made following Israel complaints of mines laid by United Arab Republic forces along the east bank of the Canal. Investigating United Nations military observers had observed, *inter alia*, damaged vehicles, craters, anti-tank mines and footprints leading to the east bank of the Canal.

208. In a letter dated 1 November (S/8878), the United Arab Republic charged that on the night of 31 October Israel aircraft had penetrated deep into the Nag Hamadi area inside the United Arab Republic bombing civilian targets, among them the Nag Hamadi Bridge, and killing one civilian and wounding two others. It requested an urgent meeting of the Council.

209. On the same day Israel also requested (S/8879) an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the recent acts of aggression by the United Arab Republic against Israel which already had been brought to the Council's attention in previous communications (S/8868, S/8869, S/8875, S/8877) and in the relevant reports by the Chief of Staff of UNTSO.

(f) *Consideration by the Council at the 1456th and 1457th meetings (1 and 4 November 1968)*

210. At its 1456th meeting, on 1 November, the Security Council included in its agenda the complaints submitted by the United Arab Republic and Israel. The representatives of the United Arab Republic and Israel, and later the representative of Saudi Arabia, were invited, pursuant to their requests, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

211. The representative of the United Arab Republic said that the latest act of aggression against it by Israel was ominous not only because of its premeditated nature but because it had been openly admitted by responsible Israel leaders. The selection of civilian installations for bombing showed that Israel aimed at paralysing the economy of the United Arab Republic. While carrying out those and other destructive acts, Israel was, at the same time, conducting a propaganda campaign about its peaceful intentions and constructive approaches. However, Israel had so far refused to declare its acceptance of, and willingness to implement, the Security Council's resolution of 22 November 1967, and that fact spoke more eloquently about its real intentions. In those circumstances, the Security Council, which had already condemned Israel in its resolutions 248 (1968) of 24 March and 256 (1968) of 16 August 1968, must discharge its authority by invoking the required enforcement measures as envisaged in the Charter.

212. The representative of Israel said that although the Security Council, as far back as 1948 and more recently on 22 November 1967, had called upon the parties concerned in the Middle East conflict to conclude a permanent peace settlement, the United Arab Republic had continued in its policy of belligerency, in pursuance of the Khartoum decision of not recognizing and not making peace with Israel. It had now initiated a new policy of so-called preventive defence, under which it had begun a series of aggressive acts against his country. That policy had been started at a time when Ambassador Jarring was doing his best to promote an agreement between the parties for the establishment of a just and lasting peace. As a result, Israel was left with no choice but to act unilaterally in

self-defence. Thus, the blowing up of the power station and the two bridges in upper Egypt, carefully avoiding populated areas and Egyptian troops, was meant to persuade the United Arab Republic to stop its flagrant violations of the cease-fire agreement.

213. The representative of the United States said that the latest violations of the cease-fire in the Suez Canal sector again showed that the parties, instead of complying with the Council's decisions, were engaged in their so-called policies of preventive defence and reprisal or retaliation. While the cease-fire was not in itself a substitute for peace, its scrupulous observance would strengthen the efforts of the Secretary-General's Special Representative to transform it into a just and lasting peace, in accordance with the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967.

214. The representative of Algeria stated that the penetration so far west of the Suez Canal by the Israel commandos implied a grave threat to the safety of the Aswan Dam itself. He reiterated that the real problem of the Middle East was that of Palestine and of the occupied territories, and he urged the Council to tackle immediately the political problem created by the presence of Israel in the Middle East rather than concentrate upon the observance of a precarious cease-fire.

215. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the occupation of Arab lands by Israel was a constant source of tension and the main reason for new military incidents. The latest premeditated act of provocation by Israel against the United Arab Republic could not be justified, and it was the duty of the Council to condemn Israel and to demand its compliance with the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967.

216. The representative of the United Kingdom stated that the only way to break the vicious circle of violence in the Middle East was to make an urgent advance towards a political settlement. Since there was already an agreement on the purposes and principles on which a settlement in the area should be based, the Council must give every support to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in his talks with the Foreign Ministers of the parties concerned towards finding an agreed formula for the implementation of the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967. It must also be remembered that while violence not only hampered progress towards a political settlement, its worst sufferers were mainly innocent people. The Council should not forget the civilian populations living in danger and in fear, and the more than 300,000 refugees in the hills of eastern Jordan who had homes to which they could return immediately. That should provide an added impetus for making progress towards a political settlement.

217. The representative of Saudi Arabia stated that, as he had said before, the real problem in the Middle East was the expulsion of the indigenous people of Palestine and the settling there of eastern European Jews, who sought to create a religious State under the banner of Zionism. More than 100 million Arabs, though they felt no hatred for the Jews as such, were nevertheless united in pressing for the rights of the Palestine refugees to their homeland and would not be intimidated by the announced intention of the United States Government to sell Phantom jets to Israel. The only solution to the problem was for the Zionists to relinquish the dream of gathering the Jews of the whole world into Palestine and to look forward instead

to an era of brotherhood with the Arabs. The Security Council, instead of adopting resolutions which remained ineffective, should look towards a new approach and urge upon the Zionists to re-examine their presence in the Middle East.

218. At the Council's 1457th meeting, on 4 November, the representative of France stated that in view of the increasingly large-scale incidence of violence it would not be enough to protest against violations of the cease-fire or to increase the means of detecting its observance. Rather, it was necessary to remove the evil by its root by securing the full implementation of the Council's unanimous resolution of 22 November 1967. It was a matter of great regret to his delegation that the application of that resolution had not been accepted in equal fashion by both parties to the dispute, but he hoped that Israel would make an effort, comparable to that recently shown by the United Arab Republic, to facilitate the work of Ambassador Jarring, Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

219. The representative of the United Arab Republic stated that the arrogant admission by Israel of having deliberately bombed civilian targets in the United Arab Republic on the pretext of bringing home the necessity of the maintenance of the cease-fire was not only defiance of the Security Council but an ultimatum to the whole world. The protective defence measures undertaken by his country, on the other hand, were aimed at protecting the lives of citizens in the Suez Canal cities. The Israel forces stationed on the east side of the Suez Canal were systematically shelling civilian targets across the Canal. An unexploded Israel missile had been shown to the United Nations military observers at Port Tawfiq on 27 October 1968. Israel's lip service to the cease-fire resolution was but a subterfuge designed to obstruct the implementation of the resolution of 22 November 1967. Moreover, the cease-fire injunctions were only a first, though essential, step that was to be followed by the withdrawal of Israel forces from the occupied territories and the establishment of a just and peaceful settlement. On that basis the United Arab Republic, unlike Israel, had accepted and adhered to the Council's resolutions of 6 June and 22 November 1967.

220. The representative of Brazil stated that the recent acts of aggression and retaliation by the parties to the dispute signified a lack of will to compose differences and forgo violence. The authority and prestige of the Security Council had been challenged repeatedly, and therefore the current debate called for more than merely another stereotyped resolution. It was necessary to achieve implementation of the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967 while the unanimity with which it had been adopted, particularly among the big Powers, still lasted. His delegation would again urge upon the major Powers the halting of the arms race in the Middle East and regretted that they had not exerted serious efforts to arrest it. The co-operation of the major Powers in that respect, as well as in securing an agreed implementation of the Council's resolution, was most essential.

221. The representative of Hungary stated that Israel, contrary to the principles of the Charter and to the Council's resolution 248 (1968), claimed the right of military reprisals whenever it felt or said that it had been wronged. Unfortunately, the Council had been prevented from taking effective measures by those members who had protected Israel from the application of Chapter VII of the Charter. Attempts were

being made by Israel and its protectors to place Israel and the Arab victims of its aggression on an equal footing, with the objective of enabling Israel to maintain its occupation over the Arab territories. To use the cease-fire for such a purpose ran counter to the principles of the Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Whatever military activities had occurred in the Middle East since June 1967 had taken place on Arab territory; Israel could not therefore claim to be defending itself. By its latest act, Israel had extended its aggression to targets deep in the territory of the United Arab Republic. Perhaps Israel's real aim was to sabotage the peace mission of Ambassador Jarring. If the Council wished to give support to that mission, it could not but condemn Israel's latest act of aggression.

222. The representative of Canada said that the recent series of incidents in the Suez Canal sector and inside the United Arab Republic had shown once again the precarious nature of the cease-fire. While the cease-fire was not meant to be a permanent solution, it was, nevertheless, important, because it provided for the abandonment of violence for the pursuit of peace. Its value clearly depended on strict observance, and neither party was entitled to interpret its arrangements to its own advantage. All violations of cease-fire must therefore be condemned, and each party bore full responsibility for the maintenance of the cease-fire. The repeated acts of violence further obstructed the achievement of a peaceful and accepted settlement and only resulted in frustration and further acts of hostility. In that respect, Canada endorsed the warning of the representative of Brazil regarding the dangers of an unlimited escalating arms race in the Middle East and hoped that efforts would be directed towards finding a solution of that problem. It must, however, be remembered that the parties themselves carried the main responsibility in the search for a peaceful settlement. The Secretary-General's Special Representative could assist them in that respect, but he needed their fullest co-operation.

223. The representative of Ethiopia said that the events of the last few weeks in the Middle East had dampened the hopes of the international community for peace-building in that troubled region at a time when such hopes had been enhanced by the provisions of the Council's resolution 258 (1968) and by the presence in New York of the two Foreign Ministers concerned and the Secretary-General's Special Representative. The Council should insist that no violation of the cease-fire and no military retaliation should be allowed to occur; otherwise a continued cycle of violence and counter-violence might lead inevitably to further escalation of the conflict. A basis for a solution of the problem had already been provided in the Council's resolution 242 (1967).

224. The representative of Israel stated that he regretted to inform the Council of another cease-fire violation. On 3 November two United Arab Republic aircraft had violated the cease-fire line in the Suez Canal sector, but they had been intercepted and had been driven back by Israel fighter aircraft. That violation plus the incident of 26 October pointed to the fact that the United Arab Republic was intensifying its aggressive policy and making it more difficult to make any advance towards peace in the area. Moreover, the United Arab Republic had not given any indication of willingness to conclude an agreement with Israel

for a just and lasting peace, which was the central provision of the resolution of 22 November 1967.

225. The representative of Algeria reiterated that the substance of the problem in the Middle East was the recognition of the right of the people of Palestine to self-determination and their right to nationhood. Regarding the cease-fire, he said that, according to the experience of Algeria itself and of Viet-Nam, a cease-fire invariably emerged from a political settlement, and not vice versa, adding that if Algeria had fought alongside the United Arab Republic, it was because of a natural solidarity with fighters for national liberty within the context of Arab and African fellowship.

226. The representative of Saudi Arabia, referring to the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967, said that Israel was not really interested in peace, because it was linking withdrawal from occupied Arab territory with a demand for bilateral peace talks, knowing quite well that no Arab country could talk about a bilateral treaty with Israel. The people of Palestine had as much right of survival as any other people, and the right to regain their homeland could not be denied to them.

227. The representative of the United Kingdom stated that the efforts towards achieving a settlement in the Middle East had reached a critical stage and that if the Council were to fail in 1968 to give effect to its unanimous agreement reached in 1967, then 1969 would be the year of retribution, when hate, fear, hopelessness and the horror of another war might become a terrible certainty. Noting that the Foreign Ministers of the parties concerned were currently engaged in discussions, he suggested that the Council at that stage might adjourn.

228. Following a procedural discussion, the President announced that the Council would adjourn until 7 November; the Council, however, did not resume consideration of the above complaints on its agenda.

(g) *Communications to the Council and reports of the Secretary-General on the observance of the cease-fire from 4 November 1968 to 15 July 1969*

229. During this period, although the Council did not meet to consider complaints relating to breaches of the cease-fire, there were numerous communications from Israel and the United Arab Republic, each accusing the other of violations of the cease-fire. In addition, frequent, at times daily, breaches of the cease-fire were reported by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and brought to the attention of the Council by the Secretary-General in the series "Supplemental Information" (S/7930/Addenda). These incidents comprised firing over the Canal, ranging from single rifle shots to large-scale heavy artillery, mortar, tank and rocket fire, overflights, aerial attack and the laying of mines in commando operations across the Canal. The Chief of Staff included in his reports summaries of inquiries conducted by United Nations military observers into individual incidents. The number and intensity of the incidents led the Secretary-General, in special reports in April (S/9171) and again in July (S/9316) to draw the Council's attention to the critical situation prevailing in the area and in a report of 2 May (S/9188), to express his concern at the threat to the observance of the cease-fire and the dangers to United Nations military observers and installations.

230. Below is a month-by-month indication of communications received from the parties and reports from the Chief of Staff:

231. During the month of November 1968, the Secretary-General circulated to the Security-Council supplemental information from the Chief of Staff issued on 4, 27 and 29 November (S/7930/Add.101, Add.103 and Add.104) relating to an overflight, a mining incident and firing across the Canal.

232. During December the Council received a letter from Israel dated 16 December (S/8934) relating to incidents reported by observers in S/7930/Add.104 and Add.106 and supplementary information from the Chief of Staff issued on 11 December (S/7930/Add.106) relating to firing of single shots across the Canal by United Arab Republic forces.

233. During the month of January 1969, the Council received a letter from Israel dated 25 January (S/8978) in which the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel quoted from a reported statement by the President of the United Arab Republic in support of the "Palestinian resistance forces" and maintained that this statement, which must be regarded as official United Arab Republic policy, had disturbing implications for the maintenance of the cease-fire and the establishment of a just and lasting peace as called for by the Council's resolutions. In addition, supplemental information from the Chief of Staff issued on 2 and 26 January (S/7930/Add.109 and Add.111) related to firing on an Israel patrol and the presence of and firing on Israel motor gun boats on the Canal.

234. In February, the Council received three letters from Israel dated 5, 12 and 13 February (S/8994, S/9004 and S/9009), charging the United Arab Republic with waging terror warfare against Israel, repeated sniping attacks against Israel forces on the east bank of the Canal and the laying of mines at various points on the east bank. It also received a letter from the United Arab Republic dated 13 February (S/9008), in which the Minister for Foreign Affairs charged that Israel had refused to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and that its expansionist plans had been confirmed by statements of its leaders. Thirteen documents containing supplemental information from the Chief of Staff were issued on 5, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28 February (S/7930/Add.112, Add.114-117, Add.119-120, Add.122-127) relating to numerous firing incidents with small arms, automatic weapons and machine guns, as well as inquiries into mining incidents.

235. During March, the Council received seven letters from Israel dated 8, 9, 11, 13, 18 and 24 March (S/9057, S/9059, S/9062, S/9078, S/9093, S/9106 and S/9109), charging the United Arab Republic with large-scale attacks on those dates along a wide front, sometimes extending throughout the whole Canal sector. Algerian forces, it was charged, had participated in the attacks on 8 and 9 March (S/9076). On 13 March Israel replied (S/9077) to the United Arab Republic letter of 13 February (S/9008), rejecting its charges and stating that, on the contrary, it was the United Arab Republic which had a negative position on resolution 242 (1967), as had been revealed in statements by President Nasser as well as in the artillery, sniping and mining attacks recently carried out along the Suez Canal sector. The Council also received seven letters from the United Arab Republic dated 9, 11, 13, 18 and 24 March (S/9060, S/9061, S/9071, S/9072, S/9080, S/9092, S/9108), charging Israel with large-



scale attacks on those dates and the shelling of cities and civilian installations on the west bank.

236. Seventeen documents were circulated by the Secretary-General containing supplemental information from the Chief of Staff issued on 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 24 and 26 March (S/7930/Add.128, Add.130-145) relating to firing incidents, overflights and, in particular, the large-scale incidents of 8, 9, 11, 13, 18 and 24 March.

237. Documents issued during the month of April included a letter from Israel dated 1 April (S/9124), charging that speeches by President Nasser on 27 and 30 March showed the policy of aggression being pursued by the United Arab Republic in disregard of the Charter and the Security Council resolutions, as well as a letter from the United Arab Republic dated 3 April (S/9130), rejecting those charges and stating that the cause of the deteriorating situation in the area was the refusal of Israel to implement United Nations resolutions.

238. The Council also received letters from Israel dated 4, 8, 9, 10, 14 and 21 April (S/9134, S/9140, S/9144, S/9147, S/9156 and S/9172), charging the United Arab Republic with large-scale artillery attacks, sniping, overflights and commando attacks across the Canal on 19 and 21 April.

239. During the same period, the Council received ten letters from the United Arab Republic, dated 4, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21 and 25 April (S/9132, S/9143, S/9148, S/9152, S/9155, S/9157, S/9159, S/9165, S/9168, S/9178), charging Israel with large-scale artillery and tank-fire attacks, in particular, against cities and civilian installations on the west bank of the Canal, with overflights and with responsibility for the grave situation in the Suez Canal sector because of its expansionist policies and its refusal to implement the resolutions of the Security Council. The Council also received a cable dated 30 April (S/9186) from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic, charging an Israel air attack on 29 April on civilian installations in the Naga Hammadi and Idfou areas, hundreds of miles away from the military front.

240. Also during April, the Secretary-General circulated thirty-three documents containing supplemental information from the Chief of Staff issued on 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 April (S/7930/Add.147 and Corr.1, Add.148-151, Add.153-164, Add.165 and Corr.1 and Add.166-180), relating to continuous firing incidents, including the major incidents complained of by the parties, and reporting damage to United Nations installations.

241. On 21 April, the Secretary-General submitted a special report (S/9171) on the critical situation in the Suez Canal sector. The Secretary-General said that he felt it necessary to employ the unusual means of a special report from the Secretary-General to the Security Council to call most urgently to the attention of its members the prevailing situation in the Suez Canal sector which, in his view, was grave. After referring to the information submitted by the Chief of Staff of UNTSO, the Secretary-General stated that it was clear that observance of the Security Council cease-fire resolutions had been degenerating steadily, particularly since 8 April 1969, and that there had been daily major breaches of the cease-fire for twelve successive days. In numerous instances, the exchange of fire had taken place along most of the length of the

Canal. The weapons employed ranged from small arms to heavy mortars, rockets, tank fire and heavy artillery. The United Nations military observers, who were operating under great danger and difficulty, had exerted every effort to bring a quick end to the firing, but in each instance, not later than the following day, firing had erupted again. In those circumstances, the Secretary-General stated, the only conclusion that could be drawn was that the Security Council cease-fire had become almost totally ineffective in the Suez Canal sector and that a virtual state of active war existed there.

242. Referring to this report, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in a letter dated 8 May (S/9196), expressed satisfaction that the Secretary-General had brought that matter to the attention of the Security Council at an opportune moment. The deterioration of the situation in the Middle East, it was stated, which aroused grave concern, was caused by Israel's policy of frustrating the efforts towards a peaceful settlement as provided in the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. That same policy was evident in Israel's attitude towards the Four-Power consultations which could be an effective means of reaching a settlement on the basis of the Council's resolution. If the situation in the area was to be returned to normal, it was necessary that the Security Council resolution on the cease-fire be strictly observed.

243. In a reply dated 15 May (S/9209), Israel rejected the USSR charges as without foundation and stated that the responsibility of the United Arab Republic for the aggravation of this situation in the sector had been clearly shown in General Bull's reports.

244. On 2 May 1969, the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report (S/9188), in which he stated that he was increasingly concerned about certain recent developments which threatened the effectiveness of the observation of the cease-fire in the Suez Canal sector. Those developments exposed United Nations military observers and other United Nations personnel to grave danger and caused heavy damage to United Nations installations, vehicles and equipment. In his report, the Secretary-General included texts of identical letters he had sent to the representatives of Israel and the United Arab Republic on 21 April, the replies of Israel, dated 23 April, and those of the United Arab Republic, dated 25 and 29 April, as well as the texts of further letters he had addressed to the parties on 1 May.

245. In his letters to the parties on 21 April, the Secretary-General had expressed his anxiety for the safety of the United Nations military observers and supporting Field Service personnel stationed in the Suez Canal sector and referred in this connexion to some of the damage caused to United Nations installations and vehicles in the twenty firing incidents between 8 March and 20 April. Referring to complaints by the Chief of Staff that United Nations installations and facilities, though clearly marked, had been repeatedly fired on by both sides and that United Nations observation posts on both sides of the Canal had been encroached on by military positions of the parties, he requested that instructions be issued urgently to the military forces of the parties to avoid actions which restricted the observation operation and endangered the lives of the United Nations personnel. He also requested that the construction of new shelters for United Nations personnel be completed as a matter of urgency.

246. Both of the parties in their replies gave assurances of their co-operation with General Bull and stated that they were taking the necessary steps, as requested by him, to expedite the construction of shelters for United Nations military observers. Each side blamed the other for the danger to United Nations personnel and damage to United Nations installations.

247. The Secretary-General, in his report, pointed out that since he had addressed his initial letter to the parties, daily exchanges of fire had taken place, encroachment on United Nations observation posts had continued and some of them had been hit. An observer had been wounded when his vehicle struck a mine, and the relief of observers had been delayed owing to continued firing. He endorsed proposals by the Chief of Staff that safe perimeters should be established around United Nations installations and that UNTSO should be provided with a United Nations craft to be used for the relief of United Nations personnel when relief by road was not possible.

248. In a letter dated 17 May (S/9213), referring to this report, Finland expressed appreciation of the Secretary-General's efforts to provide adequate protection to the United Nations military observers, took note of the statements by Israel and the United Arab Republic in response to the Secretary-General's appeal and expressed the hope that the arrangements initiated by the Secretary-General would ensure the effectiveness of UNTSO, which was an indispensable means for maintaining the cease-fire.

249. On 13 May the United Arab Republic informed the Secretary-General (S/9207) of the progress of the steps that had been taken by the United Arab Republic to eliminate the exposure of the observers to Israel fire and to ensure their safety.

250. On 27 June, Israel charged (S/9286) that the United Arab Republic authorities were continuing to obstruct Israel's efforts to assure the safety of United Nations military observers in the Suez Canal sector by firing on United Nations personnel, installations and vehicles, as evidenced by General Bull's reports, as well as on sites where shelters were under construction by United Nations and Israeli personnel, despite promises not to disrupt that work.

251. Also during May, two letters were received from Israel, dated 7 and 19 May (S/9194 and Corr.1 and S/9214), rejecting the charges contained in communications from the United Arab Republic of 25 and 30 April (S/9178 and S/9186) and of 13 and 15 May (S/9206 and S/9210), and stating that the United Arab Republic was responsible for maintaining tension in the area and initiating breaches of the cease-fire, while Israel had acted only in self-defence.

252. Three letters were received from the United Arab Republic, dated 1, 12 and 15 May (S/9189, S/9206 and S/9210), charging Israel with firing across the Canal, with attempts to cross the Canal and with systematic destruction of civil and economic installations in the area.

253. Every day during May, the Secretary-General received supplemental information from the Chief Staff, which was issued on 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31 May (S/7930/Add.181-194, Add.195 and Corr.1, Add.197-209, Add.211, Add.213, Add.215-216), relating to daily incidents of firing across the Canal with weapons ranging from rifles through light and heavy machine-guns and artillery to mortar, tank

and rocket fire, aerial activity and anti-aircraft fire, and incidents of firing on United Nations personnel and damage to their installations, as well as proposals for their relocation.

254. During the month of June, Israel addressed two letters to the Council, on 3 and 24 June (S/9254 and S/9278), containing charges that units of the armed forces of Kuwait stationed in the United Arab Republic were collaborating in armed attacks against Israel and that the Kuwaiti Government was assisting Arab terror warfare. On 16 June, Kuwait replied (S/9256) to those charges, asserting that its co-operation with the United Arab Republic was in full accord with Article 51 of the Charter and that its support for the Palestinian resistance movement stemmed from support of the legitimate right of the Palestine people to self-determination.

255. On 25 June, Israel complained (S/9283) that United Arab Republic forces had crossed the Canal and attacked an Israel position on 22/23 June, leaving behind the bodies of five Egyptian soldiers. Despite arrangements which had been made for the return of their bodies by United Nations and Red Cross representatives, their removal was prevented by Egyptian mortar fire.

256. During June also, the Secretary-General continued to circulate, on a daily basis, supplemental information from the Chief of Staff, issued on 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28 and 30 June (S/7930/Add.217-224, Add.226-242 and Add.244-249), relating to firing incidents in the sector involving small arms, artillery, machine-gun, mortar, tank and rocket fire, and incidents of firing on United Nations personnel and installations with damage to the latter, as well as relocation of some installations and efforts under way to relocate certain others.

257. On 11 July, the United Arab Republic transmitted (S/9325) a communication from a representative of the International Committee of the Red Cross concerning difficulties encountered in retrieving the bodies of United Arab Republic soldiers killed on 23 June and charged that Israel authorities had left their bodies to deteriorate in violation of the 1949 Geneva Convention.

258. Between 1 and 15 July 1969, the date of closure of this report, the Secretary-General circulated to the Security Council sixteen documents containing supplemental information provided by the Chief of Staff, issued on 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 15 July (S/7930/Add.250-257, Add.259-264, Add.265 and Corr.1 and Add.266), relating to daily firing incidents in the Suez Canal sector, in which it was reported that weapons used had included rifles, machine-guns, artillery, mortars, tanks and rockets; aerial activity had included flights by light aircraft and Mirage aircraft, provoking anti-aircraft fire; and one incident, on 10 July, when twelve rubber boats, containing from six to eight men, had crossed from the west bank towards the east bank and had returned approximately one hour later, following which two United Arab Republic flags were observed on the east bank the next morning. On several occasions the reports included information concerning incidents of firing by rifles and machine-guns, and once by mortars, at United Nations personnel and installations, with occasional damage being reported.

259. In a special report dated 5 July (S/9316) the Secretary-General, after recalling his special report of 21 April (S/9171), stated that although there had been some reduction in violence in the Suez Canal sector during the last two weeks of May and the first week of June, the observance of the cease-fire had again deteriorated in the second week of June, with exchanges of heavy-weapons fire initiated almost daily, especially from the west side of the Canal, as reported to the Security Council in the supplemental information reports of the S/7930 series, which had covered firing on eighty-six consecutive days as of 5 July. The fact that many of those activities had been announced by the parties themselves implied a tacit recognition by them that the cease-fire, to all practical intents and purposes, had ceased to be respected in the Suez Canal sector. The Secretary-General, referring also to his report of 2 May (S/9188), in which he had expressed his concern about the danger to which United Nations military observers and installations had been exposed, stated that that risk had increased in the past two weeks. The military observers, although carrying out their duties with a devotion worthy of the highest praise, were doing so under conditions of continuous danger. Messages had been sent by UNTSO to the authorities of the United Arab Republic and, on occasion as necessary, to Israel concerning incidents of firing on United Nations personnel and United Nations observation posts and equipment, but without any noticeable effect. In the month of June alone, there had been twenty-one reported incidents of firing by United Arab Republic forces and five by Israel forces on United Nations personnel or installations. After recalling that the observers were unarmed men doing their best under extraordinary stress and strain to fulfil the task assigned to them by the Security Council, the Secretary-General stated that they could not be expected to serve as what amounted to defenceless targets in a shooting gallery. If they continued to be fired upon, the Secretary-General added, he would have to advise the Council on the future course of action, including even the possibility of withdrawal of the observers.

260. The Secretary-General said that the conclusion was inescapable that throughout the Suez Canal sector open warfare had been resumed. Experience showed that it was virtually impossible to ensure effective observance of a cease-fire for a prolonged and indefinite period in a situation where two hostile forces constantly confronted each other across a narrow no man's land, with one party in military occupation of territory belonging to the other and with no early prospect of the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

261. After referring to the worsening situation also in the Israel-Jordan sector, the Secretary-General stated that the level of violence in the Middle East since 1967 had never been higher than it was at the time of his report. He was bringing that situation to the attention of the Security Council fully aware that as Secretary-General he had been unable to improve it, and because if it continued, the situation could soon render vain efforts towards a peaceful settlement and could even be the overture to more general intensive hostilities in the Middle East.

262. The Secretary-General then appealed to all parties in the Middle East to end immediately all offensive military actions, particularly those taking place daily in the Suez Canal sector, and return to observance

of the Security Council cease-fire in order to avoid frustrating current efforts to restore peace in the Middle East. He also appealed to the members of the Security Council and to all Members of the United Nations to exert all influence and to take all measures which might be helpful in making the cease-fire effective and the peace efforts successful in the vital interest of the whole world.

263. In a letter dated 10 July (S/9321), the United Arab Republic stated that the full responsibility for the deterioration in the situation, to which attention had been called in the Secretary-General's report, lay with Israel. The Security Council had called for a cease-fire as a first step, and in a second resolution had called upon Israel to withdraw its forces from the occupied territories and had provided for a peaceful settlement. By refusing to accept and implement this resolution and other United Nations resolutions, Israel was obstructing the efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement and was therefore responsible for the prevailing state of tension in the area. For its part, the United Arab Republic had exerted all efforts for the success of Ambassador Jarring's mission, had accepted the Security Council's resolution 242 (1967) and had co-operated with the United Nations Command to ensure the safety of the observers in the Suez Canal sector.

264. In a letter dated 11 July (S/9322), Israel stated that it had accepted the Security Council's cease-fire resolutions in June 1967 and had at all times been prepared to adhere to them scrupulously on a reciprocal basis. However, if armed attacks were made across the cease-fire lines from the territory of Arab States, whether by regular or irregular forces, Israel had to take appropriate self-defence measures. It was clear that the responsibility lay with the Arab States; the United Arab Republic was openly proclaiming a policy of initiating fire and of raiding across the Suez Canal, and the activities of terrorist groups were openly supported by Arab Governments and armies. There were almost daily cases of firing by United Arab Republic troops at United Nations observers and installations. There was full agreement and co-operation between the Israel military authorities and the United Nations cease-fire machinery for the protection of United Nations personnel on the Israel side; Israel forces were under strict orders to avoid any harm to United Nations observers or installations, and where posts on the Egyptian side might have been hit by shell fragments, that had been an unavoidable result of return fire at Egyptian positions.

### 3. COMPLAINTS BY ISRAEL AND LEBANON

(a) *Communications to the Council and reports of the Secretary-General on the observance of the cease-fire between 16 July and 26 December 1968 and requests for a meeting*

265. In a letter dated 28 October (S/8872), Lebanon complained that on the night of 26/27 October, Israel forces had shelled the Lebanese village of Almajdyiah, and, in a letter dated 29 October (S/8874), further complained that on 28 October, Israel forces had shelled two border positions.

266. With regard to the first of these complaints, the Chief of Staff of UNTSO reported in supplemental information issued on 28 October (S/7930/Add.96) that in an inquiry into the incident, United Nations military observers had found blood-stains, craters, holes in the roofs of houses and dead livestock. In a

subsequent report issued on 31 October (S/7930/Add.98), the Chief of Staff summarized the results of three inquiries into a further Lebanese complaint that on 28/29 October mortar fire had been directed towards the areas of Nabi el Oueida, Houle and Blida; observers had seen craters and mortar tailfins with markings in Hebrew.

267. In its reply of 6 November (S/8891), Israel stated that the cease-fire had been first violated from the Lebanese side and that Israel had had to take appropriate defensive measures.

268. In a letter dated 29 December (S/8945), Lebanon requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider an act of aggression committed by the Israel Air Force against Lebanon by the attack on the Civilian International Airport of Beirut on 28 December 1968, for which, the letter added, the Israel authorities had admitted their responsibility.

269. In a letter of the same date (S/8946), Israel also requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the constant violation by Lebanon of the United Nations Charter and the Council's cease-fire resolutions by assisting and abetting acts of warfare, violence and terror by irregular forces and organizations operating from Lebanon against Israel, particularly against Israel civil aviation.

*(b) Consideration at the 1460th to 1462nd meetings (29 to 31 December 1968)*

270. At the 1460th meeting, held on 29 December, the Security Council adopted, without objection, an agenda which listed the letter of 29 December from Lebanon (S/8945) under the general heading of "The situation in the Middle East", followed by the letter of 29 December from Israel (S/8946), again under the same general heading.

271. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that while his delegation had not formally objected to the adoption of the agenda, it reserved its right to come back to that matter, as the second item on the agenda had no direct relationship to the situation in the Middle East, inasmuch as the events had taken place in Athens.

272. The representative of Canada stated that his delegation would wish to have the assurance from the President that, in adopting the agenda, members of the Council had done so without prejudice to the positions they or the parties concerned might take on the substance.

273. The President said that it was his understanding that in their statements members of the Council could refer to any part of the agenda as it stood.

274. The representatives of Lebanon and Israel and, subsequently, of Saudi Arabia, were invited, at their request, to participate without vote in the discussion.

275. The President drew the attention of members of the Council to information relating to the question received from the Acting Chief of Staff of UNTSO and contained in documents S/7930/Add.107 and Add.108.

276. The first report, issued on 29 December (S/7930/Add.107), stated that on that morning the Chairman of the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission had received a complaint from the Lebanese delegation that on the previous evening Israel heliborne troops had destroyed thirteen civilian aircraft at the Beirut International Airport. An immediate inquiry

had been requested and was being conducted. The report added that in discussion with the Chief Operations Officer of UNTSO, the Assistant Israel Liaison Officer had stated that fourteen aircraft had been destroyed or damaged. The second report (S/7930/Add.108), containing the summary of inquiry, stated that eleven witnesses had been interrogated, who provided an account of the attack at the Beirut International Airport, the physical damage caused and injury to one of the personnel at the airport. The United Nations military observers had seen thirteen destroyed aircraft, damage to the main terminal building, explosive charges and a grenade with Hebrew markings.

277. The representative of Lebanon said that his country and people, which had always been ardent supporters of the principles and purposes of the Charter, had become the latest victim of Israel's aggression on 28 December 1968. The defenceless Civilian International Airport of Beirut had become a target of Israel's aggressive designs. Units of the Israel Air Force had staged a surprise and treacherous attack on its installations and on civilian aircraft which had been in the hangars and on the ground of the airport. The airplanes destroyed in that attack constituted the main portion of Lebanon's civilian aircraft fleet. Hangars, repair shops and fuel depots were also hit and destroyed. The buildings of the air terminal also suffered extensive damage. The aggressive act committed against Lebanon was a flagrant violation of the principles and objectives of the Charter. The Security Council should go beyond the usual condemnatory resolutions and take effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. The Lebanese Government would, at a later stage, after having fully assessed the damage suffered, request the Council to take the necessary measures against Israel in order to compensate Lebanon fully for such damages.

278. The representative of Israel stated that on 26 December an Israel civil airliner, en route to New York on a regular, scheduled commercial flight, had been attacked by bombs and machine-guns at the Athens International Airport. The assailants had come from Beirut. They had opened fire indiscriminately with sub-machine-guns against the passengers and the crew, killing one passenger.

279. Speaking on a point of order, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the representative of Israel was involving the Security Council in the consideration of events which had taken place in Athens and related to the sovereignty and competence of the Greek Government. In dealing with that matter, the Greek Government had not appealed to the Security Council. The question before the Council related to a completely different matter arising out of Israel's aggression against a peaceful country, Lebanon.

280. The representative of Israel, resuming his statement, stated that it was in Beirut that the major Arab terrorist organizations had established their headquarters and had set up their international networks; by permitting them to do so, the Lebanese Government had assumed responsibility for their activities. Lebanon had, however, undertaken obligations towards Israel under the Security Council cease-fire resolution, and any attack against an Israel civil aircraft, wherever it might be, was as much a violation of the cease-fire as any attack on Israel territory and entitled the Israel

Government to exercise its right of self-defence. Two attacks on Israel aircraft within the last year by the same commando group based in Beirut showed that the objective was to disrupt Israel civil aviation. On 28 December a commando unit of the Israel defence forces had landed at Beirut airport and had struck at a number of aircraft belonging to Arab airlines parked in the airport. There was no loss of life. The action was taken to uphold Israel's basic right to free navigation in international skies. The complaint had to be seen in the broader context of the continuation by the Arab States of active warfare against Israel through irregular forces, armed, trained and financed by them. The activities of the terrorist organizations seriously undermined the patient efforts of Ambassador Jarring towards a settlement. Israel hoped that the Security Council would clearly indicate that it could no longer tolerate the continuation of warfare under the guise of terrorist activities and would demand from the Arab States, including Lebanon, full adherence to their obligations under the Charter and the cease-fire.

281. The representative of the United States said that the Council was meeting to deal with a most regrettable Israel action which his Government strongly condemned. It shared the concern of Israel over the increasing interference with the right of unimpeded air travel between States, but felt the Israel action of 28 December was unjustified. It saw no justification for retaliation of any kind against Lebanon. Lebanon was a country which clearly had been doing its best to live in peace with all other States in the area. Furthermore, such a military attack upon an international airport was an unacceptable form of international behaviour. In magnitude it was entirely disproportionate to the act which had preceded it. It was disproportionate in two ways: first, in the degree of destruction involved; secondly, in a more fundamental way, in the difference between the acts of two individual terrorists and those of a sizable military force operating openly and directly under Government orders. The attack on the Civilian International Airport of Beirut had introduced new dangers into the already alarming situation in the Middle East. The Security Council and every Member of the United Nations owed it to itself to help break the pattern of violence in the Middle East. For its part the United States was prepared to support prompt action by the Security Council to condemn the latest Israel action.

282. The representative of the United Kingdom emphasized the profound concern of his Government at the action of the Israel Government in sending forces to commit dangerous and deplorable acts of violence at the Beirut International Airport. The Council must necessarily look at events not in a vacuum but against the background of past violence in the context of the situation in the Middle East. The Council could not ignore the dangers to peaceful international air travel posed by such acts as the hijacking of aircraft and the machine-gunning at Athens airport. However, the scale and intensity of the Israel action stood out exceptionally, even against that sombre background, involving as it did the traditionally peace-loving Lebanon. The events of 28 December were also a setback to efforts for a peaceful settlement of the Middle East situation.

283. The representative of France expressed serious concern over the Israel raid and especially regretted

that the Israel attack was directed against a country which had always shown respect for the principles of the Charter. On many previous occasions the French delegation had stated that the very idea of reprisals was unacceptable. From that point of view the raid of 28 December was inadmissible and therefore deserved condemnation. A satisfactory settlement could result only from putting into effect the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. Joint action by Member States, and especially those with particular responsibility, was now indispensable and urgent.

284. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the Israel military action against Lebanon represented a very serious violation of the Security Council cease-fire decision. The new aggressive act by Israel could not be justified in any way and could be regarded only as the expression of a pre-planned decision to create further complications in order to undermine the United Nations efforts, in particular those of Ambassador Jarring, to achieve a political settlement. In spite of the fact that Israel's responsibility for the attack on the Beirut Airport was clearly established, certain representatives, and particularly the representative of the United States, had attempted to put the aggressor and its victim on the same level. Counting on the moral and political support of certain circles in the West, the Israel extremists were broadening their aggression and threatening international peace. The Security Council must first of all condemn in the most decisive manner the criminal military adventure of Israel directed against Lebanon and take appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, in order to force Israel to respect the Security Council and the General Assembly decisions and the Charter of the United Nations.

285. The representative of India said that from all information available to the Council it was clear beyond any doubt that the Israel military action against the International Airport at Beirut was unprovoked, unnecessary and a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. It was the duty of the Council to condemn it and to take suitable measures under the relevant provisions of the Charter to prevent the repetition of such acts. At the same time the Council should demand of Israel the payment of compensation to Lebanon for the damage caused in the action. The incidents in occupied Arab territories of individual acts against Israel property had been cited as justification for the recent recrudescence of tensions. While his delegation deplored all violent incidents leading to loss of life and property, it could not, however, accept that those incidents could justify in any way the massive attacks launched by Israel on Arab civilian property. That action was a serious set-back to the achievement of a political settlement.

286. The representative of Hungary stated that while the complaint of Lebanon clearly belonged within the competence of the Security Council, Israel's letter was meant to be a pretext to justify its aggressive policy. By its attacks against civilian installations, Israel aimed at terrorizing the civilian population and undermining the economy of the Arab States. All States should exert their influence to have the Government of Israel discontinue the series of deliberate destructive acts committed against its neighbours and compensate the victims for the losses suffered. The Hungarian delegation was strongly convinced that it was time to take resolute action against Israel and it would, therefore, co-operate with other members of the Security Council

in considering the application of the measures as envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter.

287. The representative of Algeria stated that his delegation had accepted the agenda to facilitate consideration of the Lebanese complaint. It considered that the Israel complaint did not fall within the purview of the Council. Israel's act of aggression had been carefully premeditated and undertaken in defiance of the international community. That behaviour stemmed from the encouragement and assistance which Israel was receiving from certain major Powers as shown by the recent decision of the United States to supply Israel with modern fighter planes, which, in the light of the events in Beirut, had sinister implications in the eyes of Arab countries and world public opinion. Peace in the area would become a reality only when solutions were found which took into account the vital interests of the Palestinian people. In view of the latest act of aggression by Israel, his delegation believed that the Security Council must unequivocally condemn it and must see to it that, in addition to necessary compensation, effective measures were taken under Chapter VII of the Charter to put an end to the policy of systematic aggression pursued by Israel.

288. The representative of Senegal said that the raid on the Beirut Airport by Israel troops, which had been interpreted as an act of reprisal, had caused concern in the world and had contributed to increased tension in the area. Such acts made the prospect for peace even more remote. They damaged the efforts of Ambassador Jarring to find a peaceful settlement of the conflict. Senegal condemned all acts of reprisal, including the recent attack against Lebanon. In view of the increase in acts of violence, the Security Council must agree to achieve the implementation of its resolution of 22 November 1967.

289. The representative of Brazil stated that the unjustifiable and premeditated attack by Israel against the Civilian Airport of Lebanon had clearly shown how close the situation was to open warfare. The authority and prestige of the Security Council had been challenged. His delegation wished to reiterate its conviction that such violent acts as that under consideration by the Council should not be ignored. It was imperative that the Security Council should act promptly by discharging its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Brazil would be prepared to join in any effort to uphold the authority of the Council under the Charter.

290. At the 1461st meeting on 30 December, the representative of Lebanon stated that the Armistice Agreements and the Council's cease-fire decisions had always been scrupulously respected by his country. From the point of view of international law, a State could not be held responsible for acts committed by inhabitants of the State acting outside its territory on their own initiative. In that respect, the attitude of Israel itself could be cited when Argentina had submitted its complaint to the Security Council concerning the Eichmann case. Moreover, the persons responsible for the Athens airport incident were Palestinians, who had come to Beirut only two days before the Athens operation. After having committed a premeditated act of aggression, Israel had sought to justify it by submitting a contrived complaint of its own against Lebanon, a complaint which it had not filed at the time the incident occurred. Lebanon, however, could not be held responsible for acts of Palestinians whose intentions were not known to it and who, being refugees

as a result of Israel action, held strong feelings for their cause. The representative concluded by quoting the diplomatic note which had been sent by the President of the Republic of Lebanon to certain States.

291. The representative of Denmark said that his Government deplored all violent incidents arising out of the conflict in the Middle East and condemned the Israel attack on the Beirut International Airport, which was particularly deplorable, as it extended the area of conflict to Lebanon, a country which had stood for moderation. Israel should instead have brought promptly to the United Nations the act of terror committed against its aircraft at Athens on 26 December. He expressed the hope that the parties would come to realize that the best promise for peace in the area lay through co-operation with Ambassador Jarring.

292. The representative of Canada said that the Israel attack was unprecedented and out of proportion to any provocation offered. It seriously risked bringing about a rise in tension and further violent incidents in the Middle East. That kind of reprisal must be regarded with deep concern by all countries upholding the rights of persons to use civil air carriers to move safely from one place to another. He appealed to the parties concerned to make a renewed and determined effort to break out of the vicious cycle of violence and work for a settlement on the basis of the provisions and principles of resolution 242 (1967).

293. The representative of the United Kingdom said that his Government strongly condemned the attack on the Beirut Airport, just as it deplored all violations of existing cease-fire arrangements. It regarded the attack in Beirut as particularly reprehensible. The Security Council could not accept or condone acquisition of territory by conquest. Any suggestion that Israel must be subject to continuous violence and intimidation was equally unacceptable. The Council had thus declared the twin principles of withdrawal and security. It had also declared other purposes, among which was included a just settlement of the refugee problem and the freedom of passage through international waterways to all shipping without exception. Those principles and purposes had been repeatedly endorsed, particularly by the four permanent members of the Security Council. Unfortunately, because of mistrust and bitterness between the two sides, those approved principles and purposes had not yet been implemented. It was therefore necessary that, instead of violence, which created further mistrust and fear, the two sides should declare, without any reservation, their readiness to implement the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, permit the new refugees to return to their homes without delay and begin negotiations through the Secretary-General's Special Representative.

294. The representative of China said that the Council had been told that the military action taken by Israel was in the nature of a retaliation provoked by an attack on an Israel aircraft in Athens on 26 December and the previous hijacking of another Israel airliner. It seemed to his delegation that the massive, destructive foray into a centre of international transportation could not be justified under the circumstances. To deal an unwarranted blow to a country which had hitherto shown itself to be moderate and restrained in its attitude towards Israel must cause universal concern. No Government, even under extreme provocation, should take the law into its own hands. His delegation was prepared to support prompt, effective and just action by the

Council for the maintenance of peace and tranquillity in the Middle East.

295. The representative of Pakistan said that in the current situation, resulting from Israel's latest act of aggression at the Civilian International Airport of Beirut, there seemed to exist no doubt among the members of the Council that the Council's authority should be reasserted and that it should act promptly and speedily. It had been established during the debate, first, that the Israel attack called for condemnation by the Security Council in the most unmistakable terms; secondly, that the occurrence of a certain act at the Athens airport on 26 December not only was irrelevant to the current debate but was outside the purview of the Security Council; thirdly, that the Security Council was confronted with the worsening of the crisis in the Middle East as a result of the repetition of the acts of belligerency and the inclusion in the area of conflict of the defenceless State of Lebanon. Considering these factors, the Council, if it were to reassert its authority, must put responsibility on Israel to make reparation for the damages which it had caused to Lebanon. Every act and every declaration of policy by Israel aggravated the indignation felt by the Arab Governments and peoples at the continued occupation of their territories. The chances of a peaceful settlement could not be promoted unless that indignation was assuaged. For the Council to arrest the trend towards another war, it was essential that a balance be introduced into the situation by the imposition of some element of restraint on Israel's reckless course. The Pakistan delegation was also convinced that there was a need for the permanent members of the Security Council to concert their efforts for peace in the Middle East. It was their concerted action alone which could bring about the conditions necessary for the implementation of resolution 242 (1967). What was further required was a re-examination of the policies pursued so far in order to show an awareness of the sense of outrage suffered by the Arab peoples over the historic injustice inflicted upon them.

296. The representative of Paraguay said that his delegation had never hesitated to condemn premeditated military activities carried out in the territory of another sovereign State. Although attempts had been made to justify them by using the term "reprisals", the unprecedented attack carried out by the elements of the Israel Air Force against the Civilian International Airport of Beirut was most reprehensible. The situation in the Middle East being very grave and tense, it was necessary that individual and collective efforts be carried out in an effort to establish in the entire area a just and lasting peace. His delegation could support efforts towards a unanimous resolution reflecting the universal concern and anxiety in order to avoid a repetition of incidents similar to that before the Council.

297. The representative of Israel stated that the attackers of the El-Al aircraft in Athens had testified that they were Lebanese and had lived in the city of Tripoli. Both were members of the Palestine Liberation Front, which was the first to announce the execution of the Athens attack. The encouragement and the complicity of the Lebanese Government was no doubt accountable for the rapid expansion of that Front's activities. The attention of the Lebanese Government had been drawn on numerous occasions to the activities of the terror organizations within its borders. That Government, however, had not only continued to condone those activities but had publicly identified

itself with them. Israel was determined to defend itself against attack, whether by regular or irregular forces; peace could not be attained if warfare continued while the Arab States disclaimed responsibility for it.

298. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the latest Israel armed provocations against the United Arab Republic, Jordan and now Lebanon, represented a new stage in Israel's aggressive policy directed against the neighbouring Arab States. The fact that the Government of Israel had officially declared that it had conducted a raid against the Beirut Airport simply proved that Israel's practice of reprisal and military provocation had now been raised to the level of the official policy of the Government of Israel. Modern international law ruled out the policy of military reprisals by States. Even before the Charter of the United Nations was adopted, international law recognized that it was absolutely inadmissible to carry out reprisals as a response to actions taken by individuals. The question of putting a stop to Israel's aggression depended very much on the position of the United States. It might contribute greatly to achieving a political settlement in the Middle East if the United States, eschewing lip-service and verbal condemnation, would use the possibilities that it had at its disposal, jointly with the Security Council and with other States, to bring the necessary pressure to bear on Israel. The United Kingdom could also take measures that would have a definite impact on the Government of Israel. For its part, the Soviet Union considered that the Council was now required to condemn Israel and, as indicated in resolution 248 (1968), to adopt in regard to Israel "the further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter".

299. The representative of Saudi Arabia stated that the Charter was quite explicit about measures to be taken against aggression. Chapter VII of the Charter spoke of sanctions. One would like to know if the United States would be willing to apply sanctions if Israel would not offer reparations and an apology to Lebanon. He then recalled that he had already warned the Council that the question of Palestine was no longer one between the Arab States and Israel but, indeed, between the Palestinian people and those who had robbed them of their homeland.

300. The representative of Israel, speaking in exercise of the right of reply, charged that it was the Soviet Union which by its unreserved support of Arab intransigence and belligerency and its encouragement to Arab terror warfare against Israel had made the attainment of peace in the Middle East more difficult.

301. At the 1462nd meeting of the Council on 31 December, the President stated that after intensive consultations, the members of the Council had been able to reach agreement on the text of the following draft resolution:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having considered the agenda contained in document S/Agenda/1462,*

*"Having noted the contents of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon (document S/8945),*

*"Having noted the supplementary information provided by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization contained in documents S/7930/Add.107 and 108,*

"Having heard the statements of the representative of Lebanon and of the representative of Israel concerning the grave attack committed against the civil International Airport of Beirut,

"Observing that the military action by the armed forces of Israel against the civil International Airport of Beirut was premeditated and of a large-scale and carefully planned nature,

"Gravely concerned about the deteriorating situation resulting from this violation of the Security Council resolutions,

"And deeply concerned about the need to assure free uninterrupted international civil air traffic,

"1. Condemns Israel for its premeditated military action in violation of its obligations under the Charter and the cease-fire resolutions;

"2. Considers that such premeditated acts of violence endanger the maintenance of the peace;

"3. Issues a solemn warning to Israel that if such acts were to be repeated, the Council would have to consider further steps to give effect to its decisions;

"4. Considers that Lebanon is entitled to appropriate redress for the destruction it suffered, responsibility for which has been acknowledged by Israel."

**Decision:** At the 1462nd meeting on 31 December 1968 the draft resolution was adopted unanimously as resolution 262 (1968).

302. The representative of Canada said that in supporting the resolution his delegation wished to emphasize that the Israel attack had taken place against a background of growing violence throughout the area. Neither that incident nor other incidents could be taken out of context, because otherwise they would be inexplicable. The incidents at the Athens and Beirut airports must be understood as expressions of extreme feelings of frustration and anger provoked by a state of mutual hostility. There would be no peace unless both sides felt free to develop their national life free from violence.

303. The representative of Brazil said that his delegation was gratified that the Council had adopted a clear indication of a firm purpose to deal with threats to peace in the Middle East. Brazil did not condone such violent acts as that at Athens airport, but no responsibility, direct or indirect, of the Lebanese Government had been established in that connexion. To bring permanent peace to the area, the Council should strive towards a definite political settlement on the basis of its resolution 242 (1967) and should do its utmost to check the arms escalation which was daily building up there.

304. The representative of Denmark stated that his Government, which deplored any and all violent incidents, would have preferred the Council to deal more directly with the act of terror committed against the Israel civil aircraft in Athens on 26 December. However, the last preambular paragraph of the resolution adopted by the Council should leave no doubt that the Council insisted that all undue interference with international civil air traffic be henceforth discontinued.

305. The representative of France said that the Israel attack against the Beirut International Airport was an obvious violation of the Council's resolutions, which was all the more serious as it had not been provoked by Lebanese action. While the events at the Athens airport were regrettable, the direct responsibility of the

Lebanese Government had not been established. Israel's premeditated aggression struck a blow against a country which had always shown respect for the principles of the Charter and extended *de facto* warfare to a region that had up to then been spared. The resolution just adopted was the logical result of debates in which his delegation had been happy to note the emergence of certain common views on the necessity of concerted action by permanent members of the Security Council towards the achievement of a settlement of the Middle East conflict.

306. The representative of the United Kingdom stated that the Council must deplore all acts of violence and all violations of the cease-fire wherever they occurred, and, in particular, must be concerned at the new trend of threats to the safety of international civil air traffic. The pattern of violence emerged from the fundamental, unsolved problems of the Middle East. The Charter laid on all Members the duty to bring about by peaceful means the settlement of dangerous situations.

307. The representative of Hungary stated that the resolution adopted by the Council did not fully meet the requirements of the dangerous situation. Some members of the Council, while condemning Israel, were not prepared to take the logical step of applying sanctions as envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter. It was hoped that those members who considered the current resolution as adequate would use their influence with Israel to secure its compliance.

308. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that his delegation had already pointed out that Israel's attempt to describe its attack at Beirut as a "response" was futile. From the point of view of modern international law, reprisals as a means of self-defence against illegal action taken by another State would be admissible only if conducted within a very limited scope and without the use of armed force. Moreover, no evidence had been given of Lebanon's responsibility for the attack against the Israel airplane at the Athens airport. That attack had been carried out by citizens of a third State on the territory of yet another State, and under international law a State could be held responsible only for acts of its own citizens or armed forces. In violation of international law, the United Nations Charter and the Armistice Agreement, Israel had invaded Lebanese air space. After stating that the new act of aggression by Israel had aroused indignation everywhere, he read out a communication from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic on that subject. In the circumstances a much more clear-cut decision by the Council was needed, making provisions for measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. The resolution adopted by the Council might produce some useful results only if all members of the Council, particularly its permanent members, took all necessary measures to prevent a repetition of Israel's aggressive acts. Unfortunately, certain members of the Security Council, including certain permanent members, while condemning Israel's aggression in statements, had failed to demonstrate their will to proceed from words to deeds.

309. The representative of Algeria said that in a message to the Secretary-General, the Foreign Minister of his country, after condemning Israel's aggression, had stated that it gave additional proof of Israel's despair at the increasing success of the Palestinian patriots in their legitimate struggle to regain their homeland. No State could be held responsible for their



acts. He added that Israel, in violation of all international tenets, had attacked Lebanon, and the Council would have been well within its competence to take action under Chapter VII of the Charter. The resolution adopted by the Council, although falling short of that requirement, had been supported by his delegation because it condemned Israel unequivocally, stressed the rights of Lebanon to compensation and issued a warning to Israel.

310. The representative of the United States said that his delegation wished to disassociate itself from the sweeping denunciations of Israel's alleged policies and acts, having nothing to do with the episodes properly before the Council. The Council was not being asked to pronounce its judgement on all issues of the Arab-Israel conflict. The resolution did not entirely suit his delegation. Despite differences over language or substance, however, it supported the resolution and endorsed its condemnation of the action against the Beirut Airport in accordance with his Government's initial response to the operation. His Government believed that the United Nations should be in the forefront of an effort to perfect new rules of international law that would give to the civilian airports of the world a special status, providing for appropriate examination of every situation in which that status was disregarded. He stated that it had been alleged that his Government, in supporting the resolution, had exhibited inconsistency. It should be noted that the policies of his Government were governed by principles on which friends sometimes disagreed. The United States Government was ready at any time to discuss measures to limit the flow of arms into the Middle East.

311. The representative of Senegal stated that his delegation's support was based upon its firm conviction that force should not be used to resolve international disputes. It also believed that Israel's attack against the Beirut Airport would only extend the zone of conflict.

312. The representative of Paraguay said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution, hoping that it would impress upon the parties the need of scrupulous respect for the cease-fire, thus facilitating the creation of an atmosphere for the success of the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Jarring. Moreover, the last preambular paragraph of the resolution reflected the deep concern of the Council regarding the need to ensure free and uninterrupted international civil air traffic.

313. The representative of Israel said that by ignoring the fundamental principles of the United Nations, equality of all Member States, the resolution adopted by the Council was contrary to the principles and purposes of the Charter and was, therefore, not applicable. The resolution reflected the moral, political and juridical bankruptcy of the Security Council in respect of the Middle East situation. It was not the Security Council resolution but the attitude and actions of the Governments in the area that would determine the destiny of that area. Israel's action in Beirut, taken in defence of its rights, should make the Arab Governments understand the depth of Israel's determination to ensure its right to peace and security. When the Arab States realized that determination, there would be peace in the Middle East.

314. The representative of Saudi Arabia congratulated the Council on reaching in such a short time unanimous agreement on a resolution condemning the Israel attack on Beirut Airport. However, Israel had been condemned in the Council many times without

any effect. The right of the Palestinian people to survive and to return to their homeland should not be forgotten; it was they who would resolve the question, and they would be supported by every Arab.

315. The representative of Lebanon stated that the Council had hesitated to order the application of Chapter VII of the Charter, which was a logical step to take in the light of its discussions. Israel, which had deliberately attacked the Beirut Airport, aware that it was violating international law, the Armistice Agreements and the cease-fire decision, was not likely to heed the Council's warning. Lebanon, however, hoped that the Council, in the future, would respond to Israel's acts of aggression by sanctions; otherwise paragraph 3 of the resolution would be futile.

316. The President, at the conclusion of the debate, stated that by virtue of their great power and the responsibility given to them under the Charter, the permanent members of the Council had a special role to play in the maintenance of international peace and security and, therefore, periodic meetings of the four permanent members, as suggested at the beginning of the twenty-third session of the General Assembly by the Secretary-General, and as recently called for by France, would enhance the effectiveness of the Organization in that respect. The Middle East, he added, could perhaps be the first of the problems on which such consultations could be conducted profitably, since in that particular case all four permanent members had supported the Council's resolution 242 (1967).

(c) *Communications to the Council from 1 January to 15 July 1969*

317. In supplemental information issued on 4 January 1969 (S/7930/Add.110), the Acting Chief of Staff transmitted a report of an inquiry into a Lebanese complaint that during the night of 2-3 January, mortar and artillery shells had been fired on two occasions from Israel territory against four Arab villages in Lebanon. United Nations military observers had interviewed three witnesses and had seen physical evidence of mortar impacts and two broken telephone wires but had found no evidence of artillery shelling or casualties.

318. In a letter dated 22 February (S/9023), Lebanon complained that on the previous day Israel military planes had violated Lebanese air space on twelve occasions, sometimes in groups of two or four. Lebanese anti-aircraft artillery and Air Force units had taken action against the intruders. The Lebanese representative stated that the action should be viewed in the light of Israel's repeated threats against Lebanon, its efforts to implicate Lebanon in the incidents at the Zurich and Athens airports and other unjustified and unprovoked acts which revealed Israel's aggressive designs against Lebanon. In supplemental information issued on 24 February (S/7930/Add.121), the Chief of Staff reported complaints from the Lebanese authorities of overflights by two Mirage-type jet aircraft on 21 February. Aircraft had been seen by a United Nations military observer.

4. COMPLAINTS BY ISRAEL AND SYRIA

*Communications to the Council and reports of the Secretary-General on the observance of the cease-fire from 16 July 1968 to 15 July 1969*

319. In supplemental information issued on 3 and 4 September 1968 (S/7930/Add.75 and Add.77), the Chief of Staff of UNTSO reported on two firings in-

cidents which took place on 30 August and 2 September in which fire had been initiated by Israel. A Syrian complaint regarding the incident of 2 September, which stated that two Syrian soldiers had been killed and one wounded, had at first requested an inquiry, but later that request was cancelled. In a letter dated 5 September (S/8804), Israel, referring to these incidents, stated that the Syrians had approached the Israel cease-fire line across the no man's land and had been fired on, and that other recent incursions in the area for mine-laying and sabotage purposes had shown the need for vigilance on the part of the Israel forces. The refusal of the Syrian authorities to allow United Nations military observers access to the place of the incident showed Syrian responsibility for violation of the cease-fire.

320. Further firing incidents were reported on 13 and 14 September (S/7930/Add.84-85 and Add.87), in which fire was initiated from the Israel side and returned by Syria.

321. In supplemental information issued on 9 October (S/7930/Add.93), the Chief of Staff reported on two further firing incidents on 5 October. The first report concerned a Syrian complaint that Israel military positions had opened fire across the Israel cease-fire position, killing one woman. In the inquiry by United Nations military observers into the incident, observers reported hearing one shot, and Syrian witnesses stated that the woman had been picking grapes in an area considered by the local villagers to be east of the Syrian cease-fire position. In the second incident, Syria had complained that two Syrian soldiers forming part of a routine patrol had been shot when they lost their way and ran into an Israel ambush. Israel had complained that three Syrian soldiers had penetrated into Israel-held territory in the Golan Heights and opened fire at an Israel patrol; as a result of the exchange of fire two Syrian soldiers had been killed. United Nations military observers reported having heard several explosions and heavy machine-gun fire and seen flares illuminating the area. The bodies of the two soldiers were returned to Syria through arrangements made by Red Cross representatives.

322. A further exchange of fire was reported on 30 October (S/7930/Add.97).

323. In supplemental information issued on 25 November (S/7930/Add.102), the Chief of Staff reported on an inquiry into a Syrian complaint that one Syrian civilian had been killed and two had disappeared while looking for livestock on 19 November. Syrian witnesses stated that they had seen and heard firing from Israel forces and had seen Israel soldiers in the area between the forward defended localities and that fifteen Israel soldiers had been observed running after a civilian. The body shown the inquiry team had been identified as that of one of the three men who had been searching for livestock between the forward defended localities. Machine-gun and rifle cartridges with Hebrew markings had been found at the alleged scene of the incident in the area between the forward defended localities.

324. In supplemental information issued on 8 February (S/7930/Add.113), the Chief of Staff reported that on 7 February an Israel light aircraft had been seen crossing the Israel forward defended localities and ack-ack rounds and heavy machine-gun fire had been heard. On the same day the Israel authorities had

stated that an Israel vehicle had struck a land mine south of the village of Rafid and that one Israel soldier had been killed and another wounded. Observers had seen an Israel half-track and other vehicles proceeding south, and an hour later had heard a loud explosion and seen the Israel half-track seriously damaged.

325. In supplemental information issued on 14 February (S/7930/Add.118), the Chief of Staff reported that United Nations military observers had observed unidentified aircraft crossing the Syrian and Israel forward defended localities and heard firing from both Israel and Syrian positions. Both Israel and Syria had charged that jet aircraft belonging to the other side had violated its air space and that following an air engagement Israel had claimed and Syria had admitted the loss of one of its aircraft. In an inquiry a damaged MIG 21 aircraft had been observed east of the Syrian forward defended locality.

326. In supplemental information issued on 24 February (S/7930/Add.122), the Chief of Staff reported several over-flights, many of the planes having been identified as Israel Mirage aircraft. Syrian anti-aircraft guns had opened fire on some of those planes. Explosions and machine-gun fire had been observed west of the Israel forward defended locality on the previous evening. Syria had complained that jet fighters and bombers had attacked civilian installations in the Hamah and Maisaloun areas and civilian cars on the main Damascus-Beirut road and that twenty civilians had been wounded as a result of that aggression. The Chief of Staff indicated that the bombing of Hamah and Maisaloun had been confirmed. In further supplemental information issued on 27 February (S/7930/Add.126), the Chief of Staff reported that in an inquiry conducted on 25 February at the request of Syria into the Israel air attack, observers had seen destroyed and damaged houses, factories and other buildings, as well as thirty-one persons who had allegedly been injured in the air attack on Hamah, all having the type of injuries that could be sustained by aerial bombing.

327. In relation to the same incident, Syria, in a letter dated 25 February (S/9028), charged that on the previous day a number of Israel bombers escorted by fighters had launched air attacks on civilian targets in the suburb and district of Damascus. Fifteen people had been killed, forty wounded and a number of houses, factories, a summer youth camp, a customs police station and other civilian installations had been destroyed. Private vehicles, including the car of the Ambassador of the People's Republic of Hungary in Syria, had been attacked on the road, and two Syrian and three Israel aircraft had been shot down in the engagement. That act of aggression had been preceded by statements of Israel leaders proclaiming a policy aimed at the annexation of Arab lands, in particular the Golan Heights. Israel, in a reply dated 28 February (S/9033), stated that it had taken air action on 24 February in self-defence to disable two El Fatah bases at Hamah and Maisaloun on the road between Damascus and Beirut, which were the central bases of that terrorist organization. The Government of Syria had for years, it charged, openly sponsored, organized and encouraged terror warfare against Israel.

328. In a letter dated 4 March (S/9041), Syria denied that the targets of Israel attack of 24 February were El Fatah bases and cited the report of the Chief of Staff (S/7930/Add.126) to show that the targets of that planned attack had been civilian installations.

In a reply dated 12 March (S/9075), Israel reiterated its charge that the air action of 24 February had been directed against El Fatah bases, citing in support of its contention reports in the Arab Press attributed to El Fatah spokesmen to the effect that Hamah and Maisaloun served as bases for that organization. In a further letter dated 25 March (S/9110), Syria listed the names of civilian victims killed and seriously injured in that attack, including women and children.

329. Hungary and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics also sent communications with regard to the incident of 24 February. In a letter dated 11 March (S/9070), the representative of Hungary transmitted the text of a *note verbale* sent to the Government of Israel, protesting the air attack in which the life of the Ambassador of the Hungarian People's Republic had been endangered and his car demolished as a grave violation of international law and reserving Hungary's right to claim full compensation. In a letter of the same date (S/9073), the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics transmitted a TASS statement dated 28 February protesting that and other acts of provocation committed by Israel against the Arab countries which Israel sought to justify as reprisals. The struggle of peoples against invaders and occupiers was justified from the point of view of international law. Israel's acts of aggression showed that Israel was pursuing an aggressive policy with the aim of aggravating the situation in the Middle East and creating conditions which would preclude the possibility of establishing a lasting peace in the region in conformity with the Security Council's resolution of 22 November 1967.

330. On 18 March Israel replied (S/9091) that, with regard to the TASS statement, its most sinister aspect was the blanket approval it expressed for the Arab terror warfare waged against Israel. The attempts to make that warfare legitimate was open encouragement to the Arab States to continue to violate the cease-fire and further undermine the prospects for peace.

331. In another letter dated 18 March (S/9094), Israel drew attention to the reported entry and stationing of Iraqi armed forces in Syria, stating that their presence would further aggravate the situation in the area, as there was no assurance that they would observe the cease-fire. Israel requested the Secretary-General to obtain from Iraq an assurance that the Iraqi forces would respect the cease-fire.

332. In a letter dated 25 March (S/9111), Syria stated that in view of Israel's policy of aggression, in particular after June 1967, it was only natural that the Arab countries should co-ordinate their defence and it was for that reason that they had formed an Arab common defence pact.

333. In a letter dated 1 April (S/9125), Iraq, commenting on Israel's letter of 18 March (S/9094), stated that the entry of Iraqi armed forces into Syria had taken place at the specific request of the Syrian Government and under the Joint Defence Agreement between Iraq and Syria. Iraqi troops, it was stated, had been stationed at a considerable distance from the cease-fire line in Syrian territory, and their presence in Syria was in accordance with the right of self-defence recognized by the Charter of the United Nations and by international law.

334. In two communications dated 10 April (S/9145 and S/9146), Israel noted that the Government of

Iraq had refused to accept the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council in June 1967 and continued to proclaim a policy of waging war against Israel. Accordingly, Israel considered that Governments which permitted the maintenance of the Iraqi expeditionary forces on their territory should bear full responsibility for the consequent aggravation of the situation. Israel further stressed the urgency of efforts by the Secretary-General to obtain assurances that Iraq accepted the cease-fire resolutions and that its forces would respect the cease-fire. The positions of Iraq and Israel in this matter were reiterated in letters from the representative of Iraq on 24 April and 5 May (S/9175 and Corr.1, S/9192) and from the representative of Israel on 29 April and 12 May (S/9181, S/9201).

325. In a letter dated 4 April (S/9131), Syria charged Israel occupation forces with the destruction of Syrian villages and the demolition of houses (see section B, below) and said that on 28 March Israel soldiers had taken up positions at Briqa village in the buffer zone and on 30 March had fired on shepherds in the buffer zone, wounding and capturing one. In a letter of 8 April (S/9139), Syria charged that Israel had erected a new advanced observation point in the buffer zone, and in a further letter of the same date (S/9141), charged that on 5 April six Syrian shepherds had been captured and murdered by Israel soldiers in the area of Briqa village. In a letter dated 15 April (S/9158), Israel rejected the Syrian charges contained in the three above-mentioned letters and stated that Syria had no right or grounds for complaint over defence measures taken by Israel on its side of the cease-fire line, particularly when they were essential in face of repeated Syrian attempts to violate the cease-fire by its regular forces and by marauders and saboteurs (see also section B, below).

336. During the period from early April until 15 July, the Secretary-General continued to circulate supplemental information received from the Chief of Staff of UNTSO containing data reported by United Nations military observers on breaches of the cease-fire in the Israel-Syria sector. Supplemental information reporting on firing incidents or exchanges, in which machine-gun, mortar, heavy weapon, tank and ack-ack fire, as well as mine explosions, were heard, were issued on 9 and 28 April, 14, 27 and 28 May, 7 and 24 June and 9 July (S/7930/Add.152, Add.178, Add.196, Add.210, Add. 212, Add.225, Add.243 and Add.259). On 6 June (S/7930/Add.222), the Secretary-General circulated a revised list, submitted by the Chief of Staff, of the locations of the observation posts situated along the limits of both the Syrian and Israel forward defended localities. Also reported during this period were two incidents of aerial engagements in which the military observers had observed the firing of air-to-air missiles and the probable downing of aircraft. The first incident was reported in supplemental information issued on 29 May (S/7930/Add.214), and the second on 9 July (S/7930/Add.258). The observers reported in the latter incident having seen four Israel Mirage aircraft flying west to east over the area between the limits of the forward defended localities, two Mirage aircraft engaging three MIG 21 aircraft, and two unidentified aircraft falling in the area. Shortly thereafter, observers had again seen four Mirage aircraft crossing the area, two aircraft engaged in high air battle, five air-to-air missiles fired and an object falling

which could have been an aircraft. In a letter dated 10 July (S/9320 and Corr.1), Syria complained that three Syrian planes had been downed and a Syrian pilot killed, while intercepting attacking Israel planes, four of which had been downed. The letter charged that the latest attack had been premeditated and executed as part of a new aggressive military strategy adopted by the Israel General Staff.

## **B. Question concerning the treatment of civilian populations in Israel-occupied territories and related matters**

337. During the period covered by this report, the Security Council received a number of communications concerning the treatment of civilian populations in territories under Israel occupation. Communications from the Arab States complained about Israel's policies in these territories, alleging the arrest, detention, torture, dispossession and expulsion of Arab civilians from their homes, the destruction of Arab villages and houses and the establishment of Israel settlements in the occupied areas. Israel rejected the charges of the Arab States and made countercharges regarding the treatment of Jews in certain Arab States (see section D, below). The Secretary-General submitted a report on his efforts to send a representative to the Middle East to enable him to meet his reporting obligations under Security Council resolution 237 (1967) concerning humanitarian questions. His report was discussed by the Council at two meetings in September 1968.

### *(a) Communications to the Council from 16 July to 18 September 1968*

338. By a letter of 18 July (S/8685), Jordan drew attention to a map circulated at the twenty-seventh World Zionist Congress held in Jerusalem in June depicting the location of some thirty-five new Jewish settlements. The majority of those para-military fortified settlements, it was stated, were to be established in occupied Arab territory. In reply, Israel, in a letter of 28 July (S/8696), stated that of the "thirty-five new Jewish settlements" referred to only fourteen were in areas that had come under Israel control since the cease-fire of June 1967, and nearly all of them had been in existence for some time. In previous communications Israel had explained that the activities of the "Nahal outposts" were designed to assist in ensuring the security of the area and in maintaining the cease-fire. In a letter of 2 August (S/8717), Jordan rejected the Israel explanation and stated that land had been illegally expropriated, villages had been razed to the ground and thousands of Arabs had been expelled to accommodate new Israel settlers.

339. In a letter dated 24 July (S/8690), Jordan drew attention to the deteriorating conditions of more than 400,000 refugees and displaced persons forced to flee from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip to the East Bank of Jordan. Jordan charged that owing to Israel intransigence in implementing Security Council and General Assembly resolutions only a small proportion of the displaced persons had been allowed to return. In a further letter dated 25 July (S/8691), Jordan charged that Israel intended to deport another 50,000 Palestinian refugees from the Gaza Strip to the East Bank and charged Israel with systematically persecuting the Arabs in the occupied territories in order to further its policy of colonization. In a letter

dated 26 July (S/8693), Sudan also protested the planned mass expulsion. Jordan, in a letter dated 29 July (S/8698), protested the carrying out by Israel of that act of mass expulsion in defiance of the Security Council's resolutions; Israel's expulsion of the refugees with the support of its armed forces had resulted in a firing incident at the King Hussein Bridge (see section A, above). In a letter dated 30 July (S/8700), Israel rejected the charges that any pressure had been exerted on Palestinian refugees to leave the Gaza Strip; nor, it was added, were they being prevented from leaving. In a further letter dated 1 August (S/8711), Israel stated, in reply to the Jordanian letter of 24 July, that it was Jordan that had failed to effect the return of 3,000 refugees a day to the West Bank, following a humanitarian agreement signed by the two countries on 6 August 1967. In reply, Jordan stated in a letter of 2 August (S/8717) that Israel's distortions could not justify the obstacles that it had placed in the way of the return of the refugees. In a letter of 5 August (S/8722), Jordan transmitted a copy of a protest against deportation sent by the Mukhtars of Jabalia Camp to the Director of UNRWA in the Gaza Strip to show Israel's premeditated plan for the expulsion and deportation of the refugees.

340. In a letter dated 25 July (S/8689), Syria charged that the Israel invading forces were systematically continuing their ruthless colonization of Arab-occupied territories, as evidenced by Israel statements and press reports, and their inhuman treatment of the Arab civilian population. These allegations were rejected by Israel in a letter of 1 August (S/8708), which also charged continued oppression of Syrian Jews and continued rejection by Syria of all United Nations efforts towards peace in the Middle East. In a letter of 9 August (S/8742), Syria stated that Israel had ignored the issues raised in Syria's previous letter and maintained its charges. In a letter of 16 August (S/8749), Syria quoted further reports and statements in support of its charges that Israel was integrating occupied Syrian territory in the Golan Heights into Israel.

341. By a letter dated 29 August (S/8789), Jordan transmitted a copy of a letter of 25 July from the inhabitants of Emmaus, Yalo and Beit Nuba, charging that following their forced evacuation from their houses and property in the six-day war, their villages had been destroyed, and they had been rendered destitute.

342. By a letter dated 18 September (S/8820), Jordan transmitted protests sent by Arab leaders and inhabitants of the occupied territories to Israel officials and international bodies against the measures taken by the Israel authorities in the occupied territories. In addition to protests relating to Jerusalem, there were included protests concerning the mistreatment of innocent Arab ladies in Israel prisons, a letter from Arab lawyers and a declaration by trade union leaders concerning the expulsion of refugees in Jabalia Camp in the Gaza Strip and a request for the end of Israel occupation by the mayors and dignitaries of the West Bank.

### *(b) Report of the Secretary-General of 31 July 1968 and requests for a meeting*

343. On 31 July 1968, the Secretary-General, pursuant to Security Council resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V), submitted a report (S/8699) setting forth the communications between the Secretary-General and the parties from

May to July 1968 relating to his proposal to send a representative to the Middle East, in particular for the purpose of meeting his reporting obligations under Security Council resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) concerning humanitarian questions. In letters of 2 and 20 May, the Permanent Representative of Syria had emphasized his Government's understanding that the humanitarian resolutions under which the proposed special representative would be appointed referred exclusively to the civilian population in the Arab areas occupied by Israel and to the Arab refugees from those areas and did not apply to Jewish communities in Arab countries, and that the mission of the representative would be confined to reporting under those resolutions. In conversations on 23 May and in written communications of 12 and 26 June and 8 July 1968, the Permanent Representative of Israel had stated his Government's view that the mission of the representative should include the situation of the Jewish communities in the Arab countries, including those in Iraq and Lebanon. Israel maintained that the relevant resolutions related to the conditions of the civilian population throughout the Middle East area of conflict and not only in Israel-held territories. It was clear that Iraq was one of the States directly concerned because of its participation in the war; although Lebanon did not fully participate in the fighting, anxiety was felt about the Jewish community there, and there was no logical reason why Lebanon should be excluded from the scope of the mission.

344. The Secretary-General, orally on 23 May and in written communications of 18 and 27 June and 15 July, stated that the proposed extension of the terms of reference to cover the treatment of the Jewish communities in Iraq and Lebanon was unacceptable and regretted that the question had been raised, particularly at such a late stage. The second humanitarian mission would have the same terms of reference and general scope as the first (Gussing) mission, and the suggested extension had not been raised at that time. The Secretary-General expressed his deep concern for the situation of the Jewish communities in the Arab States and said that he had been dealing directly with the question of the treatment of the Jewish community in Iraq through that country's Permanent Representative and would continue to do so. He added that there was no indication that a problem existed concerning the treatment of the Jewish community in Lebanon. The Secretary-General then pointed out that it was only by a broad humanitarian interpretation that it had been possible in the case of the Gussing mission to stretch the terms of the resolutions to include "humanitarian inquiries" concerning Jewish persons in Syria and in the United Arab Republic as ancillary to the investigation of the condition and treatment of inhabitants in occupied territories. The Security Council resolution could not, by legal interpretation, be regarded as applying to the Jewish communities in Iraq and Lebanon. Attached to the Secretary-General's letter of 15 July was a brief legal analysis concerning the application and scope of the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. The Secretary-General stated that he regretfully had to conclude that the points raised by Israel were to be taken as conditions which had to be met, if the proposed mission was to be able to proceed and have the necessary access to the areas with it was concerned.

345. The Secretary-General communicated the position of Israel to Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic. The replies from the representatives of Syria and Jordan on 23 July and the United Arab Republic on 25 July confirmed that their Governments would welcome the Secretary-General's Special Representative, whose terms of reference, they stated, had been clearly indicated in Security Council resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V). The obstacles and arbitrary demands of Israel to the proposed second mission were aimed, it was stated, at perpetuating the tragedy of the Arab inhabitants expelled by the Israel occupation authorities and at continuing the inhuman treatment of the civilian population under Israel rule in occupied Arab territories. The representatives of the Arab States hoped that the Secretary-General would see that the two resolutions were effectively and fully implemented.

346. On 29 July a reply was transmitted from the Foreign Minister of Israel, in which he stated, *inter alia*, that Israel was not imposing "conditions" but was asking only that the mission should have an equal opportunity to investigate the situation of Jewish communities in Arab countries since the recent conflict. Israel believed that that was clearly within the scope of the relevant resolutions, which had made plain that United Nations humanitarian concern extended to civilians in the whole Middle East area. It was the unwillingness of the Arab Governments to co-operate in that respect which was delaying the mission. The Foreign Minister requested that the Secretary-General communicate the substance of his Government's position also to Iraq and Lebanon, since those countries were also directly involved in the conflict and inquiry needed to be made into the situation of their Jewish communities.

347. The Secretary-General concluded his report by stating that there was currently no basis on which the mission could proceed, since it required the co-operation of the parties concerned and the necessary assured access. The difficulties arose from an attempt to broaden the scope and terms of reference of the new mission beyond those applying to the Gussing mission, which went as far as the relevant resolutions would permit. There was no question of discrimination; approaches had been made to the Governments concerned, including the Government of Iraq, regarding the treatment of Jewish communities, and there appeared to be no problem regarding the Jewish community in Lebanon. The Secretary-General held that on the legal level, the resolution could not be stretched to cover those two countries and stated that he had not approached them regarding the question of the acceptance of the mission. He pointed out that resolution 237 (1967) had referred to "the area of conflict" not the territory of States parties to the conflict and that the records of the discussions preceding the adoption of the resolution also showed that it had been motivated by concern for the inhabitants of the occupied areas where military operations had taken place. The proposed mission would be concerned exclusively with humanitarian matters. The Secretary-General considered it unfortunate that considerations involving the well-being of a great many people should not be regarded as being of sufficient urgency to override the obstacles that the projected mission was facing.

348. By a letter dated 17 September (S/8819), the representatives of Pakistan and Senegal requested

the President of the Security Council to call an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the Secretary-General's report (S/8699).

(c) *Consideration by the Council at its 1453rd and 1454th meetings (20 and 27 September 1968)*

349. At the 1453rd meeting on 20 September 1968, the Security Council placed the letter from Pakistan and Senegal on its agenda. The representatives of Jordan, Israel and the United Arab Republic and, subsequently, of Syria were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

350. At the same meeting, the representative of Senegal introduced a draft resolution (S/8825, and Rev.1) co-sponsored by Pakistan and Senegal, which, in its operative part, would have had the Security Council: (1) deplore the refusal of Israel to receive a Special Representative of the Secretary-General; (2) request the Secretary-General urgently to dispatch a Special Representative to the Arab territories under military occupation by Israel, following the hostilities of 5 June 1967, and to report on the implementation of resolution 237 (1967); and (3) request the Government of Israel to receive the Special Representative, to co-operate with him and to facilitate his work. The representative of Senegal stated that the Israel Government, by introducing into the question elements which were entirely alien, in fact as well as in law, to the humanitarian procedure which the Secretary-General wished to follow, had hindered the implementation of resolution 237 (1967) which related solely to the civilian populations in the area where hostilities had taken place and were subsequently occupied by Israel and which had nothing whatsoever to do with the status of minorities in foreign countries. He hoped that the Government of Israel would co-operate with the Secretary-General's Representative and that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

351. The representative of Pakistan said that the Secretary-General's report showed clearly that Israel had raised certain issues entirely irrelevant to resolution 237 (1967) in order to becloud the fact that the Council had addressed a clear call to Israel to ensure the welfare and fundamental rights of inhabitants under its military occupation since June 1967. His delegation entirely agreed with the interpretation that the projected mission was limited only to "areas where military operations have taken place". It was the clear duty of the Council to ensure that, pending final settlement of the political issues, the people who had been left under Israel military occupation were not denied their fundamental rights. The attempt to bury that humanitarian question by raising irrelevant issues must be resisted by the Council.

352. The representative of Jordan said that the issue before the Security Council was whether or not Israel should be permitted to defy the Council's injunction calling for the security, welfare and safety of the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories. Israel was resisting an impartial investigation because that would uncover its criminal acts and lawless behaviour. He charged that the Israelis had (1) denied the right of the inhabitants of the occupied areas to protection, safety, welfare and security; (2) unlawfully interfered in the religious rights of the inhabitants; (3) forced prisoners of war to take part in services of military

production, which would be used in war operations against their country; (4) arbitrarily arrested many innocent individuals without trial and tortured many others; (5) expelled thousands of Palestinians and many of their leaders from Sinai and the Gaza Strip and from the West Bank of Jordan to the East Bank; (6) ignored the laws of the occupied territories, changed the status of officials and judges, and promulgated Israel laws in direct violation of international law and practice; (7) destroyed Arab houses and confiscated Arab property; (8) settled Jewish groups on Arab land in occupied territories; (9) imposed harsh and discriminatory economic measures on the inhabitants of the occupied territories; and (10) committed acts leading to systematic destruction of the essential foundations of the life of the Palestine people. Should Israel deny these charges, he said, that would reinforce the fact that the only way to find out the truth was by on-the-spot investigation. In support of his charges, the representative of Jordan referred, *inter alia*, to previous communications he had addressed to the Council concerning the destruction and looting of Arab property, desecration of the Holy Places, attacks on Arab inhabitants, intimidation and torture of arrested persons, expulsions of Arab leaders and groups of inhabitants, destruction of Arab villages after the cease-fire resolutions and the demolition of Arab houses and establishment of Israel settlements (S/8750, S/8820, S/8290, S/8311, S/8445, S/8373, S/8691, S/8698, S/8722, S/8634, S/8666, S/8667, S/8609, S/8685).

353. The representative of Israel stated that the complaint before the Security Council was but a reflection of continued Arab hostility and intransigence and an expression of Arab refusal to advance towards a just and lasting peace. Far from contributing to the promotion of understanding, it heightened tension and did not assist the mission of Ambassador Jarring. It was regrettable that the Arab Governments were delaying the process by which the current situation of cease-fire lines and military administration could be replaced through agreement and peace by recognized boundaries and normal government. Israel had conveyed its willingness to the Secretary-General to co-operate with a second representative on a fact-finding mission within the context of Security Council resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V). If the mission was unable to undertake its work it was only because the Arab countries had insisted that the mission be based on anti-Jewish discrimination.

354. The representative of Israel then said that he was authorized to state that any person present at the Security Council table who wished to come to Israel would be welcome and his visit to the territories under Israel control would be facilitated so that he could form his own impressions. What Israel could not accept was deliberate disregard for the fate of Jews who were in distress. The meeting for the first time since 1948 between Arabs and Israelis showed that peaceful co-existence between the two peoples was possible, since both wanted peace; the normalcy of the situation had been commented upon by neutral observers. The real humanitarian problem in the Middle East concerned the people of Jewish faith in Arab countries. The representative of Israel charged that in Egypt, Syria and Iraq, Jews had been subjected to discrimination, oppression and inhuman treatment.

355. The representative of Algeria, on a point of order, stated that by raising the question of the situation of people of Jewish faith in various Arab countries, the representative of Israel was departing from the agenda and interfering directly in the domestic affairs of sovereign States.

356. The President explained that the item in the agenda was the situation in the Middle East, under which the Council was considering the letter from the representatives of Pakistan and Senegal (S/8819). That, in turn, referred to the report of the Secretary-General (S/8699), which contained the views of Governments, including Israel. Those views had ranged over the issues which had been referred to by speakers in the debate.

357. The representative of Senegal, supported by the representatives of Algeria and Pakistan, called attention to the terms of the letter from Senegal and Pakistan.

358. Following informal consultations, a revised version of the draft resolution of Pakistan and Senegal (S/8825/Rev.2) was before the Council at its 1454th meeting on 27 September 1968. It read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Concerned with the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the Arab territories under military occupation by Israel following the hostilities of 5 June 1967,*

*"Recalling its resolution 237 (1967) of 14 June 1967,*

*"Noting the report by the Secretary-General, contained in document S/8699, and appreciating his efforts in this connexion,*

*"Deploring the delay in the implementation of resolution 237 (1967) because of the conditions still being set by Israel for receiving a Special Representative of the Secretary-General,*

*"1. Requests the Secretary-General urgently to dispatch a Special Representative to the Arab territories under military occupation by Israel following the hostilities of 5 June 1967, and to report on the implementation of resolution 237 (1967);*

*"2. Requests the Government of Israel to receive the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, to co-operate within him and to facilitate his work;*

*"3. Recommends that the Secretary-General be afforded all co-operation in his efforts to bring about the implementation of the present resolution and resolution 237 (1967)."*

359. The representative of the United Kingdom expressed concern that humanitarian action, in accordance with the clear purposes of the Council unanimously expressed after the June hostilities, had been so long delayed. At the same time, the Council must not lay itself open to charges of discrimination. The General Assembly and the Council, in adopting the humanitarian resolutions, had been concerned about civilians in the area of conflict. The Secretary-General had explained that by a broad humanitarian interpretation it was possible to stretch the terms of the resolution to include humanitarian inquiries concerning Jewish persons in Syria and the United Arab Republic as ancillary to the investigation of the condition of the inhabitants of the occupied territories; he had also explained why it was not possible to extend the inquiries to Lebanon and Iraq. While it might be possible

to contend that the Secretary-General had gone beyond the strict interpretation of the resolutions, he had done so for humanitarian reasons which should be respected; no charge of discrimination could be made against him. What was needed was effective action without delay through a unanimous decision to assist those who had been suffering too long. He appealed on humanitarian grounds that every support should be given to the Secretary-General and his representative in the discharge of that humanitarian mission.

360. The representative of France stated that his delegation supported the Secretary-General's idea of sending a new representative to the area to enable him to report in accordance with the resolutions of the Council and the Assembly and regretted that certain obstacles had made it impossible to send such a representative. The Secretary-General had stated that the second mission would have the same scope as the first mission and that had caused no particular difficulties. France, for obvious humanitarian motives in line with its traditions, had been gratified at the broad interpretation placed by the Secretary-General on the resolutions concerning the area of activity of the Gussing mission. However, the areas at which the resolutions were aimed were the territories occupied by Israel. France had always urged a speedy end to that occupation, but as long as it continued the Security Council must be informed with regard to the conditions prevailing there.

361. The representative of the United Arab Republic said that the continued illegal occupation of the Arab lands and the mistreatment of their inhabitants was a constant violation of the international principles, including the Geneva Conventions of 1949, regarding behaviour of States in time of war and protection of civilians. Among the most flagrant crimes were the inhumane practice of indiscriminately demolishing houses as a means of suppressing the legitimate aspirations of the civilian inhabitants; the appropriation of lands owned individually or collectively by Arabs, especially in Jerusalem; intimidation, coercion and massive deportation aimed at changing the ethnic and demographic structure of the occupied Arab territories. That established policy of repression explained why Israel was adamant in its refusal to co-operate with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and had put obstacles in the way of the implementation of resolution 237 (1967). Israel's violation of human rights had been recognized by the Teheran Conference on Human Rights. The resolution of that Conference had made it imperative for the Secretary-General not to delay the dispatch of his Special Representative.

362. The representative of Syria stated that resolutions 237 (1967) and 2252 (ES-V) had been completely disregarded by Israel, which had committed and was still committing war crimes and crimes against humanity in the occupied Arab territories, as could be seen from various United Nations documents and in writings of Israel, American and other Western writers. While the humanitarian aspect of the problem was the one which should guide the Council's deliberations, it should not override legal considerations, as the Secretary-General had made clear. The members of the Jewish community in Syria were Syrian citizens with full, equal rights and duties; those who were concerned about ethnic or religious minorities in Arab countries could seek assurances from the International Red Cross Committee, whose representative had paid tribute to

Syrian efforts to protect its Jewish citizens. Swelling the number of refugees, which were increasing daily, the occupied areas of Syria had been almost completely emptied of their inhabitants, and over forty villages there had been levelled by Israel bulldozers; as the Commissioner-General of UNRWA had pointed out, the standard of living which UNRWA had been able to provide to the refugees was inadequate.

363. Referring to his delegation's previous communications to the Council, the representative of Syria charged that the Israel occupying authorities had committed violations of human rights and of the Geneva Conventions, including intimidation and expulsion of indigenous inhabitants, burning of crops, seizure of innocent individuals, looting and bulldozing of villages. There were now thirty-eight new Israel settlements in the occupied Arab territories, nine of which were on Syrian soil. Jewish sources had stated that the Golan Heights would be converted into a summer resort area, and plans had been made for grazing massive herds of cattle there. The resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights and the Teheran Conference relating to the treatment of the Arab civilian population in the Israel-occupied territories should remind the Council of the gravity and dimensions of the human problem involved.

364. The representative of Israel said that the Arab delegations and their supporters had tried by devious arguments to dismiss the problem of oppression of Jews in the Arab States in the wake of the June 1967 hostilities; it was not the first time that they had proposed in the Council that justice and law be one-sided. He cited reports relating to the situation of Jews in Egypt, Syria and Iraq. The situation had been considered grave enough for the Secretary-General's first Representative on humanitarian matters to concern himself with it, and the situation of Jews in Iraq woeful enough for the Secretary-General to take it up repeatedly with the Government of Iraq. Yet the Arab delegations and the sponsors of the draft resolution before the Council would have it ignored. The Arab Governments by continuing to wage war against Israel were responsible for the situation and Israel was therefore compelled to put its security in the forefront of its considerations. Israel had no objection to a second United Nations humanitarian mission examining the situation in areas under Israel control, provided the Arab Governments took the same position regarding the situation of Jews in their territories since June 1967. Resolution 237 (1967) was addressed to the Governments concerned, not to one Government, and its preamble and paragraph 2 made it plain that international concern extended over the Middle East region as a whole, not only the territories under Israel occupation.

365. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the Council was dealing with one more manifestation of Israel's aggressive policy in violation of the Charter and the Council's decisions. The question of the situation of the Arab population in territories occupied by Israel and of the dispatch to the Middle East of a Special Representative of the Secretary-General for humanitarian purposes was an inalienable part of the problem of the speedy liquidation of the consequences of Israel aggression against the Arab States. Israel had not heeded the warning contained in resolution 237 (1967) but had continued to commit acts of lawlessness in the occupied

Arab territories and had established there a régime of arbitrary oppression, expropriating Arab lands, expelling the Arab inhabitants, and destroying Arab villages. Because it feared exposure, it was therefore hindering the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. What was happening in the occupied Arab territories emphasized the need for the speediest possible liquidation of the consequences of Israel aggression, the earliest possible withdrawal of Israel troops from Arab territories and a political settlement in the Middle East through the implementation of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. For refusing to comply with the Security Council's resolution of 14 June 1967, and for refusing to allow the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to enter the territories concerned in spite of all the Secretary-General's efforts, Israel should be decisively condemned by the Security Council which should also reaffirm resolution 237 and demand its immediate implementation.

366. The representative of Algeria said that Israel had set conditions which it knew in advance were unacceptable for the fulfilment of the humanitarian mission in order to avoid having to account for the conditions of life of the displaced populations following its expansionist policies. There was only a slight chance that Israel would eliminate the obstacles it had imposed, because its unavowed aim in posing as the champion of minorities all over the world was to provoke dissension within States and create an atmosphere of suspicion towards their minorities. It was seeking to provoke or increase a current of emigrants who would be forced out out of fear and hatred and thus allow Israel to increase its population and colonize the newly conquered territories. Instead of admitting its responsibilities for the non-implementation of resolution 237 (1967), Israel had preferred to cast blame on the Arab countries. The humanitarian mission must be maintained as precisely interpreted by the Council and the Secretary-General.

367. The representative of Ethiopia said that in sponsoring resolution 237 (1967) his delegation's primary purpose had been to ensure the safety and welfare of peoples who had been directly affected by the military conflict of June 1967 and, more particularly, those inhabiting the territories which had come under Israel military control during and subsequent to the conflict. In requesting the Secretary-General to follow the implementation of the resolution it had taken special care not to specify any rigid course of action which would make it difficult for him to carry out his mandate; it commended his efforts and hoped that they would continue. His delegation could not accept the Israel interpretation of resolution 237 (1967) or the conditions that emanated from it. That did not mean that Ethiopia was unconcerned about the necessity of universal respect for religious freedom; it condemned all religious persecution and discrimination on grounds of race, religion, colour or creed. The course of action proposed in the draft resolution was fair and just, and his delegation would support it.

368. The representative of India said that the language of paragraph 1 of resolution 237 (1967) made it quite clear that the scope of the inquiry was limited to the occupied areas. The task of the Special Representative was simple and unambiguous: to gather full information on the basis of which the Secretary-General



could report to the Council on the implementation of the resolution. In the light of the Secretary-General's report, it must be concluded that the purposes and principles of the resolution had not yet been fulfilled. India was deeply concerned about the plight of the Arab civilians under foreign occupation and urged Israel to co-operate with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

369. The representative of Hungary said that the discussion had shown that the representative of Israel was attempting to widen the scope of the debate to include issues outside the framework of the subject-matter. The Security Council should not tolerate those attempts. The representatives of Jordan, the United Arab Republic, Syria and Algeria had produced a large number of facts in favour of the urgency of a visit of the Special Representative to occupied Arab territories. The term "areas where military operations have taken place" in resolution 237 (1967) clearly referred to the areas of the Arab States illegally occupied by Israel. By frequent reference to the Jewish people, the representative of Israel was trying to confuse the issue. Israel was responsible for implementing resolution 237 (1967) and the resolution which the Council might adopt regarding the humanitarian conditions of those Arab citizens, no matter what their religious beliefs. The draft resolution was very modest in form and careful in wording and should be adopted unanimously.

370. Statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Syria, Israel and the USSR referring to conditions of Jews, Christians and Kurds in Syria and Jews in the USSR and of Arabs in the occupied areas in Syria and the Gaza strip.

371. Following a brief procedural discussion in which the representative of the United Kingdom, on a point of order, suggested that the vote on the draft resolution be postponed and the representatives of Pakistan and the USSR opposed such postponement, the President put the draft resolution to the vote.

**Decision:** *At the 1454th meeting on 27 September 1968, the revised draft resolution of Pakistan and Senegal (S/8825/Rev.2) was adopted by 12 votes in favour, none against and 3 abstentions (Canada, Denmark, United States of America) as resolution 259 (1968).*

372. Following the adoption of the resolution, the Secretary-General stated that the Special Representative could be on his way with minimum delay, once there was assurance that he would have the access and co-operation indispensable to the fulfilment of his mission.

373. The representative of Brazil said that in voting for the draft resolution, his delegation had had the same humanitarian concern without political motivation which had inspired it to co-sponsor resolution 237 (1967). The new resolution should not be construed as being directed against any State or any of the parties involved in the Middle East dispute; it was a measure to help the Secretary-General in his efforts to bring about the implementation of resolution 237 (1967).

374. The representative of China said that in voting for the draft resolution, his delegation understood that it was a follow-up of resolution 237 (1967) for the purpose of enabling the Secretary-General again to dispatch a Special Representative on a humanitarian mission and would in no way detract from the earlier resolution or prejudice the discretion of the Secretary-

General in his efforts to bring about its implementation.

375. The representative of Denmark stated that his delegation had abstained in the voting on the draft resolution, as it was not convinced about the adequacy of the approach in that resolution to the problems involved. It had felt strongly that the United Nations, in pursuance of resolutions 237 (1967) and 2252 (ES-V), should take an active interest in the safety, welfare and security of the civil populations affected by the hostilities of 1967. It was clear that the Secretary-General had done everything in his power to follow the implementation of the two resolutions, and it was highly regrettable that obstacles should have been raised to the sending out of a second humanitarian mission. It was the duty of those concerned to co-operate with the Secretary-General, especially in a case like the present one where, in a truly humanitarian spirit, he had shown considerable flexibility and given to the resolutions in question what the Secretary-General himself had called a broad humanitarian interpretation. There could be no doubt that those concerned, and not least the Government of Israel, should have been more forthcoming. His delegation believed that the Council should have expressed its full support of the Secretary-General's efforts, including the dispatch of another Special Representative with the scope and terms of reference set forth in the Secretary-General's report, and should have called on those concerned to co-operate fully and unconditionally with the Secretary-General and his Special Representative.

376. The representative of Paraguay said that his delegation had voted for the resolution for humanitarian reasons and because it adhered to the fundamental principle that all resolutions of the Security Council must be scrupulously observed. It regretted the omission in the resolution of the provision of the first and second preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 2 of resolution 237 (1967). It felt that the Governments concerned must scrupulously observe the provisions of that resolution.

377. The representative of the United States stated that his Government continued to support an approach to the issue on the basis of resolution 237 (1967). It would have been pleased to vote for a draft resolution which clearly provided for the dispatch of a United Nations representative on the same basis as before. It regretted that the sponsors had not found acceptable an informal proposal presented during the consultations by which the Secretary-General would have been asked urgently to pursue his efforts, including the dispatch of a Special Representative, with a view to implementing resolution 237 (1967), and would have requested that the Secretary-General be given all necessary assistance and be permitted to carry out his task without conditions being imposed. His delegation could have supported such a text. Moreover, it appeared that the sponsors wished to disassociate the Security Council from the fate of Jewish minorities in the area of conflict; this was unacceptable to his delegation. A text which appeared to narrow the terms of reference of the Special Representative or was ambiguous on that point was not designed to achieve practical results; the United States could not therefore support it. The United States was deeply concerned about the plight of those who were suffering as a result of the hostilities and considered that the United Nations should pursue its humanitarian role. It considered that it was on the basis of resolution 237 (1967), as interpreted by the

Secretary-General, which had produced practical results the previous year, that further progress was most likely to be made, and it hoped that despite the divisive elements introduced by the adoption of the resolution a common ground might yet be found that would permit the United Nations to manifest its legitimate and real concern for the people of the Middle East.

378. The representative of the United Kingdom said that his delegation had felt that the resolution was in a form unlikely to facilitate the implementation of resolution 237 (1967) and therefore had put forward alternative proposals, which it regretted had been rejected. On the other hand, it strongly supported the purpose of resolution 237 (1967), the dispatch of the Secretary-General's Representative to the Middle East and the implementation of the humanitarian resolution without conditions. Therefore, although it did not accept certain sections of the resolution, it supported, in particular, the last operative paragraph and had voted in favour of the resolution.

379. The President, speaking as the representative of Canada, said that Canada shared the deep and general concern about the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants in the area of conflict in the Middle East and supported the efforts of the Secretary-General to send another Special Representative on humanitarian questions to the Middle East. It would have accepted the suggestion in the Secretary-General's report that the second mission should have the same scope and terms of reference as the first and that the broadest possible humanitarian interpretation should be given to the terms of reference. Unfortunately, the resolution took a restrictive view of the mission and was therefore unlikely to achieve its primary purpose, the dispatch of another Special Representative. Since it was concerned that Security Council resolutions should be so drafted as to be carried out, Canada had been obliged to abstain.

380. The representative of Senegal said that the sponsors of the resolution had taken into account the Secretary-General's report in trying to find a way out of the deadlock in the Council. It hoped that after the adoption of the current resolution, resolution 237 (1967) would be applied effectively and rapidly. The sponsors asked only that a representative of the Secretary-General should go and find out what was happening to the inhabitants of the Arab territories occupied by Israel. Clearly, the Representative could find in the resolution just adopted by the Council no legal basis permitting him to go to sovereign States which no longer administered zones currently occupied by Israel. If Israel did not wish to admit a representative, it had only to withdraw from the occupied territories. The sponsors hoped that no further obstacles would be placed in the way of an important inquiry concerning the safety, welfare and security of inhabitants of the Arab territories militarily occupied by Israel.

381. The representative of Pakistan stated that Pakistan's position that the Council had adopted resolution 237 (1967) out of concern for the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of Arab territories under the temporary military occupation of Israel remained unchanged; that was the basis for the current resolution which it had co-sponsored. The amendments accepted to the original draft did not, in his delegation's opinion, change the basic concept of that resolution.

382. The representative of the United Arab Republic said that the Council had indicated clearly to Israel

that the responsibility for co-operating with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General lay with the Israel authorities and that no conditions would be accepted with regard to the fulfilment of the Representative's mission. The Representative should be sent to the occupied areas immediately, and all facilities necessary for his mission should be accorded to him. He regretted that the delegations of the United States, Denmark and Canada had abstained from voting for a merely humane resolution.

383. The representative of Syria associated his delegation with the statement of the representative of the United Arab Republic.

(d) *Report of the Secretary-General of 14 October 1968*

384. On 14 October, the Secretary-General, in pursuance of paragraph 1 of resolution 259 (1968), submitted a report (S/8851) containing the texts of letters exchanged by him with the representatives of Israel, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic. On 28 September, the Secretary-General had addressed a letter to the representative of Israel, seeking assurance that the Israel Government would receive, co-operate with and facilitate the work of the Special Representative to be designated by him. On the same day, he had also written to the representatives of the three Arab States to obtain the co-operation of their Governments for the Special Representative.

385. In their replies, the representatives of Jordan and the United Arab Republic had given assurances of their Governments' fullest co-operation with the Special Representative. The representative of Syria, after stating his Government's understanding that under resolutions 237 (1967) and 259 (1968) the Special Representative had no mandate over Syrian citizens of Jewish faith, had also assured him that the Special Representative would be afforded all co-operation in his efforts. The representative of Israel reiterated his Government's stand that the task of the Special Representative should, in accordance with its interpretation of resolution 237 (1967), include the question of treatment of both Arab and Jewish persons in the States which were directly concerned because of their participation in the war. He added that as soon as the Secretary-General had received assurances from the Arab Governments that had participated in the June war that the Special Representative would have the access and co-operation indispensable to the fulfilment of his mission concerning the Jewish minorities in those countries, Israel would be ready to discuss the arrangements for the mission.

386. In his reply to the representative of Israel, the Secretary-General pointed out that his request for co-operation was made under resolution 259 (1968) which in its paragraph 1 referred exclusively to "Arab territories under military occupation by Israel", and in its paragraph 2 made a request of Israel which envisaged implementation without conditions. The Secretary-General concluded that since Israel's reply did not afford him a basis on which to dispatch the Special Representative, he had no alternative but to report to the Security Council accordingly.

387. In conclusion, the Secretary-General stated that as would be seen from the correspondence, he had not been able to give effect to the decision of the Security Council.

(e) *Further communications received between 27 September 1968 and 15 July 1969*

388. In this period many communications were received relating to the conditions of the inhabitants of the territories occupied by Israel following the hostilities of June 1967.

389. In a number of letters Syria made specific charges of the demolition of Syrian villages in occupied territory or of houses in Syrian villages. Israel in reply stated either that it was a question of demolition of damaged and abandoned houses or that the Israel actions were necessary for security reasons.

390. In a letter dated 15 October (S/8857), Syria charged that on 18 September Israel had started demolishing the occupied Syrian village of Souraman and on 10 October the village of Ahmediye. In a letter dated 21 October (S/8863), Israel replied that Syria had magnified out of proportion the demolition of some abandoned and damaged houses which constituted a risk as they were in danger of collapse. Syria confirmed its charges in a letter of 7 November (S/8893) and, in a letter dated 21 November (S/8904), stated that the demolition of Souraman was continuing.

391. In a letter of 4 March (S/9042), Syria charged that on 26 February the Israel occupation forces had set fire to the village of Khisfne. On 4 April it charged (S/9131) further demolition of houses on 26 March and at Aboukhibit on 31 March; on 8 April it charged (S/9139) the demolition of houses at Kuneitra on 31 March; on 11 April it charged (S/9150) the demolition of houses on 6, 7 and 8 April at the villages of Zbizetun, Tel Esseqi, Errazaniye and Khan El-Joukhar. In reply to those charges, Israel asserted in a letter dated 15 April (S/9158) that Syria had no grounds for complaint over defence measures taken by Israel on its side of the cease-fire line in the face of Syrian violations by its regular forces and by marauders and saboteurs. In a letter dated 17 April (S/9164), Syria, in turn, protested that so-called defence measures could not justify the razing of villages, demolition of houses and mass execution of shepherds, and called attention to Israel's refusal to accept the dispatch of a Special Representative of the Secretary-General in accordance with the Council's resolution 259 (1968) of 27 September 1968. In a further letter dated 25 April (S/9177), Israel declared that since Syria's policy had remained one of war with Israel, Syria had no basis for advising Israel on how to defend itself. In a letter dated 9 May (S/9199), Syria charged further demolition of houses by Israel authorities on 27 and 28 April at the village of Aache.

392. In letters of 12 December 1968 (S/8928) and 16 January 1969 (S/8971), Syria drew attention to reports by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency concerning Israel plans for establishing Israel settlements on the Golan Heights.

393. Charges of the violation of human rights and the Geneva Conventions in occupied Arab territories were also made in communications from various Syrian organizations transmitted by letters dated 28 October and 5 November (S/8873 and S/8887). In a letter of 30 October (S/8876), Israel rejected Syrian charges and accused Syria of oppressing Jews and other minorities. Syria, in rejecting the Israel charges in a letter of 6 November (S/8892), quoted a letter from Israel intellectuals regarding violation of human rights in the occupied territories.

394. In a number of communications throughout the period, Jordan, in addition to protests relating to Jerusalem and the treatment of its population (see section C, below), complained of oppressive measures against Jordanian citizens in the occupied areas, in particular, of arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, ill-treatment in prisons, unjustified expulsion and demolition of houses. A number of these charges were rejected by Israel as false or distorted.

395. In a letter dated 9 December (S/8923), Jordan charged Israel with taking oppressive measures against Jordanian citizens in the occupied areas, in particular, with arbitrary arrests and imprisonment, and, in letters of 12 December (S/8929, S/8930), transmitted resolutions adopted by the Arab Regional Conference on Human Rights held in Beirut on 4 December 1968, condemning the Israel attack on the civilian population of Irbid on 3 December and the arbitrary imprisonment of Jordan citizens under Israel occupation.

396. By a letter dated 13 December (S/8932), Jordan transmitted a memorandum signed by mayors, members of the professions and members of women's organizations on the West Bank, protesting the treatment of the inhabitants by the occupation authorities, including house demolition, property confiscation and unjustified arrests and expulsions.

397. By a letter dated 7 January 1969 (S/8961), Jordan transmitted a statement by a Jordanian citizen, the President of the Union of Palestine Arab Students in Lebanon, alleging his ill-treatment and that of other Arabs in Israel prisons. His charges were rejected as false by Israel in a letter dated 13 January (S/8965).

398. In a letter dated 30 January (S/8988), Jordan drew attention to the condition of the refugees in eastern Jordan, following floods and snowstorms, and urged that steps be taken for their speedy return to their homes.

399. On 10 February, Jordan transmitted (S/9001) a list of protests submitted to the Israel occupying forces by religious leaders and institutions against Israel measures in the occupied areas, in particular in Jerusalem.

400. In a letter dated 21 March (S/9102), Jordan charged Israel with arbitrary measures against the Arab population in the occupied areas, especially Jerusalem, including arbitrary detention, attacks on schools and students and demolition of houses. In a letter of reply dated 31 March (S/9122), Israel stated that Jordan had distorted necessary security measures taken by Israel against those who had committed acts of murder and terror or had abetted them.

401. In a letter of 17 April (S/9162), Jordan charged Israel with the arbitrary arrest and expulsion of Arab personalities from the West Bank as a means of pressure on the population. In a letter dated 22 April (S/9174), Israel replied that in the two cases cited, the individuals had been arrested on the basis of information that they were engaged in terrorist activities and that they had been well treated and had left the country at their own request.

402. In a letter dated 8 May (S/9197), Jordan charged further violations of human rights in the West Bank and in Gaza, particularly with regard to women suspected of resistance to foreign occupation, and transmitted protests from relatives of those detained and from the Red Cross Societies of Jordan and Lebanon. Israel, in a letter of 14 May (S/9208), rejected those charges as false and distorted and said that they were

designed to divert attention from Jordan's responsibility for the continuation of acts of terror and aggression carried out by and from Jordan. Jordan reaffirmed its charges in a letter dated 26 May (S/9225) and quoted reports from Israel papers of arbitrary detentions and the demolition of houses. Israel rejected the Jordanian contentions and reaffirmed its position in a letter of 2 June (S/9230 and Corr.1).

403. In a cable dated 3 February (S/8991), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic charged the Israel authorities with inhuman treatment of the civilian population in the Gaza Strip. Israel rejected these charges in a letter dated 5 February (S/8994), stating that the Israel Defence Forces in Gaza limited their actions to the minimum required to prevent outbreaks of violence, which, it stated, the Egyptian Government was fostering.

404. In a communication transmitted on 21 February (S/9029), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Southern Yemen protested against the armed attack by Israel on the civilian inhabitants of Khan Younis on 13 February 1969.

405. In a letter transmitted on 13 February (S/9011), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq charged Israel with atrocities against the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories.

### **C. Communications concerning the situation in and around Jerusalem and its Holy Places**

#### *(a) Communications and reports received between 15 July 1968 and 2 July 1969 and requests for a meeting*

406. During the period covered in the current report, a number of communications were addressed to the Security Council concerning Jerusalem and its Holy Places, which had been discussed by the Council in April and May 1968 prior to the adoption on 21 May of resolution 252 (1968).

407. In a letter dated 19 August 1969 (S/8750), Jordan complained of incidents of lawlessness against Arab inhabitants in occupied Jerusalem, charging that on the preceding day hundreds of Israel youths had attacked Arab residents in Arab Jerusalem, injuring scores of innocent civilians, looting Arab stores and destroying property, during which time the Israel police apparently had not intervened. The letter linked the incidents with other charges of mistreatment of Arab inhabitants in the occupied territories (see section B, above). In a reply dated 21 August (S/8756), Israel charged that the incidents in question had arisen with three premeditated and planned terror attacks carried out by terror organizations operating from Jordan, which, the letter stated, were supported and even participated in by the Government of Jordan (see section A, above). Moreover, the Jerusalem authorities had condemned the outburst and had arrested a number of the young men implicated.

408. By a letter dated 11 October (S/8847), Syria transmitted to the Secretary-General a message from some of the religious leaders in Syria condemning the desecration of the Holy Places by the Israel occupying forces. By a letter dated 22 October (S/8864), Kuwait forwarded a group of forty photographs, together with accompanying explanatory notes, which related to alleged desecration by Israel authorities of Moslem and Christian Holy Places in and around Jerusalem and the destruction of Arab homes in the city. In a letter

dated 6 November (S/8890), Jordan also brought to the attention of the Secretary-General charges of continuous Israel acts of demolition and change of character of historical and religious buildings in Jerusalem and transmitted a letter from the Mayor of Jerusalem containing an account of Israel's measures in that respect.

409. By a letter dated 5 February 1969 (S/8995), Jordan transmitted a cable which it stated had been addressed to the President of the Security Council on 1 February by Mr. Rouli El-Khatib, the Mayor of Jerusalem, urging action to end the liquidation of the 70,000 Arabs of Jerusalem and the repressive measures being promulgated by Israel to change the character of the Holy City. In a further communication dated 10 February (S/9001), Jordan transmitted a list of protests submitted to the Israel authorities by religious leaders and institutions against the measures taken by the Israel Government and concerning the conduct of some Israel citizens in Jerusalem.

410. In a letter dated 8 February (S/8998), Jordan requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council "to consider the continued Israeli defiance of Security Council resolution 252 (1968)", which, among other things, called upon Israel "to desist from taking any action which tends to change the status of Jerusalem". Jordan stated that despite that clear warning, Israel had enacted, against Arab opposition, legislation designed to destroy the character of the city and incorporate the Arab life and institutions into Israel life. The legislation was to take effect on 25 February and would create a situation which threatened not only the economic life of the Christians and Moslems of Jerusalem but international peace and security, warranting, therefore, consideration of that situation by the Security Council.

411. By another letter dated 8 February (S/8999), Jordan transmitted the text of a memorandum addressed to the Prime Minister of Israel by a group of Arab lawyers in Israel-occupied territory, in which they had protested against Israel legislation aimed at completing the process of Israel's annexation of Jerusalem and its environs.

412. In a note dated 10 February (S/9000), the President of the Security Council stated that since the Government of Israel had decided to postpone until 23 May 1969 the putting into effect of the legislative provisions which formed the subject-matter of Jordan's complaint, the meeting of the Security Council, which had been fixed for 11 February, had been postponed.

413. In a letter dated 13 February (S/9010) to the Secretary-General, Jordan stated that the postponement allowed for an extension of the time-limit during which efforts could be made for the repeal of the legislation and thus avoid confronting the world with a *fait accompli*. Jordan also requested the Secretary-General to furnish the Security Council with a progress report on the implementation of resolution 252 (1968).

414. In a report dated 11 April (S/9149), submitted in pursuance of Security Council resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968, the Secretary-General stated that since the termination of the mission of his Personal Representative in Jerusalem in September 1967, he had had no means of obtaining first-hand information upon which he could base a report. On 13 February 1969, the Secretary-General had sent a note to Israel in

which he recalled that under resolution 252 (1968) the Security Council had considered that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, including expropriation of land and properties thereon, which tended to change the legal status of Jerusalem were invalid and could not change that status; had urgently called upon Israel to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action which tended to change the status of Jerusalem; and had requested the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of the resolution. The Secretary-General had stated that he must, in the main, look to the Government of Israel for the information necessary in the discharge of his responsibilities and had therefore requested the Government of Israel to provide him with such information. In reply on 25 March, the representative of Israel had informed the Secretary-General that the position of his Government continued to be the same as set forth in the letter of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel of 10 July 1967 (S/8052) and in the statements which had been made on that subject by the representatives of Israel in the General Assembly and the Security Council.

415. The Secretary-General then stated that the only other source of information of an official nature pertinent to the implementation of Security Council resolution 252 (1968) was the Israel Official Gazette, published originally in Hebrew. According to that source, the Israel Parliament had adopted on 14 August 1968 the "Legal and Administrative Matters (Regulation) Law", which was relevant to the situation in Jerusalem. Regarding the implementation of that law, the Secretary-General recalled that the President of the Security Council had indicated, in his note of 10 February 1969, that Israel had decided to postpone until 23 May 1969 the putting into effect of that law. The report of the Secretary-General contained as annex I an unofficial translation of the "Legal and Administrative Matters (Regulation) Law, 5728, 1968", and as annex II an unofficial translation of the "Administrative Matters (Regulation) Law, 5728, 1968" and explanatory notes.

416. In a letter dated 23 June (S/9277), Israel complained of an incident which it stated was carried out from Jordan on 20 June against the civilian population of Jerusalem, when three bombs were exploded in a narrow street which serves as a passage for worshippers on their way to the Western (Wailing) Wall, injuring three Arab and one Israel inhabitants.

417. By a letter dated 26 June 1969 (S/9284), Jordan complained of Israel's further violations of its resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968 concerning Jerusalem. Jordan stated that instead of complying with the Security Council's directives, the Israel Government, in utter disregard of the will of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, had enacted Administrative Regulation Law 1968 and had, on 27 April 1969, enacted further provisions and new regulations. Although an urgent meeting of the Council on this matter, called in February 1969, had been deferred, Israel had continued to take measures contrary to the Council's resolution 252 (1968) and the United Nations Charter and was further implementing its plans for the establishment of Israel settlements in the city. Jordan requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider Israel's continued defiance of resolution 252 (1968) on Jerusalem.

418. By letters dated 30 June and 2 July (S/9289 and S/9303), Jordan transmitted photographs which, it stated, showed Israel bulldozing of Arab houses and Muslim shrines in Jerusalem adjacent to the Western Wall of the Aqsa Mosque and the construction of Israel settlements on confiscated Arab land in eastern Jerusalem.

(b) *Consideration by the Council at the 1482nd to 1485th meetings (30 June to 3 July 1969)*

419. At the 1482nd meeting on 30 June, the Security Council included in its agenda Jordan's letter of 26 June 1969 (S/9284), and the President invited the representatives of Jordan, Israel and the United Arab Republic, pursuant to their requests, to participate in the debate without the right to vote. Subsequently, the representatives of Saudi Arabia, Syria, Morocco, Iraq, Indonesia, Lebanon, Malaysia, Afghanistan, Sudan, Yemen, Tunisia and Kuwait also requested, and were similarly invited, to participate in the discussion.

420. The representative of Jordan stated that the urgent meeting had been called to consider a situation threatening not only the political and economic life of Jordanian citizens in Jerusalem but international peace and security. By failing to respond to the request of the Security Council, Israel had continued to violate the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly calling on it not to take any action tending to alter the status of Jerusalem. Israel laws were designed to create a greater Jerusalem to be part of a greater Israel and tended to subordinate all previous Arab life to those laws and gradually liquidate the whole Arab character of the city. With eviction on political grounds a daily occurrence in occupied Jordan, the Israelis were able to confiscate Jordanian property under the law, although Jewish ownership in the whole city of Jerusalem was not more than 26 per cent, the rest being legally Arab. Indicating that the new law contained provisions making it impossible for Arab business to maintain its independence and identity, he stated that there were more than 180 Arab companies and firms in Jerusalem, employing more than 4,000 people, which, under the law, could either be totally absorbed in the Israel economy or be automatically liquidated. Such laws violated the Council's resolutions, international law and the Geneva Convention and were therefore null and void and had no legal basis. If the Israel actions, intended to create a *fait accompli*, remained unchecked, it would be impossible to create the necessary preconditions for peace. If no action was taken immediately, the Security Council would face more conflict in the area, and if something was not done soon, the city of peace might very well become a city of real conflict. The representative of Jordan asked the Security Council to deplore the failure of Israel to show any regard for Security Council resolution 252 (1968); to call once more upon Israel to rescind all measures which had resulted or might result in changing the status of the city of Jerusalem, and, in future, refrain from all actions likely to have such an effect; to warn Israel that unless the illegal acts of legislation were rescinded the Council would reconvene to take action, including the application of Article 41 of the Charter; to appeal to Member States to refrain from sending arms and military equipment to Israel until it complied with the Council's requests; to reaffirm Security Council resolution 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968 and General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) of 4 and 14 July 1967 on Jerusalem

and declare the new Israel legislation dated 23 August 1968 and the subsequent decrees and legislation null and void; and to call upon the Secretary-General to submit a report to the Council on the implementation of its resolution.

421. The representative of Israel stated that Jordan had come before the Security Council to plead the cause of its 1948 invasion and that Jordan and other Arab States were openly pursuing warfare against Israel. The Jordanian regular army and the Iraqi forces stationed in Jordan were actively involved in terrorist operations. To seize the Security Council in these circumstances with technicalities of registration and commercial enterprises was the height of frivolity, and the intensification of Jordanian and Egyptian armed attacks had been widely condemned as prejudicing the search for peace in the Middle East. The Jordanian complaint was a manoeuvre to divert attention from the fact that the Arab Governments had hardened even further their refusal to conclude peace with Israel. Regarding the regulations which were the subject of the complaint, he said that what mattered to Jordan was less what Israel did than the fact that Israel did it. In reply to Jordanian complaints concerning Israel measures in the area of the Wailing Wall, he stated that Jordan had, in 1948, razed thirty-four of the thirty-five houses of worship, as well as schools and homes, in the Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem. Moreover, captured saboteurs had admitted that they had been dispatched to attack worshippers at the Wailing Wall on 20 June. The people of Israel and the world at large would follow with interest the views expressed by the members of the Security Council on such outrageous assaults on peaceful worshippers at a Holy Place in the city of Jerusalem.

422. Describing the life in Jerusalem under a united rule, the representative of Israel stated that the thousands of foreign visitors visiting Jerusalem would attest to the fact that the city was basically content. An incident did sometimes occur, and some of Jerusalem's inhabitants might not be happy, but a large number of Christian and some Moslem leaders had expressed satisfaction at the situation regarding their Holy Places. He then charged that Jordan was not motivated by Jerusalem's welfare but by continued belligerence against Israel. Jordan's attitude disregarded the basic precepts of international law and morality and was in violation of the rights of the city's population, which consisted of more than 200,000 Jews, 60,000 Arabs and 5,000 others. It was evident that the great majority of the city's population categorically rejected any Jordanian claims to intervene in its life.

423. The representative of Jordan, exercising the right of reply, stated that the figures established by the Anglo-American Commission on Palestine showed that Jerusalem had had a majority of Arabs, not Israelis, as the representative of Israel had stated. Regarding the unity of the city, he stated that the Council had objected to annexation by force, which amounted to aggression, not unity. He concluded by stating that the issue was Israel's defiance of the Council's own resolution. Violations had continued and more acts of aggression had been committed; and Jordan had come to the Council for an effective remedy.

424. The representative of Saudi Arabia asked if the Council was paralysed on the question and whether it was going to pass more resolutions which would not be implemented. After referring to the history of

Jerusalem, he stated that Jerusalem was sacred to three great religious faiths and the Zionists should not make it their capital. He warned that the situation was serious and that the lethal weapons of today might tomorrow wipe out Jews and Gentiles alike.

425. At the 1483rd meeting, on 1 July, the representative of the United Arab Republic stated that the Israel measures of annexation were meant to achieve the consolidation of Israel's occupation and that the will of the international community in that respect had been demonstrated in the General Assembly and the Security Council resolutions, which had all invalidated the Israel measures, reaffirmed the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and called upon Israel to rescind those measures and desist forthwith from changing the status of the Holy City. Israel was under obligation to carry out those decisions, but Israel's reaction to these resolutions had been negative and Israel had persisted in its destruction of Arab homes and properties. The time had come for the Council to move from the stage of passing resolutions of condemnation and injunctions to the stage of measures and actions to enforce its decisions. His delegation would fully support the measures suggested by the representative of Jordan.

426. The representative of the United Kingdom reaffirmed the position of his Government, as stated in the General Assembly by his Foreign Secretary on 21 June 1967, that under Article 2 of the Charter, war should not lead to territorial aggrandizement. Regarding Jerusalem, he reiterated his support of the position that no unilateral action should or could change the status of that city. It was essential for the Council to require that nothing should be done by unilateral action to prejudice the future of Jerusalem, which must be kept open and decided upon as part of a final settlement ensuring a permanent peace. Although no one disputed the vital concern in the matter of the countries of the Middle East, the Council and the whole world had a legitimate interest in peace in the area, and the Council was not to be told that its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security was diminished or deferred. He said in conclusion that Jerusalem was the heart of the whole problem and that a just and complete settlement should not be ruled out in advance or rendered impossible by any act designed to prejudice the future status of the city.

427. The representative of France stated that Jerusalem had already been the subject of many debates and resolutions by the Security Council and the General Assembly, including resolution 252 (1968), and that since 1967 a number of measures adopted in the occupied territories, and particularly in Jerusalem, had given rise to Jordan's protests to the Council and the General Assembly. The new complaint of Jordan appeared to be the continuation of previous ones and stemmed from Israel's non-compliance with the provisions of resolution 252 (1968). Recalling that France had voted in favour of General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) of 4 and 14 July 1967, he pointed out that since that time France had opposed anything that might further increase the hostilities among the parties concerned in the Middle East. There could be no doubt that all legislative or other measures adopted by Israel that might facilitate the process of integration of part of Jerusalem were in contradiction to those resolutions and that some of them were contrary to the rules of international law regarding armed occupation and to the Charter and

the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Israel authorities had often given assurances that they would take steps to assure free access by all to places of worship. However, the problem was not only administrative and social but political, religious and legal in nature. It was his delegation's hope that Israel would consent to put an end, without delay, to the contested measures and safeguard the character of a city, the future status of which could in no way be prejudiced.

428. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the Council was forced again to consider the question in view of the illegal attempts by Israel to annex the Arab part of Jerusalem. The General Assembly had firmly opposed the annexationist designs of Israel and termed Israel's action illegal. In its resolution 252 (1968), the Security Council had confirmed the resolutions of the General Assembly, but the actions of Israel in Jerusalem testified to the fact that the Government of Israel was ignoring those resolutions. Israel occupation forces were carrying out in Jerusalem a programme of measures aimed at changing the Arab nature of the Old City, expelling Arab inhabitants, destroying Arab houses and imposing Israel settlements in the Arab section. The overwhelming majority of the Member States of the United Nations and world public opinion had condemned and rejected Israel's annexationist plans in Jerusalem. Israel therefore should ponder the dangerous consequences for the State of Israel itself in pursuing such a policy. The Security Council, in discharging its duties under the Charter, must take the necessary measures to see that its decisions were carried out. The Council must demand of Israel that it cease immediately all attempts at "Israelizing" Arab Jerusalem, which it was occupying, and implement resolution 242 calling for a political settlement in the Middle East and the withdrawal of Israel forces from all occupied Arab territories.

429. The representative of Algeria stated that by promptly and almost unanimously adopting the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council regarding Jerusalem, the international community had shown the occupiers the importance it attached to the fate of the Holy City. But Israel, defying the hundreds of millions of human beings for whom Jerusalem was the symbol of faith, had begun on 8 June 1967 to take preliminary measures to absorb the Old City, in flagrant violation of all the resolutions of the United Nations and despite the opposition of the population of Jerusalem. In three successive aggressions Israel's objective had been more land and fewer Palestinians. The Security Council must examine Israel's refusal to implement its previous decisions on this question. It was his delegation's opinion that the Council should take up its responsibilities in accordance with the Charter and tackle the causes of the crisis that has shaken the Middle East for twenty-one years.

430. The representative of the United States stated that the discussion thus far had made amply clear that the status of Jerusalem was not an isolated problem but an integral part of the whole complex of issues in the current conflict. The Council had recognized that fact in resolution 242 (1967), which treated the entire Middle East situation as a package. That resolution remained the basis for the approach to a just and lasting peace in the area. Because Jerusalem was one of the holiest cities in the world, the United States had always considered that the city enjoyed a unique international standing. In the opinion of his delegation, none of the deep concerns over Jerusalem which moved

all parties to the Arab-Israel dispute were served by what was now taking place there, whether it was actions by those now in authority or by individuals considering themselves aggrieved. The United States considered that the part of Jerusalem that came under Israel control in the June war was occupied territory, subject to the provisions of international law governing the rights and obligations of an occupying power. Under the Geneva Convention and international law the occupier must maintain the occupied area as intact and unaltered as possible, any changes being necessitated by immediate needs of the occupation. The actions of Israel in occupied Jerusalem gave rise to understandable concerns that the eventual disposition of East Jerusalem might be prejudiced and that the private rights and activities of the population were already being affected and altered. His Government did not accept those measures as affecting the ultimate status of Jerusalem. After recalling his government's efforts to bring peace to the Middle East, he suggested that the Council should request the parties concerned to desist from any action in Jerusalem or elsewhere that might prejudice a final comprehensive settlement and a just and lasting peace. Any proposal should be subjected to the test of whether it would help or hinder the peaceful settlement process.

431. Exercising his right of reply, the representative of Israel, referring to the talks between the four Powers, stated that Israel's Prime Minister had said that Israel did not accept in principle that those Powers should arrogate to themselves the right to decide the destiny of other States without the participation of those concerned. From the political and practical standpoint, she had said, Israel could only react negatively to the Big Four talks, being fully aware that one of the Powers was hostile and the outspoken representative of the Arabs. He stated that the United Arab Republic and Algeria had refused to accept United Nations resolutions, including the call in the 22 November 1967 resolution for a peaceful settlement, and he asked whether anyone could seriously consider that Israel should listen to advice from those sources. Quoting figures from various periods, he reiterated that Jerusalem had had a Jewish majority for many years. Any Arabs re-located in Jerusalem had been fully compensated. Violence, harassment and pressure would not weaken Israel's determination to work for its goal of real peace and security for Jerusalem, for Israel as a whole and for its neighbours.

432. The representative of Syria referred to a statement by the representative of the Catholic Women's Guild concerning the difficulties encountered by Arab workers in Jerusalem in finding work. He also stated that in 1947 the British Mandatory Powers had submitted to the United Nations a document showing that Jewish ownership in the Jerusalem subdistrict was 2 per cent and that of the Arabs 80 per cent.

433. The representative of Saudi Arabia stated that Jerusalem, in the seventh century, had been inhabited by a conglomeration of peoples, neither Arabs nor Jews, who later had embraced Islam and Arabism. Regarding the attitude of Israel about living standards in Jerusalem, he said that it reminded him of the "white man's burden" used as an argument in the colonization of Africa and Asia. A just peace had to meet the aspirations of the Palestinian people. The Arabs did not want compensation; they wanted their homes which their people had occupied for centuries. It was the indigenous people who held title to Jerusalem and to all of Palestine.

434. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the representative of Israel had distorted the facts and that there was no indication that Israel intended to comply with the resolutions of the Council, but that it meant to continue its policy of expansion and annexation.

435. At the 1484th meeting, on 2 July, the representative of the United Arab Republic stated that Israel's defiance of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions regarding Jerusalem had gone so far that it had informed the Secretary-General that its annexation of Jerusalem was irreversible and not negotiable. Regarding Israel's policies, he stated that in Israel's view, peace would amount to the surrender of the Arab peoples to its will and their acquiescence in its territorial ambitions.

436. The representative of Morocco stated that the decisions and resolutions by the United Nations on the question of Jerusalem had been violated, and although it was a question of Arab territory, interest in the city and its Holy Places was world-wide. In spite of United Nations resolutions, Israel had transferred the main part of its governmental machinery to Jerusalem and held military parades there, Jordan had submitted its complaint in order to denounce that series of violations that were contrary to clear-cut decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Noting that the representative of Israel had read a statement by the Israel Prime Minister contending that the Great Powers had nothing to say about the matter, he stated that that had not always been Israel's policy. Israel had been glad to have their support at various times, but now it feared that they would interfere with its designs. But the great Powers had special responsibilities under the Charter, and he hoped that their talks would be successful.

437. The representative of Zambia deplored the fact that Israel was, according to *The New York Times*, moving its national police headquarters from Tel Aviv to East Jerusalem, which had been part of Jordan until 1967. His delegation had been grieved to find that Israel continued to defy with impunity the decisions of the Council. Regarding the laws promulgated by Israel, he said that they were intended to confuse even more an already confused situation. Restating his Government's stand on the whole Middle East question, he said that political reality must persuade everyone to accept the independence and sovereignty of the State of Israel, but it was also clear that territorial aggrandizement could not be recognized. It was time that both sides listened and paid attention to world appeals for peace, and the Council had a duty to call on Israel not to proceed with its measures.

438. The representative of Nepal stated that his delegation considered all actions taken by Israel which tended to change the status of the city of Jerusalem as invalid. The occupying authorities, he added, had taken further measures in a clear bid to change the status of Jerusalem in defiance of the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. His delegation expected all parties, particularly those directly interested in the question, to show restraint, moderation and respect for the decisions of the United Nations. That appeal was not an equation between those who pursued a policy of annexation and those who suffered from it.

439. The representative of Hungary stated that the problems regarding Jerusalem constituted an integral part of the Middle East issue facing the Council. Israel

had created an additional and more difficult problem by fundamentally and juridically changing the status of a part of the occupied territory. The measures complained of, which the representative of Israel had qualified as mere technicalities, were violations of the Charter and United Nations resolutions. The location of the national police headquarters in the occupied city constituted an act of grave provocation and not a mere technicality. It was difficult to understand how a Government which based its claim to Jerusalem on religious grounds could fail to take into account the sentiments of others motivated by the same consideration. The Middle East situation, he concluded, remained explosive, and the Security Council should not tolerate any further violation of its decisions.

440. The representative of Finland said that the General Assembly and the Security Council resolutions on Jerusalem were based on legal and political considerations and proceeded from the basis that the Government of Israel could claim no sovereignty over Jerusalem and that measures by Israel could not be accepted as altering the status of the city. The Finnish Government had concurred in that view in voting in favour of the afore-mentioned General Assembly resolutions. He referred to the fact that the situation in Jerusalem was intensifying tensions in the Middle East at a time when the overall situation in the area was deteriorating. The Secretary-General had some time ago called to the urgent attention of the members of the Security Council the critical situation in the Suez Canal sector and the danger of a break-down in the cease-fire arrangements there. The tension and violence continued unabated along the cease-fire lines and beyond them in other areas as well. All acts in defiance of the pertinent cease-fire resolutions made the task of promoting a peaceful settlement on the basis of the resolution adopted on 22 November 1967 more difficult. The Four Power talks still offered the best hope that would ensure progress toward a peaceful and accepted settlement. The Council should, therefore, do everything possible to promote the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

441. The representative of China stated that there was a consensus that the Holy City should be kept out of international rivalry and strife. The question of Jerusalem could not be viewed in isolation from the Middle East problem as a whole. The Council's resolution on Jerusalem remained binding on the Council as well as on the parties concerned. No matter what Israel had done in Jerusalem since 1967, it had not been acceptable to the Arab population and was inconsistent with the terms of Security Council resolution 252 (1968). The Council should reaffirm the principles laid down in resolution 252 (1968) and urgently call upon Israel to comply with the requirements of that resolution.

442. The representative of Malaysia stated that perhaps it was not too late to remind Israel that the status of the Holy City was not purely a matter between Israel and Jordan and that any changes in its status would have profound repercussions also on Christians and Muslims all over the world. Recalling the resolution regarding Jerusalem adopted by the International Islamic Conference in April 1969, which condemned Israel for having usurped the Arab territories and, in particular, the Holy City, he stated that if Israel continued to defy the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly regarding Jerusalem, it would have to contend not only with its Arab neigh-



bours and the Muslim world but with the political and moral force of the United Nations.

443. The representative of Lebanon said that both the General Assembly and the Security Council in 1967 and 1968 had adopted several resolutions on the question of Jerusalem, for which Israel had shown only disrespect. His delegation was gratified that the representatives of the Four Powers had all reaffirmed the positions of their Governments with regard to Israel's illegal and invalid decision to annex the old Arab city of Jerusalem, as that decision prejudiced the final settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict under Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. If Israel wished peace, it must desist from acts that undermined peaceful development, and its presence in the Old City was not conducive to peace. In these circumstances the Security Council had a special responsibility to prevent the development of such a perpetual conflict by taking measures under the Charter to bolster its resolution 252 (1968).

444. The representative of Iraq said that the complaint before the Council constituted an appeal by all humanity, not one by Jordan or the Arab States. By taking more coercive measures in the occupied territory, and in Jerusalem in particular, Israel was showing contempt for world public opinion. In his view the Council should act immediately and put an end to Israel's defiance.

445. The representative of Indonesia stated that Jerusalem was a Holy Place to 100 million Indonesian Muslims. The tension in the Middle East was threatening the precarious balance of power in that area. The actions of Israel were a clear violation of its obligations under international law as an occupying Power. His delegation believed that only by a firm stand could any further aggravation of the situation be averted.

446. The representative of Spain stated that the military occupation of Jerusalem by Israel was not justified in any way and was contrary to a number of United Nations resolutions, despite which Israel continued to take measures designed to change the legal status of the city and to consolidate an illegal *de facto* situation. The Security Council must urgently demand respect for the United Nations resolutions, condemn the policy of *faits accomplis* and reiterate that the use of force could not justify any territorial annexation. Patience must have a limit in the light of non-compliance with resolutions and the flouting of the rights of many Member States.

447. The representative of Colombia stated that his delegation's position on the problems of the Middle East had not changed since first set forth in June 1967. On the specific question of Jerusalem which was before the Council, he entirely endorsed resolution 252 (1968) and considered that any action or step which violated that resolution was illegal and arbitrary. Therefore, his delegation could not endorse or countenance any alteration of the legal status of Jerusalem by unilateral initiative, regardless of its origin.

448. The representative of Paraguay stated that since the position of his delegation was based entirely on questions of principle, it was unchangeable and immutable. He recalled the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its second, third and fourth sessions regarding the establishment of Jerusalem as a *corpus separatum* and stated that in his delegation's view, despite the *de facto* situation, those provisions were still fully and legally valid unless they were modified by the General Assembly. He also recalled

the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V), and of Security Council resolution 252 (1968), and stated that in the light of those decisions, the new legislative and administrative measures and other actions taken by Israel which tended to change the legal status of Jerusalem had no legal validity and were not binding. Moreover, those actions taken by Israel in Jerusalem affected other aspects of the general problem of the area and had a negative effect on the efforts being made both by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative and by four Permanent Members of the Security Council.

449. The representative of Syria stated that Israel's violation of the Council resolution on Jerusalem was only part of Israel's pattern of behaviour. Israel had disregarded all resolutions relating to Jerusalem, had taken the law into its own hands and was depriving the Arabs in Jerusalem and the other occupied territories of basic human rights.

450. The representative of Israel stated that Arab intransigence and hostility toward Israel had been made clear in the statements of the United Arab Republic, Algeria and Syria. Replying to Arab assertions, he stated that Jerusalem had been united and integral for centuries and had been divided for only nineteen years after an invasion. He went on to say that for the first time all universal religions were accorded recognition and respect, and Israel would make certain that all inhabitants of Jerusalem, Jew and Arab, would have their rights respected.

451. At the 1485th meeting of the Council on 3 July, the representative of Afghanistan said that he held the same views as expressed by previous speakers that the status of Jerusalem should not be changed, that Israel should withdraw its forces from all the occupied territories and that Israel's actions in East Jerusalem were detrimental to the common interests. The United Nations had an obligation to take action in the matter, which was of interest to the small countries which made up the majority of the United Nations membership. In an insecure world no small country could allow the concept of acquisition of territory by military force to be accepted. He appealed to the members of the Council to intensify their efforts to bring about peace in the Middle East.

452. The representative of Saudi Arabia reiterated his previous position and stated that the United Nations should implement its decisions rather than pass resolutions which seemed to be a futile exercise. The big Powers, he added, should act before it was too late.

453. The representative of Tunisia said that by its action in Jerusalem, Israel was violating international law and the resolutions of the United Nations. He hoped that the Council would show the proper determination to see that its resolutions were implemented. Israel had said it would not give up Jerusalem. The Council should face that challenge.

454. The representative of Sudan said that he was appealing to the Council members to see that their decision on Jerusalem was not made void by the daily acts of Israel to perpetuate its domination. The Palestinians would never forget the injustice done to them. They were scattered in refugee camps, but they were fighting back; and the leaders of Israel must fear the relentless force of the Palestinians' desire to return to their homeland. There was no doubt that Israel's actions in Jerusalem were in violation of the Security Council resolution on the issue. Referring to statements by Israel leaders about annexing Jerusalem, half of the

Sinai Peninsula and the Golan Heights, and stating that Israel had refused all peace overtures, he said that the Council must find a way to ensure implementation of its resolutions. The peace effort would otherwise fail.

455. The representative of Jordan observed that the Council was now in possession of photographs showing the construction of Israel settlements (S/9289 and S/9303) and the bulldozing of Arab shrines. The Israelis presented the conflict as one between Israel and the Arab States, ignoring the Palestinian people. Stressing the colonial character of Israel policies, he recalled that according to one historian, the Zionist Jews from East Europe had inflicted in Palestine the same moral wrong as had been committed in South Africa and Rhodesia. He said that nobody liked any form of foreign domination. People liked freedom, even with poverty.

456. The representative of Yemen said that his country had hoped the Council would take the required measures to protect Jerusalem's special character. Israel had deprived the Palestine people of their homeland. It had persisted with its measures in Jerusalem, despite the United Nations resolutions on the subject. The Council should make sure that the Zionist State did not defy the whole world.

457. The representative of Pakistan pointed out that this was the third time in two years that the United Nations had been concerned with the question of Jerusalem. Israel had shown total defiance of the Council's resolutions and had refused to rescind measures changing the legal status of the city. Recalling the statements of the representatives of the big Powers and statements by representatives of a wide range of countries condemning Israel's actions as offensive to the universal religious interest and as transgressing the rules which govern military occupation under international law, he stated that any Council decision should be based on the principle of the non-admissibility of territorial gains by conquest. He added that no one would be deluded by Israel's talk of "reunification" of Jerusalem. Referring to Article 24 (1) of the Charter, which conferred on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, he said the four permanent members of the Council had to safeguard the interest of all Members of the United Nations in the City of Jerusalem. The representative of Pakistan then introduced a draft resolution (S/9311) sponsored by Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia. The text of the draft resolution read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling its resolution 252 of 21 May 1968 and the earlier General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) of 4 and 14 July 1967 respectively concerning measures and actions by Israel affecting the status of the City of Jerusalem,*

*"Having heard the statements of the parties concerned on the question,*

*"Noting that since the adoption of the above-mentioned resolutions Israel has taken further measures tending to change the status of the City of Jerusalem,*

*"Reaffirming the established principle that acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible,*

*"1. Reaffirms its resolution 252 (1968);*

*"2. Deplores the failure of Israel to show any regard for the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions mentioned above;*

*"3. Censures in the strongest terms all measures taken to change the status of the City of Jerusalem;*

*"4. Confirms that all legislative and administrative measures and actions by Israel which purport to alter the status of Jerusalem including expropriation of land and properties thereon are invalid and cannot change that status;*

*"5. Urgently calls once more upon Israel to rescind forthwith all measures taken by it which may tend to change the status of the City of Jerusalem, and in future to refrain from all actions likely to have such an effect;*

*"6. Requests Israel to inform the Security Council without any further delay of its intentions with regard to the implementation of the provisions of this resolution;*

*"7. Determines that, in the event of a negative response or no response from Israel, the Security Council shall reconvene without delay to consider what further action should be taken in this matter;*

*"8. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of this resolution."*

458. The President, speaking as the representative of Senegal, stated that the problem of Jerusalem was a religious, juridical and political one and could not be solved by administrative measures. Although requested by the Council not to take any measures to change the status of Jerusalem, Israel had acted in dilatory fashion and did not seem to be willing to comply therewith. All Members should abide by the United Nations decisions.

459. In putting the draft resolution to the vote, the President stated that a separate vote had been requested on operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

**Decision:** *At the 1485th meeting on 3 July 1969, paragraph 5 of the three-Power draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention (United States).*

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously, as resolution 267 (1969).*

460. After the vote, the representative of the USSR stated that he had voted for the draft resolution because, basically, it reflected world indignation at Israel's actions and its refusal to abide by the Council's resolutions. There was a special significance to the new resolution because it had been adopted unanimously. If Israel disregarded it, the Council must meet again to consider further action.

461. The representative of the United States said that he had voted for the resolution because it was consistent with his Government's position on Jerusalem. His delegation abstained on paragraph 5 because the language in it was inconsistent with the language of the previous paragraph, which stated that the measures referred to could not change the status of Jerusalem. Moreover, the United States did not consider the provision practical. In voting for the resolution, his delegation was not committing itself to any specific course of action in any future consideration of the matter by the Council. The United States continued to believe that Jerusalem could not be dealt with on a

piecemeal basis. It rededicated itself to a determined effort for agreement on a just and lasting peace in the Middle East in the context of which Jerusalem should not again become a bone of contention among religions and nations.

462. The representative of Israel stated that his delegation had already called the attention of the Council to the Arab States' repudiation of the United Nations Charter in relation to Israel, among other things their rejection of the Security Council's peace and cease-fire resolutions. He questioned the value of a resolution adopted at the instigation of those States. Resolutions of the kind just adopted by the Council could not affect Jerusalem's life.

463. The representative of Jordan stated that Israel was engaged in disqualifying various States after having disqualified the Council in connexion with its decision on the Beirut raid. But the Council should ponder what to do about Israel's defiance. There was no alternative to the Council thinking seriously of invoking Article 41 of the Charter providing for sanctions. States should also stop shipping weapons to Israel. After thanking all the delegations which stood for justice, he noted that the Council had voted unanimously and said that now, more than ever, Israel stood alone.

(c) *Communications and reports received between 30 June and 15 July 1969*

464. On 30 June the Secretary-General issued an addendum (S/9149/Add.1 and Corr.1) to his report of 11 April on the implementation of resolution 252 (1968), in which he brought to the attention of the Security Council further information concerning legislation adopted by Israel. The legislation consisted of certain emergency regulations entitled "Regulation of Legal and Administrative Matters—Further Provisions", which took the form of additional provisions of the "Legal and Administrative Matters (Regulation) Law" contained in his initial report (S/9149). The addendum contained as annex A an unofficial translation of a Law and Administration Ordinance, and as annexes B and C two sets of regulations which postponed for six months certain of the provisions of the "Legal and Administrative Matters (Regulation) Law".

465. By a letter dated 3 July (S/9312), the representative of Turkey transmitted the text of a statement made by his Minister of Foreign Affairs in connexion with the Security Council's discussion. The statement recalled the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly in connexion with the status of Jerusalem and noted that Israel had continued to take measures inconsistent with them. Turkey hoped and believed that the Security Council would re-examine the current situation in detail and take all the measures it might deem necessary for its amelioration.

**D. Other matters brought to the attention of the Security Council in connexion with the situation in the Middle East**

(a) *Communications concerning an attack on an Israel civil aircraft at Zurich airport*

466. On 18 February 1969, a spokesman of the Secretary-General stated that the Secretary-General had heard with dismay and deep concern of the attack on an El Al airliner at Zurich airport on that day.

The Secretary-General believed that that attack, as well as the one at the Beirut airport two months previously, was a matter of urgent concern to all Governments and peoples. The Secretary-General also hoped that that act would not be followed by an attack of retaliation but by constructive international action to prevent acts of violence against international civil aviation in the future.

467. In communications dated 19, 20 and 25 February (S/9016, S/9017, S/9018, S/9020, S/9025), the United States, United Kingdom, Finland, France and Italy condemned the attack and expressed concern at the threat which such attacks posed for the safety of international civil aviation. They appealed to the parties concerned in the Middle East conflict to exercise the utmost restraint so as to avoid the chain of action and reprisal and not jeopardize the efforts in search for peace in the area.

468. In a letter dated 20 February (S/9021), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel protested to the Secretary-General against an armed assault on the crew and passengers of the EL Al aircraft at Zurich on 18 February, two months after a similar attack on another Israel aircraft at Athens airport. He believed that those actions were the work of organized groups of saboteurs operating with the support and cooperation of Arab Governments which were Member States of the United Nations and of the International Civil Aviation Agency. After noting that the Security Council resolution of 31 December 1968 had not said a word against the attack on an El Al aircraft at the Athens airport, the Foreign Minister expressed the view that the latest attack had taken place "in the atmosphere of international indulgence thus created". After referring to the above statement of the spokesman of the Secretary-General, he expressed interest in what constructive international action the Secretary-General had in mind to prevent those actions against international civil aviation.

469. In a reply dated 26 February (S/9030), to the Foreign Minister of Israel the Secretary-General stated that he had been in touch with the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the International Air Transport Association regarding the Zurich incident. He had also consulted certain Members of the United Nations with a view of finding means to prevent those acts. He believed that improved methods of international police co-operation and regulation of a national as well as international character might contribute towards the prevention of those acts of terrorism and violence. However, he considered that the only sure way of bringing an end to terrorist acts would be some substantial movement towards a peaceful settlement of the major issues underlying the Middle East conflict on the basis of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. An essential first step towards that end would be a declared readiness by the parties to implement that resolution.

470. In a reply dated 5 March (S/9048), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel stated his country was vitally interested in the promotion of improved methods for international police co-operation and regulation of a national and international character and would actively associate itself with the meeting of the Council of the ICAO. However, it would be wrong to ignore the responsibility of Member States, since the attacks at the Zurich and Athens airports and the hijacking of an Israel airliner to Algiers had not been acts of individuals, but of terrorist organizations sup-

ported and encouraged by Arab States in violation of their international responsibilities. He suggested that constructive international action to safeguard civil aviation might include an undertaking by all States to prevent and condemn actions on their soil designed to endanger civil aviation, and he regretted that the Secretary-General had not conveyed his Government's request to certain Arab Governments to condemn those attacks and dissociate themselves from them and take required steps against the organizations which had carried out those attacks. His Government would continue to cooperate with Special Representative of the Secretary-General to promote an agreement for the implementation of the resolution of 22 November 1967.

471. In a letter dated 10 March (S/9064), the Secretary-General quoted the exchange of communications between himself and the Permanent Representative of Israel on 19 and 20 February in which the Secretary-General had indicated that it would not be helpful if his good offices were used to transmit questions or messages of a political nature from one Government to another unless the parties concerned had previously agreed to that procedure. He had, therefore, been unable to carry out Israel's request to transmit two questions to certain Arab Governments, but he had suggested that the Government of Israel might bring those questions to the attention of those concerned through a communication to the Security Council. The Secretary-General added that he continued to believe that a declaration by the parties of their readiness to implement the 22 November resolution would constitute a helpful first step towards a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

(b) *Communications concerning archaeological excavations in occupied territory*

472. In a letter dated 23 May 1969 (S/9220), Syria charged that Israel was continuing its excavations in the occupied territory of Syria and was misappropriating Syrian cultural property. These excavations were being undertaken in the areas of Banias and Fiq, where Roman temples had been found, and in the area of Jibbin, where an archaeological hill had been destroyed as a result of the opening of a road. After declaring that very important archaeological pieces had been removed from their places of origin, Syria stated that those illegal acts constituted a violation of articles 4 and 5 of the 1954 Hague Convention as well as of article VI, paragraph 32, of the recommendations adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO in 1956. Syria referred to its previous complaint on 7 July 1967 (S/8040), which Israel had, on 14 July 1967 (S/8058), declared unfounded, stating that a representative of UNESCO, who was then expected in Israel, would be invited to visit the site referred to by Syria. Syria requested a report on the question of excavations and theft of its cultural property.

473. In a letter dated 29 May (S/9229 and Rev.1), Israel, in reply, stated that no Israel scientist had carried out any excavations in any of the sites mentioned by Syria or in any other parts of the Golan Heights. The historical altar from the town of Banias had been removed temporarily and restored to its original site after arrangements for its safety had been completed. In a letter dated 6 February 1968 to the Director-General of UNESCO, the Commissioner-General, appointed under The Hague Convention of May 1954, had already dismissed such Syrian charges. The report of the Director-General to the seventy-eighth session of the Executive Board of UNESCO had stated that the

Commissioner-General in Jerusalem had informed him that "investigations had been carried out where the information supplied had been sufficient to make inquiries possible, and that the complaints in question had proved groundless".

474. In a letter dated 10 June (S/9246), Syria pointing out that Israel had admitted having removed the historical altar for its safety and that it had been restored later, stated that those justifications had also been used by the Nazi occupiers in Europe. The report of the Director-General of UNESCO quoted by Israel related only to complaints made in 1967 and 1968. Moreover, the High Commissioner had stated that his investigations were based upon cases "where the information supplied had been sufficient to make inquiries possible". In the same report, the High Commissioner had informed the Director-General of UNESCO that "atmospheric conditions" had made the Golan Heights inaccessible and that he had been unable to visit the site of excavations. Israel, in citing the report of the Director-General of UNESCO, had only meant to mislead the international community. Syria's six complaints, contained in its letter of 23 May 1969, remained unanswered, and only when a report of the Director-General of UNESCO on the matter was submitted in 1969, with specific reference to Syria's 1969 complaints, could it be cited in answer to Syria's letter. In a further letter dated 1 July (S/9299), Syria stated that its accusations stood and that it was awaiting the report on them by the Director-General of UNESCO.

(c) *Communications concerning the treatment of Jewish communities in Arab States*

475. In a letter dated 30 September 1968 (S/8837), Iraq protested against the interference in its internal affairs represented by the discussion by Israel in the Security Council regarding the treatment of Jews in Iraq and denied the Israel allegations (see section B, above). In a letter of 9 October (S/8844), Israel reaffirmed its position that the situation of the Iraqi Jews should be the subject of a fact-finding mission by a representative of the Secretary-General, as provided in resolution 237 (1967); and in a further letter of 11 October (S/8848), Israel drew attention to a cable from the association of Jews from Egypt, Iraq and Syria, expressing concern at the conditions of Jews in those countries.

476. In a letter dated 27 January 1969 (S/8982), the Foreign Minister of Israel protested the execution by Iraq on that day of nine Iraqi Jews, who, it was stated, had been wrongfully accused of spying for Israel. In a letter of 29 January (S/8987), the representative of the United States drew attention to the statement of the United States Secretary of State expressing concern on humanitarian grounds at the public execution of fourteen persons convicted of espionage in Iraq. In a statement transmitted on 31 January (S/8989), Iraq stated that those executed had been tried in accordance with the law and found guilty of espionage; those not found guilty, including Jews, had been acquitted. It accused Israel of distorting the facts to create a propaganda smokescreen. By a letter of 6 February (S/8997), Israel transmitted twenty-seven statements from various countries relating to the executions in Iraq.

477. In a further letter dated 26 February (S/9031), Israel protested against the executions on 20 February in Iraq of eight persons for espionage for Israel and charged continued inhuman measures against the Jewish community in Iraq. These charges

were rejected by Iraq in a letter dated 11 March (S/9068). In a letter of 19 March (S/9095), Israel, and in a letter of 27 March (S/9118 and Corr.1) Iraq, reaffirmed their charges.

#### **E. Reports of the Secretary-General on the progress of the efforts of his Special Representative to the Middle East**

478. On 29 July 1968, the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a fourth report (S/8309/Add.3) on the progress of the efforts of his Special Representative to the Middle East, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, covering his activities after 29 March 1968. It stated that during that period Ambassador Jarring had held discussions with the Governments of Jordan, the United Arab Republic, Israel and Lebanon. In addition to reporting to the Secretary-General regularly on those meetings, Ambassador Jarring also had met him at Teheran on 22 April 1968, and it was then agreed that he would return to New York for further consultations. He stayed in New York between 15 May and 21 June, during which period he held consultations with the Secretary-General and the permanent representatives of the parties concerned.

479. During the period between 21 June, when he left for Europe, and 22 July, when he returned to New York, Ambassador Jarring had met with officials of some of the parties in various cities of Europe. In the light of his discussions, he had arrived at the conclusion, which was endorsed by the Secretary-General, that it would be advisable for him to extend further

his contacts with the parties, and for that purpose he would return to the Middle East.

480. On 3 December 1968, the Secretary-General submitted the fifth report (S/8309/Add.4) on the mission of Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, covering his activities after 29 July.

481. In accordance with his intention as recorded in the previous report, Ambassador Jarring arrived in Nicosia on 15 August for a further round of discussions with Governments concerned. On 23 September, he arrived at United Nations Headquarters, where the Foreign Ministers of the parties had gathered for the twenty-third session of the General Assembly. Ambassador Jarring first met with them informally, and later formally, and concluded his discussions with them by receiving written communications from the Foreign Ministers of Israel and the United Arab Republic.

482. On 26 November, Ambassador Jarring wrote to the Secretary-General, stating that, as agreed with him, he was leaving New York on 27 November for a further round of talks with the parties and that he intended to invite them to a new round of discussions in the middle of January 1969. In his reply dated 27 November, the Secretary-General, after concurring with Ambassador Jarring's programme, expressed to him his gratification on Ambassador Jarring's willingness to continue his efforts with the parties towards a peaceful settlement. The Secretary-General once again put on record his appreciation of the wisdom, tact and patience shown by Ambassador Jarring in the task entrusted to him.

## **Chapter 2**

### **LETTER DATED 26 DECEMBER 1968 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF CYPRUS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL**

#### **A. Communications and reports received between 16 July and 31 December 1968**

483. On 4 December, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council his fourteenth report on the United Nations operations in Cyprus, for the period from 8 June to 2 December 1968 (S/8914). The Secretary-General said that it was gratifying for him to report that, at last, the emphasis seemed to be shifting from military confrontation to negotiation. There had been no bloodshed during the period under review or serious intercommunal incident to mar the atmosphere of calm and expectancy surrounding the important talks between leaders of the Greek and Turkish communities in Cyprus. What was significant and promising in those talks was that the parties in Cyprus were now engaged in a determined effort to emerge from the deadlock resulting from rigid positions of the past. The presence of UNFICYP in the island constituted an assurance to both communities that no unforeseen accident would be allowed to disrupt the efforts to overcome their differences. The Secretary-General recommended the extension of the mandate of the Force for six months, until 15 June 1969. Although improved conditions in Cyprus had made it possible to reduce the strength of the Force by about 25 per cent, its budget deficit, currently estimated at \$8 million, continued to be of alarming proportions. The Secretary-General appealed to the members of the Council to give their attention to the problem.

#### **B. Consideration at the 1459th meeting (10 December 1968)**

484. At the 1459th meeting of the Council on 10 December, the Secretary-General's report (S/8914) was included in the agenda. The representatives of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece were invited at their request to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

485. The President of the Council announced that as a result of prior consultations, agreement had been reached on the text of the following draft resolution:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Noting from the report of the Secretary-General of 4 December 1968 (S/8914) that in the present circumstances the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus is still needed if peace is to be maintained in the Island,*

*"Noting that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the Island it is necessary to continue the Force beyond 15 December 1968,*

*"Noting, from the observations in the report, the encouraging recent developments in the Island,*

*"1. Reaffirms its resolutions 186 (1964) of 4 March, 187 (1964) of 13 March, 192 (1964) of 20 June, 193 (1964) of 9 August, 194 (1964) of 25 September and 198 (1964) of 18 December 1964,*

201 (1965) of 19 March, 206 (1965) of 15 June, 207 (1965) of 10 August and 219 (1965) of 17 December 1965, 220 (1966) of 16 March, 222 (1966) of 16 June and 231 (1966) of 15 December 1966, 238 (1967) of 19 June and 244 (1967) of 22 December 1967, and 247 (1968) of 18 March and 254 (1968) of 18 June 1968, and the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting on 11 August 1964 and at the 1383rd meeting on 24/25 November 1967;

"2. *Urges* the parties concerned to act with the utmost restraint and to continue determined co-operative efforts to achieve the objectives of the Security Council by availing themselves in a constructive manner of the present auspicious climate and opportunities;

"3. *Extends* once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force, established under Security Council resolution 186 (1964), for a further period ending 15 June 1969, in the expectation that by then sufficient progress towards a final solution will make possible a withdrawal or substantial reduction of the Force."

486. The representative of Cyprus expressed the hope that the policy of his Government in unilaterally lifting all restrictions on the movement of persons and goods in and out of the enclaves would bring a positive response from the other side by a corresponding lifting of restrictions, so that a mutual and growing trust through communication might create the atmosphere necessary to further *rapprochement*. The Cyprus Government was following the political talks currently taking place in Nicosia with positive optimism. The progress of those negotiations, however, depended on a gradually growing mutual confidence and required time. All Cypriots earnestly desired that the talks might lead to a lasting settlement, so that, as an integrated whole, they might go forward together on the road to peace and the achievement of common progress. The solution must be one freely accepted by the people directly concerned and firmly based on the principles of justice, unity and freedom.

487. The representative of Greece said that his Government welcomed the observation of the Secretary-General that the negotiations between the leaders of Greek and Turkish Cypriots were continuing in the greatest seriousness and that the parties were making a resolute effort to overcome the stalemate. However, time and patience were still needed in large measure before any decisive progress on the fundamental questions could be announced. The Greek Government had, from the outset, taken a positive attitude towards those negotiations between the leaders of the two communities, and it felt that the Security Council could effectively contribute to their success by extending the UNFICYP mandate as requested.

488. The representative of Turkey said that it would be advisable to continue to maintain a tranquil atmosphere in Cyprus so that the intercommunal talks could continue. For that reason, his Government was gratified that the Secretary-General had urged the extension of the UNFICYP mandate for six months. His Government had always given its encouragement and help to the intercommunal talks on the island, and it felt that it was necessary to allow the representatives of the two communities to work out the structure of the State of Cyprus and its political institutions. Once that

was achieved, it might serve as a basis for a definitive understanding among all parties concerned.

489. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics reaffirmed the Soviet position in the Cyprus question. He said that the Soviet Union had always opposed any plans to attempt to settle the Cyprus question behind the back of its people to the detriment of their basic interests and to the advantage of the imperialist aims of certain NATO countries, particularly in furtherance of NATO military plans in the Mediterranean region. The Soviet Union wished all success to the participants in the intercommunal talks, who would obviously have to overcome considerable difficulties. The four-year stay of the United Nations Force in Cyprus could not be considered normal, but the Soviet Government would not oppose its extension, taking into consideration the wishes of the Cyprus Government and the other parties concerned and the fact that such an extension of the mandate would be carried out in full conformity with resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964. However, any attempt to link the scale of operations of the United Nations in Cyprus and the measures undertaken by the Soviet Union as a Black Sea and Mediterranean Power to strengthen peace in that region would leave no alternative for the Soviet Union but to consider the situation around Cyprus in a new light and also its attitude to the stationing there of the United Nations Force.

**Decision:** *At the 1459th meeting, on 10 December 1968, the draft resolution was adopted unanimously as resolution 261 (1968).*

490. The representative of the United Kingdom said that the problems of Cyprus must be solved from within, and although Greece, Turkey and the United Nations could contribute to the maintenance of peace there, the Cypriots themselves should work out a way of life which would finally bring permanent peace and prosperity for them. The United Kingdom Government welcomed the reports of the talks in Nicosia between leaders of the communities and wished them well. The United Kingdom supported a further extension of the UNFICYP mandate, would continue to provide and meet the full cost of the United Kingdom contingent at its current strength for the period of the renewed mandate and was ready to make a further voluntary contribution towards the cost of the Force. He hoped others who had not so far made contributions would also come forward. Although the United Kingdom supported the six-month extension of the mandate, it would have preferred a shorter period, and it also thought that it would be valuable if the Secretary-General submitted a report in three months' time on the progress achieved in Cyprus.

491. The representative of Denmark said that the United Nations should offer the best possible assistance to the parties in order to preserve and develop the existing momentum and to consolidate and accelerate the progress already achieved in the Cyprus question. He commended the Secretary-General, his Special Representative and the Force Commander, whose assistance were of the greatest importance. The continued presence of UNFICYP was indispensable, for it gave assurance to the parties concerned that the negotiations would proceed in a peaceful atmosphere. His delegation trusted that the parties would pursue with determination their efforts towards a solution, and

therefore accepted the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the stationing of UNFICYP in Cyprus be extended until 15 June 1969.

492. The representative of Canada said that his delegation favoured the idea that the Secretary-General might submit an interim report soon. Canada took considerable satisfaction from the Secretary-General's observation regarding the usefulness and performance of the Force. His delegation welcomed the fact that improving conditions in the island had made possible a reduction in the Force. Member States which so far had contributed neither men nor money to UNFICYP might take into consideration that the deficit in the UNFICYP budget had become alarming and should be remedied.

493. The representative of France said that the French delegation had taken note with satisfaction of the Secretary-General's report. The French delegation did not object to a further limited extension of the mandate of the United Nations Force in Cyprus, within the framework of the resolution adopted on 4 March 1964. However, it considered that it would be desirable to prepare for an end to these periodic extensions of the mandate of the Force, or at least to foresee some substantial reduction in its strength.

494. The Secretary-General said that he understood the motivation behind the suggestion that he should submit an interim report to the Security Council in about three months' time. He assured the Council that he would submit reports to the Council, as he had done in the past, at any time that it might prove necessary or advisable.

495. The President, speaking as the representative of Ethiopia, expressed his Government's appreciation to the Secretary-General for his efforts and to all United Nations personnel engaged in maintaining peace in Cyprus. He paid tribute to the negotiators in Nicosia and expressed the hope of his Government that the talks would soon produce the results the world was waiting for.

### **C. Communications and reports received between 1 January and 15 July 1969**

496. On 8 January the Secretary-General made an appeal (S/8964) to the Governments of States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies for further voluntary contributions for the financing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for the period from 16 December 1968 to 15 June 1969.

497. By letters dated 3 September 1968 and 10 February 1969 (S/8802 and S/9005), the representative of Greece transmitted to the Secretary-General a cheque for \$600,000, on each occasion, representing the Greek contribution to UNFICYP for the six-month periods from 26 June to 26 December 1968 and from 26 December 1968 to 15 June 1969.

498. In letters dated 7, 12, 14, and 19 March and 5 May (S/9081, S/9079, S/9086, S/9098, S/9195), the representatives of Sweden, Denmark, Norway, the Ivory Coast and Finland made certain observations regarding their Government's response to the Secretary-General's appeals for voluntary contributions. The Governments of Denmark, Finland and Sweden indicated to the Secretary-General that despite reductions in the number of UNFICYP troops, they would maintain their previ-

ous level of contributions; the Government of Norway raised its total; and the Government of the Ivory Coast made a contribution for the first time to help alleviate the serious financial difficulties the United Nations was facing in regard to its operation in Cyprus. Each of the five Governments also stated that its decision regarding its contribution at the time was taken without prejudice to its position on the principle of collective financial responsibility for United Nations peace-keeping operations.

499. On 3 June the Secretary-General submitted to the Council his fifteenth report (S/9233) on the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the period from 3 December 1968 to 2 June 1969. The Secretary-General said that the improved situation mentioned in his previous report had been generally maintained, although tension persisted in the areas of direct confrontation between the Government forces and Turkish Cypriot fighters. A great deal remained to be done to bring about a return to normal conditions. Nevertheless, as a result of joint participation in soil conservation and water development projects, the two communities had been brought closer with the assistance of UNFICYP. Some major anomalies, such as the denial to Greek Cypriot civilians of access to a number of public roads, remained. The intercommunal talks had continued, and limited agreements had been reached by Mr. Glafkos Clerides and Mr. Rauf Denktash on some important but secondary points, including the establishment of two sub-committees. On 26 and 28 March the Secretary-General had conveyed to the parties directly involved in Cyprus, as well as the Governments of Turkey and Greece, his deep concern at the slow rate of progress in intercommunal talks. Although fully aware of the difficulties involved, the Secretary-General felt that the passage of too much time might hamper a settlement. The replies the Secretary-General had received from the parties had made it clear that they shared the Secretary-General's concern, although their analyses of the causes of the current situation had differed. The Secretary-General hoped that the parties would not allow a deadlock to develop over admittedly difficult issues. In view of all the circumstances, the Secretary-General recommended the extension of the UNFICYP mandate until 15 December 1969, and, as on previous occasions, expressed his anxiety over the method of financing UNFICYP and the substantial deficit in its budget which continued to be a cause for serious concern.

500. In a letter dated 7 June (S/9238), the representative of Turkey complained about the inappropriateness and the untimeliness of an international seminar on human rights to be held by the United Nations from 26 June to 8 July at Nicosia upon the invitation of the Cyprus Government. He also quoted the text of a memorandum on that subject which the Vice-President of the Republic of Cyprus, Dr. Fazil Küçük, had delivered to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on 26 May. The representative of Turkey then added that concern had been expressed lest the holding of a human rights seminar in Cyprus at that time might adversely affect the intercommunal talks. The Turkish Government, therefore, hoped that consideration would be given to the possibility of holding the human rights seminar at a later time and at a different place.

501. In a letter dated 9 June (S/9241), the representative of Cyprus stated that the question of holding a seminar concerned the United Nations and the Cyprus Government and that Turkey's intervention in that respect was unwarranted. Invitations had been sent to thirty-two Governments, including the Turkish Government, following acceptance by the United Nations of the invitation extended by Cyprus. The seminars were intended to facilitate study by non-governmental experts of human rights in developing countries. The representative of Cyprus further expressed the hope that the seminar would promote a spirit of mutual understanding and conciliation among the people of Cyprus and throughout the world.

502. In a letter dated 10 June (S/9243), the representative of Turkey pointed out that not only his Government but a number of other countries, including certain members of the Security Council, had expressed concern over the time and the place of the human rights seminar. Were the seminar, however, held in Nicosia, the Turkish Government intended to accept the invitation to participate in its work, keeping in mind the noble objectives of the seminar and the observance of human rights in Cyprus and elsewhere.

503. In a letter dated 13 June (S/9255), the representative of Cyprus denied the charge that misgivings had been expressed regarding the seminar, but welcomed the announcement that Turkey would accept the invitation and participate in a constructive spirit, which would contribute to the improvement of the climate in Cyprus.

#### **D. Consideration at the 1474th meeting (10 June 1969)**

504. At the 1474th meeting of the Council on 10 June, the Secretary-General's report (S/9233) on the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the period from 3 December 1968 to 2 June 1969 was included in the agenda. The representatives of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece were invited at their request to participate without the right to vote in the discussion.

505. The President of the Council announced that as a result of prior consultations, agreement had been reached on the text of the following draft resolution:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Noting from the report of the Secretary-General of 3 June 1969 (S/9233) that in the present circumstances the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus is still needed if peace is to be maintained in the Island,*

*"Noting that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the Island it is necessary to continue the Force beyond 15 June 1969,*

*"Noting, from the observations in the report, that the improvement of the situation in Cyprus has been maintained during the period under review,*

*"1. Reaffirms its resolutions 186 (1964) of 4 March, 187 (1964) of 13 March, 192 (1964) of 20 June, 193 (1964) of 9 August, 194 (1964) of 25 September and 198 (1964) of 18 December 1964, 201 (1965) of 19 March, 206 (1965) of 15 June, 207 (1965) of 10 August and 219 (1965) of 17 December 1965, 220 (1966) of 16 March, 222 (1966) of 16 June and 231 (1966) of 15 December*

*1966, 238 (1967) of 19 June and 244 (1967) of 22 December 1967, and 247 (1968) of 18 March, 254 (1968) of 18 June and 261 (1968) of 10 December 1968, and the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting on 11 August 1964 and at the 1383rd meeting on 24/25 November 1967;*

*"2. Urges the parties concerned to act with the utmost restraint and to continue determined co-operative efforts to achieve the objectives of the Security Council by availing themselves in a constructive manner of the present auspicious climate and opportunities;*

*"3. Extends once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force, established under Security Council resolution 186 (1964), for a further period ending 15 December 1969, in the expectation that by then sufficient progress toward a final solution will make possible a withdrawal or substantial reduction of the Force."*

506. The representative of Cyprus observed that, as had accurately been reflected in the report of the Secretary-General, there had been a marked increase in the contacts between members of the two communities. That better understanding at the village level was not followed in the economic field, where the Turkish Cypriot leadership still pursued the aims of separation. The report had also drawn attention to two aspects of the Cyprus problem where requisite progress had not been made. Military confrontation remained, and there was no response to the normalization measures that the Cyprus Government had initiated. However, the intercommunal talks were proceeding at a rather slow pace, but some progress had been made. The recent establishment of sub-committees was another forward move towards understanding and accommodation on a broader scale. The difficulties involved in the talks, however, should not be minimized, particularly in view of outside influences and pressures, which might not always be as constructive as would be expected. President Makarios had recently stated that there was no desire to deprive the Turkish Cypriots of political or other rights; on the contrary, it was the intention of the Cyprus Government to cede certain additional privileges to the Turkish community, but not to an extent exceeding the security zone necessary for the unity of the State and the future of the island. The Cyprus Government hoped that the intercommunal talks would continue in mutual goodwill and with a broader outlook, leading to a sound, workable and enduring solution.

507. The representative of Turkey said that although his Government would wish the intercommunal talks to reach agreement quickly, it was, however, fully aware of the delicate nature of the talks and considered that the negotiators should be given every possibility of reaching common ground on the constitutional régime within which the two communities in the island were destined to live together in peace. Contrary to the statement of some Greek Cypriot leaders, the leaders of the Turkish Cypriot community had entered the intercommunal talks in order to work out a system whereby the Turkish Cypriot community could live in a unitary State within which it could maintain its identity and could run its local communal affairs itself. There was no divisiveness in their approach. On its part, the Turkish Government had pinned its hopes on the intercommunal talks and could not do much more than to counsel patience and perseverance.



508. The representative of Turkey then stated that the lack of freedom of movement of Greek Cypriots in the areas controlled by Turkish Cypriots was connected to the question of the military restricted areas under Greek Cypriot control, where neither Turks nor the United Nations were permitted to enter. These zones in fact were larger than the areas under Turkish Cypriot control. The allegation that an arms factory had been set up in the Turkish Cypriot sector was entirely unfounded and was not corroborated by UNFICYP observation.

509. The representative of Greece said that the findings of the Secretary-General that the atmosphere continued to be favourable for the holding of consultations was encouraging. Greece had constantly encouraged the dialogue between Greek and Turkish Cypriots. The continuation of those talks for a relatively long time was not without explanation. The nature of the Cyprus problem was such that it could not be solved easily or rapidly. Time, patience and the prolonged maintenance of a peaceful atmosphere were all essentials for the talks to succeed.

**Decision:** *At the 1474th meeting, on 10 June 1969, the draft resolution was adopted unanimously as resolution 266 (1969).*

510. The representative of Finland said that the lack of substantive progress in the intercommunal talks on the basic issues of the Cyprus question was a cause for profound disappointment to his delegation. Serious attention should be given to the warning of the Secretary-General that the passage of too much time might hamper rather than facilitate a settlement. UNFICYP had succeeded in carrying out its original mandate. It had been a major factor in creating conditions conducive to a political settlement on the island. It could not be expected to do more than that. UNFICYP could in many respects serve as a model from which valuable experience could be gained for use in future peace-keeping operations. The Finnish Government was of the opinion that one of the major defects of the Cyprus operation, that is, the method of financing the costs of the Force by voluntary contributions, should be remedied. The Finnish Government strongly hoped that the current review of United Nations peace-keeping operations in all their aspects would remedy that one major defect of the Cyprus operation. Peace-keeping operations based on decisions made by the Security Council on behalf of all Member States must be paid for by all. Despite recent reductions in the strength of the Force, Finland would continue to provide its contingent in UNFICYP and maintain the level of its contribution for the year.

511. The representative of the United Kingdom said that although it would have preferred a shorter extension than six months, his Government would continue to provide the largest military contingent in the Force, to meet its cost in full and to make a further voluntary contribution of £625,000 for the next six-month period. His delegation welcomed the initiative of the Secretary-General to explore the possibilities of reducing the operating expenditures of the Force, without impairing its effectiveness, and would also welcome a cost-effectiveness study to be undertaken under the direction of the Secretary-General. His delegation believed that, in spite of the threat of deadlock, the intercommunal talks would continue and would take advantage of any favourable circumstances in

order to achieve a just and final solution of the Cyprus problem.

512. The representative of Nepal shared the deep concern of the Secretary-General at the slow rate of progress in the intercommunal talks. He, therefore, on behalf of his delegation, addressed an appeal to all parties concerned to pay heed to the misgivings of the Secretary-General and to make an increasingly sustained and determined effort to expedite the talks. As an immediate step, the parties should assure freedom of movement for all the people, irrespective of their communal attachment. Such a measure would undoubtedly bring the two communities closer to each other.

513. The representative of France said that the Security Council could not perpetuate a provisional arrangement which might have been necessary five years ago but which might become a pretext for further delaying the final settlement. In addition to the heavy financial implications of the operation, it was feared that a routine extension of the UNFICYP mandate might encourage the parties to refuse to make concessions which might be necessary for the success of the negotiations. In that case the Council would be pursuing a goal exactly contrary to the objectives set in 1964. Although the French delegation had voted in favour of the resolution, it would stress the need of putting an end to the stationing of the United Nations Force in Cyprus in the near future.

514. The representative of Hungary said that a faster advance at the intercommunal talks had been expected. Six months earlier it had seemed that the Security Council had given the last authorization in extending the UNFICYP mandate. The Hungarian delegation, however, had learned with satisfaction from the Secretary-General's report that the political climate in the country had improved and that the intercommunal talks had achieved important results. The Hungarian delegation had voted in favour of the resolution with the clear understanding that the six-month extension was in full accord with resolution 186 (1964).

515. The representative of the United States said that it was obvious that the Council was anxious to see progress in the talks, and the United States delegation trusted that the parties themselves shared that sense of urgency. Patience was demanded from all, but the United States delegation shared the Secretary-General's concern that no substantive results on the basic issues had yet emerged. The United States solemnly urged the parties to build on the progress hitherto achieved and to pursue, with determination, the search for a negotiated settlement. Recalling that it had contributed heavily to the maintenance of UNFICYP, the United States Government hoped that the Secretary-General would undertake a full examination of the possibilities for economies in the operation of the Force, including a study of possible adjustments in personnel consistent with the ability of UNFICYP to discharge its current functions. The United States delegation urged other Members, particularly Security Council members, to review their position on financial contributions and hoped that those Members who had not yet contributed financially to UNFICYP would do so now.

516. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the Soviet Government continued to maintain its position on the Cyprus problem.

The Soviet Union's approach to the question of Cyprus was based on the general course of Soviet foreign policy which had been outlined by the great founder of the Soviet State, V. I. Lenin, the hundredth anniversary of whose birth would soon be celebrated by all mankind. From the first days of its existence, in accordance with the guidelines given by Lenin, the Soviet Union had always pursued a policy of peace and friendship between peoples, and had resolutely and consistently opposed the enslavement and oppression of peoples. The Soviet delegation had noted that the Secretary-General's report contained information to the effect that negotiations between the representatives of the Turkish and the Greek communities were being continued. Unfortunately, those conversations were protracted. The representatives must obviously overcome many obstacles which were the results of eighty years of imperialist and colonialist domination. Now, leading circles of the NATO military bloc were complicating relations between the Turkish and the Greek communities in Cyprus through their military and strategic policy in the Mediterranean. However, in conformity with the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964, all Member States had to abstain from any action which might complicate the situation in Cyprus. The

United Nations armed forces, which were composed mainly of armed contingents of the NATO countries, had stayed too long in Cyprus. The Soviet Government considered their extended presence abnormal and expressed the hope that the withdrawal of the Force would come soon. Regarding the deficit which had resulted from such an extended stay of United Nations forces in Cyprus, the Soviet Government believed that those who had been responsible, in the first instance, for the creation of the problem must bear those expenditures and cover the resulting deficit. The Soviet delegation had not opposed the adoption of the resolution because the extension of the Force's mandate had been the desire of the Cyprus Government and the parties concerned and because it would be carried out in full conformity with the provisions of Security Council resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964.

517. At the close of the meeting, the President expressed appreciation to the States and Governments, the organizations and individuals, as well as to the Secretary-General, for the common effort and generous assistance that they had given in order to ensure that harmony, peace, justice and prosperity might again reign in Cyprus.

### Chapter 3

#### LETTER DATED 21 AUGUST 1968 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF CANADA, DENMARK, FRANCE, PARAGUAY, THE UNITED KINGDOM AND THE UNITED STATES ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/8758)

518. In a letter dated 21 August 1968 (S/8758) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representatives of Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, the United Kingdom and the United States requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider "the present serious situation in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic".

519. At the 1441st meeting of the Security Council, convened the same afternoon, and before the consideration of the provisional agenda, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, speaking on a point of order, read out the text of a letter addressed by his delegation to the President of the Security Council. The letter, later circulated as Security Council document S/8759, stated that the Soviet Union resolutely opposed the consideration of the question by the Security Council, since that would serve the interests of certain foreign circles, the forces of aggression. The events in Czechoslovakia were a matter that concerned the Czechoslovak people and the States of the Socialist community, which were bound by appropriate mutual obligations. Military units of the Socialist countries had entered the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic pursuant to a request by the Government of that State, which had appealed to allied Governments for assistance, including armed forces, in view of the threat created by foreign and domestic reaction to the Socialist social order and the constitutional State system of Czechoslovakia. The Soviet Government and those of other allied States had decided to meet that request in conformity with mutual treaty obligations and on the basis of the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter. The letter added that the military units would be withdrawn from Czechoslovak territory as soon as the threat to security was eliminated and the lawful

authorities found that their presence was no longer necessary. The actions of the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries were prompted by concern for strengthening peace and ensuring that the foundations of European security were not undermined.

520. The representative of the United States of America stated that the request of the six Governments to place the item on the agenda should be carried out promptly if the Council was to live up to the responsibilities given it by the Charter. Foreign armies had without warning invaded a Member State of the United Nations, and the Soviet Union and its Eastern European associates had not even tried to conceal that fact but had fabricated the claim that the invasion had been requested by Czechoslovakia. He cited a broadcast by Radio Prague, as well as declarations released by the Permanent Mission of Czechoslovakia, as proof that there had been neither a Western conspiracy against Communist rule in Czechoslovakia nor a request to the Soviet Union and its allies from the Czechoslovak Government to interfere in its internal affairs. Consequently, he concluded, the Council had the responsibility to adopt its agenda immediately in order to get on with the important task of condemning the violation of the United Nations Charter and calling on the USSR and its allies to withdraw their forces immediately from Czechoslovakia.

521. The representative of Canada, supporting the inclusion of the item on the agenda, noted the responsibility of Members of the Security Council, under Article 24, to uphold fundamental Charter principles, in particular the principle of the sovereign equality of all Member States and the principle that Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or poli-

tical independence of any State. He also referred to General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX), containing the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States for the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, a resolution adopted as the result of a Soviet initiative.

522. The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stated that his Government had at once described the invasion of Czechoslovakia as a flagrant violation of the Charter and all accepted standards of international behaviour, which it said was a serious blow to the efforts which so many had been making to improve relations between East and West. He drew attention to an extraordinary claim made in a TASS statement to the effect that the aggravation of the situation in Czechoslovakia affected the vital interests of the security of the States of the Socialist community, which meant that principles of respect for the sovereignty of independent nations did not apply to Communist countries.

523. The representative of Denmark rejected the Soviet argument, invoking the principle of the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States, as in the view of his delegation, the Soviet action in invading and occupying Czechoslovakia against the wish of its Government and people was an unequivocal example of armed intervention. The matter was clearly international in character and created a situation which the Security Council was duty-bound to consider.

524. The representative of Paraguay said that his Government considered that certain principles and basic tenets of the Charter had been violated by Member States of the United Nations and was convinced that only scrupulous obedience to the principles of international law governing co-existence among States could ensure peace. It regarded the events in Czechoslovakia with consternation, and believed it to be the urgent and ineluctable duty of the Council to take up the question without delay.

525. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the real purpose of raising this matter by the United States and its allies was to foster the efforts of right-wing counter-revolutionaries against the people of Czechoslovakia and against the Socialist community as a whole. His Government had irrefutable evidence of external interference in Czechoslovakia's internal affairs. In the declaration signed at the Bratislava Conference, the fraternal Socialist States have clearly warned all imperialist and anti-Communist forces that no one would ever be allowed to break their unity and undermine the basis of socialism. The threat to the Socialist system in Czechoslovakia, he stated, was at the same time a threat to the foundations of European peace. That action of the Socialist countries was fully justified and was consonant with the provisions of the United Nations Charter, Article 51 in particular, and of the Warsaw Pact.

**Decision:** *At its 1441st meeting on 21 August 1968, the Council adopted its agenda by 13 votes in favour to 2 against (Hungary and the USSR).*

526. In explanation of vote the representative of Algeria said that his delegation's vote was not meant as an acceptance of the contents and explanations of the letter of request from the six Governments.

527. The representative of India read out a statement of his Prime Minister to the Indian Parliament expressing that country's concern for the people of

Czechoslovakia and the hope that the forces would be withdrawn as soon as possible and that the Czechoslovak people would be able to determine their future according to their wishes. He emphasized that his delegation's vote did not prejudice its position on the substance of the question.

528. The representative of Pakistan said that his delegation's affirmative vote was without prejudice to his Government's views on the substance of the question.

529. The President informed the Council of the receipt of a letter dated 21 August (S/8760) from the Deputy Permanent Representative of Czechoslovakia requesting that he be invited to participate in the discussion in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter. In the absence of any objection, the President invited him to take a seat at the Council table and make a statement.

530. The representative of Czechoslovakia stated that in addressing the Council he was acting upon the explicit instructions of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia, Dr. Hajek, and quoted several messages which his Mission had received from the Minister. These messages contained declarations of the Praesidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, of the Praesidium of the National Assembly and a statement by ten members of the Government. They stated, *inter alia*, that on 20 August the troops of the USSR, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic had crossed the State borders of Czechoslovakia, without the knowledge of the President of the Republic, the Chairman of the National Assembly, the Prime Minister or the First Secretary of the Central Committee, that Czechoslovakia's constitutional representatives should be released from internment, and that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, with the endorsement of the President and on behalf of the Government, had protested to the five Governments, asking that the illegal occupation be stopped without delay and all armed troops be withdrawn. Finally, the representative of Czechoslovakia read out the text of an appeal made by the President of Czechoslovakia by radio on the evening of 21 August which said that military units of the five States had entered Czechoslovakia without the consent of the constitutional organs of the State, which, however, proceeding from their responsibilities towards the nation, must expeditiously solve the situation and attain an early withdrawal of foreign troops. The President stated that he had begun discussions with members of the Government concerning some urgent problems and appealed to his fellow citizens to maintain calm and avoid anything which might bring about unfortunate consequences.

531. The representative of the United States of America said that the statements read by the representative of Czechoslovakia had demonstrated eloquently the need for the Council to take appropriate action to restore peace and to redress the violations of the Charter. Czechoslovakia, after having suffered Hitler's subversion and military pressure, the holocaust of the Second World War, the overthrow of its free Government there and the death in 1948 of its Foreign Minister, Jan Masaryk, was once again the victim of a carefully planned and executed military aggression when it sought to assert its own national personality and independence. After the talks held by the Communist Parties of the Warsaw Pact countries

at Cierna in July and at Bratislava in August 1968, the Bratislava communiqué had contained references to equality and respect for independence and had given no hint of any disagreement between the Czechoslovak and Soviet leaders. For nineteen days thereafter, nothing extraordinary had happened; but then armed forces of the Soviet Union and some other Eastern European States had entered Czechoslovakia in a display of massive power. The invasion of Czechoslovakia recalled another instance when the Soviet Union had used its overwhelming power to suppress the uprising of another Eastern European people who had wished to overthrow the régime imposed on them. The Council had then considered the Hungarian question also. The representative of the United States called upon the Council to consider whether relations between men and nations would be governed by the rule of force and rigid ideological conformity or by the rules of fair play and tolerance envisaged in the United Nations Charter. He strongly appealed to the Council to call urgently upon the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies to withdraw their troops from Czechoslovakia and to cease violating the principles of international law relating to sovereignty and self-determination of States.

532. The representative of Canada stated that his Government, through a statement by the Foreign Minister of Canada, had condemned the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia as a flagrant breach of the principle of non-intervention and a tragedy for all peoples who prized human freedom and national independence. It was a serious set-back to the East-West dialogue. As far as his delegation was concerned, it saw no evidence of a request from the Czechoslovak Government for the military assistance that the Soviet Union and its allies had imposed upon Czechoslovakia. It would therefore urge the Council to take immediate action and insist on the withdrawal of the forces of the Soviet Union and its allies.

533. The representative of France said that the military coup against Czechoslovakia could not be justified on any grounds, as it represented a serious violation of the principles of non-intervention in the internal affairs of a sovereign State. France, which had very close cultural affinity with Czechoslovakia, deplored the armed intervention in that country, as it had believed that such a situation belonged only to the past. It only showed that the Soviet Union had not abandoned the policy of blocs forced on Europe by the Yalta Agreements. The actions of the Soviet Union were also a threat to the policy of European *détente* which France had encouraged so studiously. Nevertheless, it hoped that the invading forces would be withdrawn immediately and that the people of Czechoslovakia would be allowed to decide their own future.

534. The representative of Denmark wished to thank the representative of Czechoslovakia for his statements based upon declarations emanating from the lawful Czechoslovak authorities. The Government of Denmark had already issued a declaration which branded the military action against Czechoslovakia as a tragedy and a serious blow to the positive forces of *détente* and to a gradual *rapprochement* between East and West. The assertions that the intervention had taken place at the request of Czechoslovakia were belied by a number of irrefutable facts. The most elementary rights of the Czechoslovak Government and people had been violated in an action contrary to international law

and morality and in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the declaration adopted by the General Assembly on the inadmissibility of the intervention in the domestic affairs of States. That declaration was very clear and contained no exceptions. The Security Council should call upon the Government of the Soviet Union and its allies to desist forthwith from any intervention and withdraw all their forces without delay from Czechoslovakia.

535. The representative of Hungary stated that the hurried raising of this matter in the Security Council by the Western Powers was meant to divert the Council's attention from their support of the Israel aggression and the exploitation of the people of Rhodesia and Namibia. The United States representative had made references also to events in Hungary in 1956 without, however, mentioning that those events, to a large extent, had been the result of the activities of Western subversive forces and had also been exploited by Western Powers. The action taken by the Socialist States was in accordance with the Bratislava declaration of six nations' Communist Parties and was meant to help the Czechoslovak people and to maintain Socialist achievements.

536. The President of the Council, speaking as the representative of Brazil, read the text of an appeal made on 21 August by the President of his country, who, after deploring the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia by foreign troops, had called for an end to the interventionist activities in that country.

537. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the current discussions in the Council were part of the attempts made to subvert the popular and Socialist revolution in Czechoslovakia and the progress made by that country since the end of the Second World War. As a result of those attempts, dangerous tensions had arisen in and outside of Czechoslovakia. To rebuff those attempts the Communist Party and the Government of the Czechoslovak Republic, together with other participants of the Bratislava Conference, had deemed it necessary to stress the special significance of the Warsaw Treaty to protect the achievements of socialism and sovereignty of fraternal States. The latest events in Czechoslovakia not only had endangered the Socialist system there but were a direct threat to the existing balance of forces in Europe. It was in view of that threat that the lawful authorities in Czechoslovakia had appealed to the allied States for assistance. The representative of the USSR then read the text of an appeal which he said had been received from a group of lawful authorities in Czechoslovakia to the allied States requesting direct and immediate assistance to the Czechoslovak people, including armed assistance. The appeal spoke of the results of the Socialist order built in the country for twenty years and of the progressive reforms initiated by the Party since January 1968, all of which were now threatened by certain forces inside the Party itself. After describing the methods employed by those right-wing forces to exploit the recent reforms for their own selfish ends, the appeal added that Czechoslovakia could only develop as a socialist country and that all its loyal citizens were prepared to defend and carry fully into life the progressive ideas formulated at the January plenary meeting of the party. It was to preserve that order that a group of members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, of the Government and of the National

Assembly of Czechoslovakia had addressed that appeal for assistance to Socialist countries. Referring to some of the statements made in the Council, the representative of the USSR pointed out that what the representative of Czechoslovakia had said, particularly in the statement attributed to the President of Czechoslovakia, showed that there were complex, internal processes in Czechoslovakia that should be permitted to proceed in circumstances of tranquility. Consequently, the Security Council, whose primary task was the maintenance of international peace and security, should avoid interfering in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia. Moreover, the representative of Czechoslovakia had not appealed to the Council for such intervention. As regards the statement of the representative of France that the policy of blocs had been imposed by the Yalta Agreements, he asserted that the Yalta Agreements had been responsible only for creating the United Nations, not the blocs. The foundation of the bloc-groupings had been laid soon after the war, when the British Prime Minister of the time, Sir Winston Churchill, had considered that friendship between the Soviet Union and the United States would be a great danger to his own country.

538. The representative of the United States, commenting on the statements of the representative of the USSR, noted that there was an apparent assumption that Czechoslovakia either was or should be a colony of the Soviet Union, since what the latter had described as an internal matter of Czechoslovakia had become a matter in which the Soviet Union had some obligation to interfere. In his view the representative of the USSR had made no attempt at all to document the fact that there was any request for help.

539. The representative of the United Kingdom said that the Council would have no difficulty in choosing between the apparently anonymous document read by the representative of the USSR and the authoritative and moving statements made by the representative of Czechoslovakia. He also found it astonishing that the representative of the USSR, whose country had been responsible for the invasion, could cite Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, dealing with the right of any people to maintain their own sovereignty and to order their own affairs.

540. The representative of Czechoslovakia, replying to a number of remarks that had been made, stated that Czechoslovakia would never return to the times prior to February 1948 or to the times prior to January 1968 and that the Government and Communist Party of Czechoslovakia had striven and would always strive to protect the rights of the workers of Czechoslovakia and at the same time the security of the Socialist States. That was the duty of every one of the socialist countries, which knew the concrete conditions for the building and development of socialism in its own country.

541. At the 1442nd meeting of the Council on 22 August, the representative of Ethiopia said that his delegation had supported the inscription of the item on the Council's agenda because it considered that the situation in Czechoslovakia was one that could affect the very foundation of international peace and security and of international law. His delegation attached special importance to the statement made by the representative of Czechoslovakia, which had shown that there was no invitation or justification for the entry of the military troops of the Warsaw Pact allies into Czecho-

slovakia. He then read a declaration made by the Emperor of Ethiopia to the effect that the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of another State was a basic principle that should always govern international relations. The statement also called for a withdrawal of all foreign troops from Czechoslovakia and urged that the misunderstanding between that country and its immediate neighbours should be settled by peaceful means.

542. The representative of the United Kingdom said that the leaders of Czechoslovakia, through their various statements and declarations as conveyed to the Council by the representative of that country, had presented to the world an unanswerable case; they had asked for the withdrawal of the foreign troops and for the preservation of the sovereignty and integrity of their country. He wondered, however, about the safety of those who had spoken so strongly about the independence of their country and sought assurances from the Soviet Union that they would be permitted to continue to speak and work for their people.

543. The representative of China said that the armed invasion of Czechoslovakia by the countries of the Communist bloc was contrary to the United Nations Charter, in particular Article 2, paragraph 4, and to General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX), of which the Soviet Union had been the prime mover. The invasion had demonstrated clearly that the Soviet Union could not tolerate any semblance of freedom and democracy inside its sphere of influence. That action was all the more regrettable, as Czechoslovakia had not repudiated socialism or the Warsaw Pact. According to its own definition of the term, the action of the USSR was clearly aggression.

544. The representative of Denmark stated that his country had followed developments in Czechoslovakia over the last weeks with the deepest compassion and anxiety and had observed the dignified restraint and resolve by the Czechoslovak people and its representatives. A bond of deep sympathy was felt between his country and the Czechoslovak people. To the call for respect for the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia his country added an appeal to the Soviet Union not to inflict prolonged damage to the painstaking efforts to build up a new and better relationship among the countries of Europe. He then went on to introduce the following draft resolution (S/8761) which was co-sponsored by Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, the United Kingdom and the United States:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling that the United Nations is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members,*

*"Gravely concerned that, as announced by the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, troops of the Soviet Union and other members of the Warsaw Pact have entered their country without the knowledge and against the wishes of the Czechoslovakian Government,*

*"Considering that the action taken by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other members of the Warsaw Pact in invading the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is a violation of the United Nations Charter and, in particular, of the principle that all Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force*

against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State,

*"Gravely concerned* also by risks of violence and reprisals as well as by threats to individual liberty and human rights which cannot fail to result from imposed military occupation,

*"Considering* that the people of the sovereign State of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic have the right in accordance with the Charter freely to exercise their own self-determination and to arrange their own affairs without external intervention,

"1. *Affirms* that the sovereign, political independence and territorial integrity of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic must be fully respected;

"2. *Condemns* the armed intervention of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other members of the Warsaw Pact in the internal affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and calls upon them to take no action of violence or reprisal that could result in further suffering or loss of life, forthwith to withdraw their forces and to cease all other forms of intervention in Czechoslovakia's internal affairs;

"3. *Calls upon* Member States of the United Nations to exercise their diplomatic influence upon the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the other countries concerned with a view to bringing about prompt implementation of this resolution;

"4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to transmit this resolution to the countries concerned, to keep the situation under constant review and to report to the Council on compliance with this resolution."

545. In introducing the draft resolution the representative of Denmark stated that it was based on three basic considerations: the inadmissibility of the intervention in and the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and other members of the Warsaw Pact; deep concern for the fate of the people of Czechoslovakia and their legitimate leaders; and the demand that the Soviet Union and other members of the Warsaw Pact withdraw all their military forces from Czechoslovakia and desist from any further intervention in the internal affairs of that country. The right of each and every country to shape its own destiny was at stake.

546. The representative of Canada said that the seven-Power draft resolution reflected the minimum that the Council could do to reassure small States of international sympathy and support and if the fundamental principles of the Charter were to have any meaning. In its preambular part the draft resolution restated the Charter principles of the sovereign equality of States and abstention from the threat or use of force, as well as the fact that the Soviet Union and its allies had acted in violation of those principles. In its operative part the draft resolution affirmed the need for full respect for the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of the Czechoslovak Republic. The sponsors also felt that the Council could do no less than condemn the armed intervention of the USSR and certain other members of the Warsaw Pact and call on them forthwith to withdraw their forces from Czechoslovakia. The draft resolution also called upon Member States of the United Nations to exercise their diplomatic influence to bring about its prompt implementation.

547. The representative of the United States stated that the joint draft resolution recommended some sim-

ple steps which could be taken to redress the current situation in Czechoslovakia. The Council must affirm beyond any ambiguity the fundamental right of the people of Czechoslovakia freely to determine their own affairs without external intervention. It must be made clear that the Communist Governments had no special immunity from their requirements and obligations under the Charter. The Council must therefore insist on the withdrawal of the Warsaw Pact forces from Czechoslovakia and on ending the oppressive activities that were reportedly being carried out there.

548. The representative of Paraguay stated that his delegation was co-sponsoring the seven-Power draft resolution because it considered it essential that the Security Council pronounce itself clearly and without delay. It was necessary to condemn the attack and uphold the right of a Member State to be master of its own destiny, as the very foundation of relations among States and the very principles contained in the Charter were at stake.

549. The President of the Council, speaking as the representative of Brazil, said that his Government condemned the action taken by the Warsaw Pact Powers against the legal Government and people of Czechoslovakia. His Government did not subscribe to any theory of spheres of influence or of arbitrary geographical partition of the world; the only sphere of influence his Government recognized was that of law and peaceful association among all States. For this reason his delegation had joined the others in co-sponsoring the draft resolution.

550. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that, in spite of all the arguments and tactics used by the United States and its allies in NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), the fact of the imperialist participation in the Czechoslovak events could not be denied. He then quoted from a TASS statement to the effect that the situation in Czechoslovakia had remained normal in spite of attempts by anti-Socialist forces to disorganize civil life there. Such counter-revolutionary forces were resorting to all means of sabotage including clandestine radio transmissions and printing presses prepared beforehand whose fabrications were being picked up by imperialist propaganda and characterized as reflecting official position and public opinion in Czechoslovakia. The representative of the USSR then said that it was quite clear that it was not Czechoslovakia which had requested Security Council debate but the United States and its NATO allies, who wished to appear as defenders of Socialist Czechoslovakia. However, relations between Czechoslovakia and other Socialist countries would continue to be determined by the peoples of those countries, who were not prepared to tolerate any outside interference.

551. The representative of the United Kingdom stated that, all along, the Council had based its discussion on the statements of Czechoslovakia's leaders. Those statements had revealed that the real threat to Czechoslovakia had come from its own allies and not from the Western countries, and they had also contradicted the claim that any military assistance had been requested by Czechoslovakia. The Soviet Union's armed intervention had made a mockery of its proclaimed adherence to the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other States. The Council owed it to itself to adopt the draft resolution without further delay.

552. The representative of Hungary stated that he would wish to draw the attention of the Council to two related points: that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia, in a statement on the evening of 21 August, had declared that it had not agreed to discussion at the United Nations of the situation inside its territory and that no Czechoslovak representative had appeared that morning in the Council. He believed that the adoption of the draft resolution would not render any help to the people of Czechoslovakia.

553. The President informed the Council of the receipt of a letter dated 21 August (S/8762) from the representative of Bulgaria requesting participation in the discussion, and it was agreed, without objection, to invite him to participate at the next meeting, without the right to vote.

554. During a procedural discussion with regard to the next meeting of the Council, the representative of the United Kingdom made a formal proposal to the effect that the next meeting of the Council be held the same day at 5 p.m.

**Decision:** *The United Kingdom proposal was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (Algeria, Hungary, India, Pakistan and the USSR).*

555. At the 1443rd meeting, held on 22/23 August, the President informed the Council of the receipt of a letter dated 22 August (S/8766) from the representative of Poland requesting participation in the discussion, and it was agreed, without objection, to invite him to participate, without the right to vote.

556. The representative of Czechoslovakia stated that the situation in his country was deteriorating as a result of the occupation by foreign armed forces. He read the text of a press cable which he said had been received that morning from the Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry which stated some of the Czechoslovak leaders were still in internment and that the fate of others was unknown. The representative of Czechoslovakia also stated that, in connexion with the Council's deliberations concerning the situation in Czechoslovakia, he would like to reiterate that the occupation of his country as well as all actions undertaken by the foreign occupation forces were illegal and should be terminated fully and without delay.

557. The representative of Senegal said that his Government regretted and condemned the military intervention in Czechoslovakia, which, despite the existence of the Warsaw Pact, constituted an interference in the domestic affairs of that country. It had jeopardized the policy of *détente*, especially as it now appeared that the intervention had not been requested by the constitutional leaders of that country. His delegation was therefore co-sponsoring the draft resolution (S/8761/Add.1), and he urged the Council to adopt it without delay as a means of restoring conditions in Czechoslovakia that would facilitate a resumption of the policy of *détente*.

558. The representative of Hungary stated that the problems that Czechoslovakia was facing were due to a large extent to the subversive activities of external forces led by the United States and the Bonn régime. As a result of a threat to lawful order and to achievements of socialism in Czechoslovakia, the fraternal socialist States were helping that country. Instead of considering the situation in Czechoslovakia, the Security Council should rather concentrate its attention on the

threat to international peace and security resulting from the presence of aggressive military alliances like NATO in Europe.

559. The representative of Poland stated that the intervention into Czechoslovakia was a justified response to a call for help from the patriots of a fraternal Socialist Republic and to a threat to the maintenance of the *status quo* in its part of Europe. Poland, which had lost more than 6 million citizens and 38 per cent of its property in the Second World War, was very sensitive to any threat to international peace. His country was therefore determined to defend all countries of the Warsaw Pact, including Czechoslovakia.

560. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the Western Powers had disclaimed any designs to interfere in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia, but the activities of their organs of mass media had not borne that out. There had been definite attempts to disrupt the Socialist set-up in Czechoslovakia. Dubious clubs, he charged, had begun to sprout, for instance the 231 Club, whose leaders had personal and financial contact with Western establishments, including the CIA (Central Intelligence Agency). The representative of the USSR also stated that an arsenal of arms, marked "made in USA" and intended for subversion of the current order in Czechoslovakia, had been found by the Czechoslovak security forces. There was, in addition, a large-scale United States espionage network, which prepared and trained spies for infiltration into the Socialist countries' Communist Parties and governmental institutions. In these activities, he added, full assistance was also given by West Germany. Under the provisions of article 5 of the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries had acted in perfect accord over Czechoslovakia within the right of States to self-defence, individually and collectively. The representative of the USSR went on to cite figures illustrating Soviet assistance to Czechoslovakia in the economic field, which had led to joint achievements in the building of socialism and communism, and contrasted them with figures illustrating what he termed a policy of exploitation of Latin American countries by American monopolies.

561. The representative of Bulgaria denied that his country, which had itself suffered intervention by others, would ever practise intervention in the affairs of other countries, particularly of a Socialist country. Bulgaria's forces had gone into Czechoslovakia in order to assist the people of that Socialist country to overcome obstacles placed in their way through foreign intervention and internal counter-revolution. He recalled that the Soviet Union's letter to the Council had stressed that the military units would be withdrawn from Czechoslovakia as soon as their presence was no longer required. Yet the United States and other Governments had continued to insist that there had been intervention in the affairs of Czechoslovakia. Quoting from a letter which he said had been written by members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and of the Parliament of Czechoslovakia, the representative of Bulgaria said that there had been counter-revolutionary forces there exerting pressure on the leaders to depart from the provisions of the Bratislava Agreement. The submission of the question and its consideration by the Security Council were an uncalled-for interference in the domestic affairs of a Member State.

562. The representative of India, referring to his earlier statement, quoted from a further statement on

the subject made by his Prime Minister to the Indian Parliament on 21 August. In that statement, the Indian Prime Minister, after declaring that there should be no external interference in the affairs of any country, said that the immediate need was for the withdrawal of forces which had entered Czechoslovakia so that the people might be free to determine their own future without outside pressure. The representative of India then added that any action by the Council should be directed towards alleviating the grave situation in Czechoslovakia. With that purpose in mind, principally to remove the judgement of condemnation, the Indian delegation had informally suggested some changes in the draft resolution which, however, had been unacceptable to the sponsors. For that reason he would abstain on the draft resolution.

563. The representative of Algeria stated that the hasty conduct of the Council's meeting had not allowed sufficient time for discussion and consultations. Consultations were all the more necessary because of certain developments in Czechoslovakia and the information given to the Council by the representative of that country, including the fact that his Foreign Minister was coming to participate in the current meetings of the Council. The haste of some representatives was, in his view, in great contrast to the complacency shown when a question concerning Africa, Asia or Latin America was before the Council. In his statements the representative of Czechoslovakia had shown restraint and had not been provoked, as some might have desired, into making slanderous accusations. Algeria firmly adhered to the principles of self-determination, withdrawal of foreign troops occupying the territory of another country and the settlement of all problems within the framework of justice and stability. Those principles applied as much to Czechoslovakia as to Viet-Nam and Palestine. It was necessary that equity and justice should be maintained in all discussions in the Council, no matter which geographical region was involved. For those reasons, his delegation would abstain on the draft resolution (S/8761 and Add.1).

**Decision:** *At the 1443rd meeting of the Council on 22/23 August 1968, the eight-Power draft resolution (S/8761 and Add.1) was put to the vote. It received 10 votes in favour, 2 against (Hungary, USSR), with 3 abstentions (Algeria, India, Pakistan). The draft resolution was not adopted, owing to a negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.*

564. The representative of the United States said that the Soviet Union had once again frustrated an action by the Security Council by casting its 105th veto. However, that veto could not stifle the earnest aspirations of the people of Czechoslovakia to pursue their own national development, even in the face of occupation of their country.

565. The representative of Pakistan stated that his delegation had had to abstain in the vote because of the insufficient time allowed to undertake the necessary consultations with his Government.

566. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that by its veto the USSR had defended, as it would continue to do, a just cause and the interest of a people requiring protection from imperialist machinations. Its veto had similarly defended interests of the people of the Middle East and had led to the admission of many independent and sovereign States to the United Nations.

567. The representative of Canada stated that in view of the continuing seriousness of the situation in Czechoslovakia and the fact that the lawful authorities in Czechoslovakia had been forcibly removed from office, his delegation would wish the Council to consider, as a minimum measure, the following draft resolution (S/8767), co-sponsored by Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, Senegal, the United Kingdom and the United States.

*"The Security Council,*

*"Concerned at reports about current developments in Czechoslovakia, including the arrest of Czechoslovak leaders,*

*"Requests the Secretary-General to appoint and despatch immediately to Prague a Special Representative who shall seek the release and ensure the personal safety of the Czechoslovak leaders under detention and who shall report back urgently."*

568. At the 1444th meeting on 23 August, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, before the adoption of the agenda, stated that the introduction of the new eight-Power draft resolution (S/8767) was another attempt to use the United Nations for purposes of propaganda in favour of imperialist interests. The Security Council had finished an extensive debate on the question of the so-called situation in Czechoslovakia, which had been imposed on the Council by those interests in violation of the Charter. Not being satisfied with the result of that debate, they wished to involve again not only the Security Council but the Secretary-General in their diversionary tactics. The new attempt was meant only to hamper the efforts of the Socialist countries to settle their problems peacefully. The draft resolution, asking the Secretary-General to appoint a representative to carry out duties which would amount to direct interference in the domestic affairs of a Member State, was contrary to the Charter and unfair to the Secretary-General himself.

569. Following a procedural discussion, the President declared that the agenda had been adopted, and informed the Council of the receipt of a letter dated 23 August from the representative of Yugoslavia requesting that he be invited to participate in the discussion. It was agreed, without objection, to invite him to participate, without the right to vote.

570. The representative of Canada stated that in sponsoring the eight-Power draft resolution (S/8767), his country had no wish to interfere in Czechoslovakia's internal affairs or to promote any unrest in Central Europe. Canada, on the contrary, was primarily concerned with the fate of nations, subject to outside intervention, regardless of their political, economic and social systems, and upheld the principle of non-intervention. At present, his delegation would urge the Council to consider the humanitarian proposal contained in the new draft resolution, which was merely meant to secure some assurance in respect of the treatment of acknowledged leaders of Czechoslovakia and represented the minimum the Council could do in the light of the blocking of more substantive action by the Soviet Union.

571. The representative of France said that his delegation had co-sponsored the draft resolution in view of reports that several leaders in Czechoslovakia were in confinement. It was necessary to dispel doubt about



the safety of those leaders, and for that reason the humanitarian draft resolution before the Council sought their release through the Secretary-General.

572. The representative of Denmark stated that in view of the negative vote cast by the Soviet Union the Council was unable to take a decision on the political situation arising from the occupation of Czechoslovakia by troops of the Soviet Union and certain of its allies in the Warsaw Pact. However, the Council should turn its attention to the humanitarian aspects of the problem, first and foremost to the safety of the lawful Czechoslovak leaders who clearly enjoyed the support and confidence of their people. That concern would be legitimate and necessary, and it was for that reason that his delegation was co-sponsoring the eight-Power draft resolution (S/8767).

573. The representative of Ethiopia stated that the position of his delegation was based on its concern for the preservation of, and respect for, the principles of international law and order as enshrined in the United Nations Charter. For that reason his delegation was in basic agreement with the suggestion that the Secretary-General's good offices be utilized. It would, however, not like to restrict the Secretary-General's choice of action and initiative by a resolution defining the scope of his action.

574. The representative of the United States noted indications that negotiations were going on between some representatives of the Government of Czechoslovakia and the Government of the Soviet Union. Although the Council should do nothing to interfere with that hopeful process, it could not be sure what would happen. Therefore, it must do everything possible to assure the welfare of the leaders of Czechoslovakia, whose only fault was that they had stood for freedom. He therefore co-sponsored the new eight-Power draft resolution, which his Government considered the best way in which the Council could secure the welfare of those leaders.

575. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, after recalling his delegation's views concerning the new eight-Power draft resolution (S/8767), added that the attempt to present it as merely a humanitarian proposal could not conceal the real aim of the representatives of the Western Powers, who wished to continue their efforts to interfere in the domestic affairs of Czechoslovakia and to support the reactionary elements there.

576. The representative of the United Kingdom said that the new draft resolution (S/8767) had been set out in clear and simple language, with no diversionary tactics in mind. It would not have been necessary if the representative of the Soviet Union had simply given assurances regarding the safety and freedom of the acknowledged leaders of Czechoslovakia. Not only members of the Council but the entire world was vitally interested in the fate of the Czechoslovak leaders.

577. The representative of Yugoslavia read a statement (S/8765) issued by his Government on 22 August 1968 concerning the situation in Czechoslovakia. The statement said that the armed intervention in Czechoslovakia, for which there was no justification, constituted a gross violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent country, as well as the principles of international law and of the United Nations Charter. Yugoslavia, after declaring its full solidarity with the people of Czechoslovakia, their Gov-

ernment and their constitutionally elected forums, appealed to the five Governments whose troops had entered Czechoslovakia to put an end without delay to the occupation of that country. The doctrine being used to justify foreign intervention in Czechoslovakia was unacceptable and very dangerous for the independence of States and peace in the world. Military blocs, he added, could not guarantee the security and free development of their members; instead, they created conditions of subjugation of the interests and independent policy of a member of an alliance to the interests of others.

578. Also on 23 August the President of the Security Council received a cable (S/8768) from the Deputy Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, Ota Sik, stating that in the absence of the Prime Minister of the constitutional Government of Czechoslovakia, he, as the Deputy Prime Minister, in agreement with other Ministers outside the occupied territory of the Republic and having consulted some other members of the Government still in Prague and enjoying some relative freedom of action, officially confirmed that Minister for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Hajek, was authorized to represent Czechoslovakia before the United Nations Security Council.

579. At the 1445th meeting on 24 August, the President requested the Under-Secretary-General to read out the text of a note from the Permanent Mission of the USSR. The note referred to a letter of the Secretariat dated 23 August forwarding the text of a cable dated 23 August from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic and drew attention to the fact that that communication had not so far been distributed as an official document of the Security Council, as the Permanent Mission expected would be done without delay. The President stated in that connexion that the procedure he had adopted in acquainting the members of the Council with the contents of the communication had followed some precedents adopted in the past, since the rules of procedure were silent in that regard.

580. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics read out the text of the cable, in which the Minister for Foreign Affairs stated that the Government of the German Democratic Republic emphatically underlined that the protection and strengthening of socialism in Czechoslovakia served the cause of peace and security in Europe and insisted on participating in the discussion of those questions by its authorized representative. The representative of the USSR stated that in conformity with the usual practice, that kind of communication from a Foreign Minister must be published as an official document of the Council, since it had a direct bearing on the matter before the Council. Moreover, since the German Democratic Republic had often been mentioned in the statements made in the Council in connexion with its participation in the assistance given to the fraternal Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, it was quite logical that it should have requested that its official representative be admitted to the Council and take part in the debate. He noted that under the United Nations Charter and the Council's rules of procedure, the rights of every State and its representatives to take part in the Council's work during debates on a problem touching upon its interests, honour, dignity and policy were fully ensured. Under those provisions, and in accordance with precedents which he cited, he considered that the

German Democratic Republic was entitled to participate in the discussion and should be invited to do so.

581. The representative of France stated that his Government did not recognize any right on the part of the Eastern German authorities to speak for the German people in international affairs. Their representative could therefore not be allowed to participate in the Council's discussions.

582. The representative of Hungary set out legal arguments in support of his view that the German Democratic Republic was a State, and he added that whether some members of the Council recognized it as such should have no bearing upon the distribution of its communication as an official document.

583. The representative of the United Kingdom also stated that his Government did not recognize that any State or Government other than the Federal Republic of Germany existed which was entitled to speak on behalf of the German people in international affairs. Consequently, it would not be useful to hear the person who asked to be heard, and since the communication was not from a State, the action taken by the President had been correct.

584. The representative of the United States considered the present manoeuvre to be clearly designed to distract attention from developments in Czechoslovakia, where the people who had suffered Hitler's brutal occupation in 1938 had again been subjected to the indignity of invasion and occupation by German troops. Both the Charter Articles and the Council's rules of procedure were applicable only to States, and the régime in the Soviet zone of Germany was neither a State nor entitled in any way to speak for the German people. He fully supported the President's manner of handling the document in question.

585. The representative of Denmark stated that because it was his Government's policy that only the Federal Republic of Germany was entitled to speak on behalf of the German people in international affairs, and because the hearing of the person who had applied would serve no constructive purpose, he would oppose the request for a hearing. It should be made clear, he added, that the action of invasion could be no passport to the Security Council.

586. The representatives of Canada and Paraguay expressed support for the manner in which the President had handled the document in question.

587. The representative of Hungary, after referring to the explanation of the President concerning the past practice of circulating documents submitted by non-member states as Security Council documents, stated that the refusal to distribute the communication received from the Government of the German Democratic Republic constituted discrimination against that State.

588. Following further discussion of the procedural question, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics formally moved that the Council invite the representative of the German Democratic Republic, pursuant to the cable received from that country's Foreign Minister, to participate in the debate without the right to vote.

**Decision:** *At the 1445th meeting of the Council on 24 August, the USSR proposal was put to the vote and was not adopted, having received 2 votes in favour (Hungary and the USSR), 9 against, with 4 abstentions (Algeria, Brazil, India and Pakistan).*

589. The President, speaking as the representative of Brazil, stated that his abstention in the vote did not imply any change in the position of Brazil with regard to East Germany. The only reason for his abstention having been his desire, as President, to maintain absolute impartiality in the debate on that procedural question.

590. At the same meeting, the representative of Czechoslovakia stated that as a member and responsible representative of the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, he was taking the floor in the Security Council with regret. The responsibility for the fact that Czechoslovakia's relations with some other Socialist countries had come before the Council rested upon those Governments which, despite agreed principles of mutual relations, had occupied the territory of Czechoslovakia with their armed units. He said that there could be no justification for that act of the use of force. It had not taken place upon the request of the Czechoslovak Government nor of any other constitutional organs of that Republic, as had been clearly attested in the official declarations of which the Council had been informed. Neither could the military occupation be justified by concern for the external security of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic or for the fulfilment of its obligations arising from the joint defence of the countries of the Warsaw Treaty, since his Government had conscientiously fulfilled those obligations. It could also not be justified by arguments about the alleged danger of counter-revolution, since those arguments were juridically not valid, and until the occupation the Czechoslovak Government had fully controlled the situation on its territory. He hoped that the five Governments would soon grasp how enormous and tragic a mistake they had made and would make a speedy reparation, as it was imperative not to permit accumulation of further harm. The basis for a future solution, the representative of Czechoslovakia continued, rested upon the principles of co-operation among the socialist countries, peaceful coexistence and respect for the national interests of each nation. On the basis of those principles his Government demanded that the foreign troops should leave without delay, that the sovereignty of the country should be fully restored and that the rights and functions of the constitutional representatives and political organs should be fully respected. He expressed the hope that the current negotiations of the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and his delegation in Moscow would contribute to that end. The solution lay squarely with the five Governments, in negotiations with the constitutional authorities of Czechoslovakia, and he believed that having discussed the problem, the Security Council could contribute to such a solution by taking a wise stand and helping to create a favourable atmosphere.

591. The representative of Pakistan stated that his country believed that the Czechoslovak people were entitled, regardless of their social system, to exercise their sovereign rights without fear or threat of use of force. The international community as well as the Security Council had a vital stake in the withdrawal at the earliest possible time of the armed forces of the five States which had entered Czechoslovakia. Taking note of the Soviet statement that the withdrawal of the armed forces of the five socialist States would be carried out, and of the efforts of the President of Czechoslovakia in Moscow to find a solution, he expressed the view that the Council should await the result of the

negotiations which were currently being held. His delegation trusted that those negotiations were taking place on a basis of genuine equality and that their outcome would be consistent with the sovereign rights of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. It was only from such negotiations that an honourable adjustment of the situation, as envisaged in Article 1 of the Charter, could be brought about, leading to the evacuation of the armed forces of the five socialist States from the territory of Czechoslovakia. Since those negotiations were in progress, he did not consider it opportune to put forward suggestions for revision of the draft resolution.

592. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics read out the text of a TASS cable which stated that the talks between the leaders of Czechoslovakia and of the Soviet Union had resumed on 24 August 1968 and, as on the previous day, those talks were being held in a frank and comradely atmosphere. He also quoted from an appeal (S/8772) to the citizens of Czechoslovakia from the Governments of the five socialist countries stating that the armed assistance from the five countries had been given to defend the working class and the entire Czechoslovak people against the activities of counter-revolutionaries who had been spoiling for power, encouraged and supported by imperialists. At the Cierne and Bratislava Conferences the leaders of Czechoslovakia had declared their intention to curtail the activities of those reactionaries and to safeguard the interests of the working people and to consolidate the unity of Czechoslovakia and the fraternal socialist countries. But those assurances and commitments had remained unfulfilled, which further encouraged the anti-socialist forces and their

foreign protectors. It was in order to thwart the hopes of those forces that the troops of the five fraternal countries had gone into Czechoslovakia. However, those troops would leave the territory of Czechoslovakia when the threat to the freedom and independence of that country was eliminated.

593. The meeting of the Council was tentatively adjourned until Monday, 26 August 1968. After the cancellation of that meeting, no further meeting on this question was scheduled.

594. In a letter dated 27 August 1968 (S/8785) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Acting Permanent Representative of Czechoslovakia stated that, in view of the agreement reached in the Soviet-Czechoslovak talks in Moscow from 23 to 26 August 1968, the President should arrange to withdraw from the agenda of the Council the item contained in the letter of 21 August 1968 (S/8758) from the representatives of Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, the United Kingdom and the United States. That item, he pointed out, had not been requested by Czechoslovakia for inclusion in the agenda of the Council.

595. Eleven communications dated 22 August (S/8765), 23 August (S/8769, S/8770), 26 August (S/8777, S/8780), 27 August (S/8784 and S/8803 of 6 September), 28 August (S/8790), 30 August (S/8798), 3 September (S/8800) and 7 September (S/8812) from the representatives of Yugoslavia, Australia, Zambia, Chile, Jamaica, Ecuador, Haiti, Indonesia, Panama and Costa Rica, respectively, were addressed to the President of the Council, transmitting statements and declarations of protest made by their Governments, National Assemblies or national leaders, concerning the situation in Czechoslovakia.

#### *Chapter 4*

### **THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA: LETTER DATED 14 MARCH 1969 ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF FORTY-SIX MEMBER STATES (S/9090)**

#### **A. Communications to the Security Council and request for a meeting**

596. By a letter dated 5 August 1968 (S/8729) the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia informed the President of the Security Council that the United Nations Council for Namibia had unanimously decided to draw the attention of the Security Council to the serious situation arising as a result of recent actions of the South African Government pertaining to the forcible removal of non-white Namibians from their homes in Windhoek to the new segregated area of Katutura.

597. In a report dated 8 August (S/8737), and in six addenda issued on 6 and 7 September, 17 and 30 October, 22 November and 5 December (S/8737/Add.1-6), the Secretary-General brought to the attention of the Security Council information supplied by Governments, specialized agencies and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees concerning implementation of General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII) of 12 June 1968. On 18 March 1969, he submitted an addendum (S/8506/Add.5) to his report in pursuance of resolution 246 (1968), adopted by the Security Council on 14 March 1968, containing further replies from Governments concerning implementation of that resolution.

598. By letter dated 10 October (S/8846) the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in accordance with a unanimous decision of the Council, further drew the attention of the Security Council to the serious situation resulting from the South African Government's decision to divide Namibia into six separate "homelands" against the wishes of the people of Namibia and with a view to destroying the territorial integrity of Namibia.

599. By a letter dated 25 October (S/8867), the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia drew the attention of the Security Council to the serious situation which had arisen as a result of the killing of forty-six Namibians and the arrest of 117 others by the South African police in the region of Caprivi Strip in the north-eastern part of Namibia.

600. By a letter dated 29 November (S/8908) the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia transmitted to the Security Council a statement issued by him with regard to the appeal of thirty-one Namibians convicted in 1967. The statement reiterated that South Africa's mandate over Namibia had been terminated by General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) and, therefore, South Africa had no right to legislate for or to exercise any administration over the Territory. Consequently, all measures taken in

regard to Namibia by the South African authorities were illegal and invalid, and the thirty-one Namibians concerned should be immediately released and repatriated.

601. By a letter dated 23 December (S/8943) the Secretary-General transmitted to the President of the Security Council the text of General Assembly resolution 2403 (XXIII), in which the Assembly had drawn the attention of the Security Council to the serious situation arising as a result of the illegal presence and actions of the Government of South Africa in Namibia and had recommended that the Security Council urgently take all effective measures, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, to ensure the immediate withdrawal of South African authorities from Namibia so as to enable Namibia to attain independence in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2145 (XXI).

602. By a letter dated 28 February 1969 (S/9032) the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia drew the attention of the President of the Security Council to the deteriorating situation in Namibia brought about by the continuing illegal occupation by the South African authorities in defiance of various General Assembly resolutions. The letter pointed out that there had been no advance towards the exercise of the right of self-determination and the attainment of independence by the people of Namibia and that the Council for Namibia had been denied the exercise of its responsibilities under the aforementioned resolutions. The South African defiance and the denial of self-determination to the people of Namibia, the letter added, constituted a serious threat to international peace and security and, consequently, the Council for Namibia deemed it necessary that the Security Council should give its urgent consideration to that situation and take appropriate action.

603. In a letter dated 14 March (S/9090) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representatives of forty Member States requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to examine the deteriorating situation in Namibia and to take appropriate action to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination. The letter added that the South African Government, in spite of the General Assembly and Security Council decisions, had continued to maintain its occupation of the Territory of Namibia, constituting a grave threat to international peace and security. The letter was signed by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia and Zambia. Subsequently, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Liberia, Libya, Mongolia and Turkey joined in signing the request (S/9090/Add.1-3).

604. By a letter dated 19 March (S/9097), the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples transmitted to the Security Council the text of a statement made by him at the 661st meeting of the Committee. The statement charged that the

Government of South Africa, instead of relinquishing its illegal control over Namibia, had taken measures aimed at destroying the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia and was extending its system of *apartheid* to Namibia by creating separate "homelands" for the non-white population groups. Those measures, taken in absolute defiance of the authority of the United Nations and in violation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, had created a grave situation in Namibia, and the Special Committee considered that the Security Council should take urgent action in the spirit of the recommendations of the General Assembly.

#### **B. Consideration at the 1464th and 1465th meetings (20 March 1969)**

605. On 20 March 1969 the Security Council at its 1464th meeting included the item in its agenda and, in accordance with his request, invited the representative of the United Arab Republic, who was also President of the United Nations Council for Namibia for that month, to participate, without vote, in the discussion.

606. The representative of Algeria said that the Security Council, which had considered the question of Namibia before, had recognized its responsibility towards the people and the Territory of Namibia. It must go beyond that and determine the means of imposing the collective will in order to achieve the right of self-determination for the Namibians. The United Nations had put an end to the Mandate of South Africa over South West Africa (Namibia). The Council was duty-bound to accept the consequences of that decision and consider the practical measures to secure the withdrawal of the South African authorities from Namibia.

607. At the same meeting, the representative of Zambia introduced the following draft resolution (S/9100), which was co-sponsored by Colombia, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal and Zambia:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Taking note of General Assembly resolutions 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967; 2324 (XXII) and 2325 (XXII) of 16 December 1967; 2372 (XXII) of 12 June 1968 and 2403 (XXIII) of 16 December 1968,*

*"Taking into account General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 by which the General Assembly of the United Nations terminated the Mandate of South West Africa and assumed direct responsibility for the territory until its independence,*

*"Recalling its resolutions 245 (1968) of 25 January 1968 and 246 (1968) of 14 March 1968,*

*"Reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to freedom and independence in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960,*

*"Mindful of the grave consequences of South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia,*

*"Reaffirming its special responsibility towards the people and the territory of Namibia,*

*"1. Recognizes that the United Nations General Assembly terminated the mandate of South Africa over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for the territory until its independence;*

"2. *Considers* that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal and contrary to the principles of the Charter and the previous decisions of the United Nations and is detrimental to the interests of the population of the territory and those of the international community;

"3. *Calls upon* the Government of South Africa to immediately withdraw its administration from the territory;

"4. *Declares* that the actions of the Government of South Africa designed to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia through the establishment of Bantustans are contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter;

"5. *Declares* that the Government of South Africa has no right to enact the 'South West Africa Affairs Bill', as such an enactment would be a violation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

"6. *Condemns* the refusal of South Africa to comply with General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI); 2248 (S-V); 2324 (XXII); 2325 (XXII); 2372 (XXII) and 2403 (XXIII) and Security Council resolutions 245 and 246 of 1968;

"7. *Invites* all States to exert their influence in order to obtain compliance by the Government of South Africa with the provisions of the present resolution;

"8. *Decides* that in the event of failure on the part of the Government of South Africa to comply with the provisions of the present resolution, the Security Council will meet immediately to determine upon necessary steps or measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations;

"9. *Requests* the Secretary-General to follow closely the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council as soon as possible;

"10. *Decides* to remain actively seized of the matter."

608. The representative of Zambia, in introducing the above draft resolution, said that although it fell far short of the sponsors' demands, it nevertheless contained some positive elements. A distinction had to be drawn between the desirable and the possible, and the draft was the possible. His delegation, together with others, had felt that the draft should have contained a categorical statement that South Africa's continued presence in Namibia was an act of aggression and a threat to international peace and security. However, that statement was not included in the draft in order to take into account the feelings of certain Governments averse to the idea of an inevitable confrontation with South Africa. But, in the view of his delegation, paragraph 8 of the draft resolution did not entirely exclude the application of Chapter VII of the Charter. The representative of Zambia added that few situations had demanded more attention than that of Namibia. South Africa had balkanized the Territory into tribal confederations on the Bantustan pattern; whole populations had been forcibly removed from their ancestral homes into semi-desert areas in the interest of the alien white minority. Already 2,000 Namibian refugees, fleeing from the recent inhuman acts by the South African régime, had been added to the many already in Zambia. There was another grave aspect to the situation. The Government of South

Africa had embarked on a huge military programme, increasing its military expenditures between 1966 and 1968 to seven times those of 1960-1961 and spending enormous sums on the police force with a view to continuing its occupation of Namibia and, eventually, defending its illegal annexation. It was not enough to declare a commitment to the principles of democracy or faith in human rights. The major Powers must commit themselves to those principles in practice and must support their application to southern Africa.

609. The representative of Senegal said that his delegation firmly believed that the situation in Namibia was a serious threat to international peace and security. If an eventual race war that could be fatal to all mankind was to be avoided, the Security Council must demand that South Africa withdraw from Namibia unconditionally and without delay. The United Nations, particularly the Security Council and its permanent members, should fully assume their responsibilities under the Charter and ask South Africa to implement and fulfil its obligations as a Member of the Organization.

610. The representative of Nepal said that the situation in Namibia called for strong and resolute action by the Security Council, particularly by its permanent members. His Government's position was based on its unqualified support for General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). It considered that South Africa, in refusing to vacate the Territory, was guilty of aggression and that that fact had brought the question squarely within the scope of Chapter VII of the Charter. His delegation was not entirely satisfied with the provisions of the draft resolution, in so far as it failed to determine the reality of the situation, warded off any hint or suggestion of enforcement actions under Chapter VII of the Charter and evaded resolution 2248 (S-V), under which the General Assembly had decided to give effect to the Organization's obligations by taking practical steps to transfer power to the people of the Territory. However, it considered the draft to be a vast improvement over Security Council resolutions 245 (1968) and 246 (1968). Under the current draft resolution, the Council would significantly, for the first time in its history, reinforce the historic General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) by recognizing the termination of the Mandate and the assumption by the Organization of direct responsibility for the Territory until its independence; and, again for the first time, would call upon the Government of South Africa to withdraw from the Territory. For these reasons his delegation had co-sponsored the draft resolution, hoping that its adoption would enable the Council to take further effective measures, if necessary, under Chapter VII of the Charter.

611. The representative of France deplored the fact that the past year had been marked by an increase in the Territory of discriminatory and repressive measures, which his country had consistently opposed, and by the intensification of a policy which his delegation had repeatedly condemned as incompatible with the obligations deriving from the spirit of the Mandate. The long debates and delicate negotiations which had culminated in the unanimous adoption of resolution 246 (1968) had shown the limits within which the Council could act if it wished to obtain the large majority which was indispensable for exerting pressure on South Africa. It was particularly important to reaffirm the international status of the Territory. That status had by no means ended with the demise of the

League of Nations and could not be modified unilaterally by the administering Power. Only the exercise by the people of their right of self-determination could bring it to an end. Its continued existence gave South Africa certain obligations both towards the population, for whose material and moral welfare and social advancement it was responsible, and towards the United Nations, to which it must transmit annual reports and petitions originating in the Territory. On the other hand, as the heir of the League of Nations, the United Nations could not, in matters respecting the Mandate handed down to it, overstep the authority that had been invested in the League. And it was doubtful that the League could have unilaterally deprived South Africa of its Mandate. Besides, the initiative taken by the General Assembly in the matter, far from having had the effect expected, had only precipitated the developments it had hoped to avoid, and it had not been possible to implement resolution 2145 (XXI). The French delegation had not voted for that resolution and consequently would not be able to follow the Council if it contemplated embarking on that course.

612. The representative of Pakistan said that the General Assembly, in its resolution 2403 (XXIII), had asked the Security Council to take effective measures to secure the withdrawal of South African authorities from Namibia in order to enable that Territory to attain independence. Recent events in Namibia had made Council action imperative, and the answer, if sought in the Charter, was contained in the provisions of Chapter VII. In order that the Council's action be meaningful, it was necessary that it should have the maximum of support. As a result of intensive consultations to that end, the text of the six-Power draft resolution (S/9100) had emerged. The draft was an improvement over Council resolution 246 (1968), and the crux of the draft lay in paragraph 8. However, his delegation was disappointed that the Council, instead of going farther in that paragraph, would merely repeat the language of paragraph 5 of resolution 246 (1968). In that respect, the draft clearly fell short of the requirements of the situation. South Africa had not heeded last year's warning. Surely that warning must now be followed, not by yet another warning, but by action. However, it was well known that three permanent members of the Council were not willing to take the measures necessary to compel South Africa to withdraw its unlawful authority from the Territory. The only redeeming feature of paragraph 8 was that it did not foreclose action under Chapter VII of the Charter. The Pakistan delegation had no doubt that, whether or not the Council committed itself to such action, only sanctions could convince South Africa that the United Nations had the will and the capacity to meet the challenge to its competence to decolonize the Territory.

613. At the 1465th meeting of the Council on 20 March, the representative of the United States said that South Africa's actions since the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI) had demonstrated that the General Assembly had been correct in determining that South Africa had forfeited the right to administer Namibia and in concluding that the United Nations should assume responsibility for the Territory. The United States had voted for resolution 2145 (XXI) and shared the objective of the Members which had taken the initiative in bringing the matter to the Council. The Council's current meeting was of historic significance inasmuch as it was meeting for the first time to con-

sider the situation created by South Africa's refusal to implement resolution 2145 (XXI). The Council would render a great service to the people of Namibia if it were successful in finding a peaceful solution. The United States would support the six-Power draft resolution (S/9100) because the text wisely did not commit the Council to the narrow path of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. It would be inappropriate in this situation to consider measures contained in Chapter VII. In his Government's judgement, this was not a situation which could sensibly and humanely be remedied by mandatory sanctions. Such measures would be likely to prove ineffective and thus weaken the prestige of the United Nations. For the same reason, far from improving the lot of the Namibians, they might run the risk of making their situation even worse. His Government took the view that, although South Africa had no legal right in Namibia, it remained accountable to the United Nations for all its actions in the Territory and for the well-being of the people so long as it remained in *de facto* control. It would be helpful if the South African Government, which had often protested that its actions in Namibia were misunderstood, would receive, without conditions, a special representative of the Secretary-General to discuss Namibia or make some other gesture that would have the effect of acknowledging its responsibilities to the international community.

614. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that South Africa's policy of conquest in Namibia and its continued defiance of the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions had resulted directly from the support it had received from certain Western countries and their monopolies. With their connivance and direct assistance, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal had formed an unholy alliance; their territories were a stronghold of colonialism and racism in Africa, serving to protect the interests of the imperialist monopolies, and exploited the people and wealth of the continent. In his delegation's opinion, one effective measure which the Council should take would be to ask the Governments of countries whose citizens and firms maintained financial, economic and trading activities in South Africa or Namibia, to take urgent legislative, administrative and other necessary measures to put an end to all private or State investments in the economy of South Africa as long as the latter did not implement United Nations decisions on Namibia. The draft resolution before the Council would have also gained much strength if its co-sponsors had included an appeal to all States to cease all commercial, economic and other relations with the South African régime. Such measures were also indispensable in order to be able to exert sufficient pressure on the Government of South Africa to compel it to heed United Nations demands. Decisive condemnation of the colonialist South Africa régime, as well as immediate cessation of all assistance and support and suspension of all relations with it, would be an effective way for the Council and the United Nations to exert pressure on the South African authorities. The representative of the USSR then said that, although it contained many positive points, the six-Power draft resolution (S/9100), nevertheless, considered as a whole, was weak, for it contained no provision for measures against Member States which continued to maintain large-scale political, economic and military relations with South Africa. However, since African and other delegations that had taken an active part in working out the text had considered

it acceptable, his delegation would not object to its adoption as the minimum which the Council could do at that time in order to help the people of Namibia.

615. The representative of Finland said that the resolutions passed by the General Assembly in the past two and a half years since the termination of the mandate had had no practical effect. The General Assembly seemed to have exhausted the means at its disposal. It was right, therefore, that the Security Council should now take up the search for practical and effective means by which the United Nations could discharge its responsibilities for Namibia and its people. The starting point had, of course, to be the recognition of the fact that the Assembly had terminated the mandate of South Africa over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for the territory until its independence. By adopting the 6-Power joint draft resolution (S/9100), the Security Council would, for the first time, be fully engaged in the task of translating that General Assembly decision into reality. In that fact lay the real significance of the action that the Council was about to take. There had been no agreement on the means by which the General Assembly's decision could be implemented. The decisions of the General Assembly, though supported by large majorities, had failed to receive the backing of the leading Powers. Subsequently they made no impression on the Government of South Africa. If the Council were to achieve any success, it must move in unison. Any future proposals, to be effective, should be based on the wide measure of agreement that his delegation believed the current draft commanded among members. Only thus could one hope to make the influence of the United Nations felt. One must be mindful of the fact that the responsibilities of the Security Council under the Charter were of a different order from those of other organs of the United Nations. The sponsors of the draft resolution had acted wisely in avoiding any attempt to commit the Council in advance to any particular course of action in the event of failure on the part of the Government of South Africa to comply with the recommendations of the Council. In the view of the Finnish delegation, the Council should be prepared to consider all constructive proposals, consistent with the responsibilities the United Nations had assumed, that could help to reverse the trend of events in Namibia. The Council should make active and concerted efforts to find a just and peaceful solution to this problem. Failure to do so would mean defeat not only to the people of Namibia, but for the United Nations itself.

616. The representative of the United Kingdom said that the Council owed it to the people of Namibia to act deliberately after the fullest consultation, to act, if possible, in agreement and, most important, within its clear capacity. If the Council were to adopt resolutions which it could not put into effect, then the Council would not be serving the people concerned but would be encouraging the Government of South Africa to pursue its evil policies. For those reasons his delegation had been urging and hoping for more than two years that it would be possible to find means of going forward together in agreement. And it was for those reasons that his delegation had considered that the course adopted by the General Assembly in 1966 was mistaken. He had constantly urged delegations to seek a more practical and positive course and was making the same plea again. He recalled his Government's support for the United Nations Education and Training Programme for southern Africa and

announced a further British contribution of £50,000. The practical proposals put forward in 1967 by the delegations of Canada, Italy and the United States at the resumed twenty-first session of the General Assembly had not been heeded; neither had the proposals made at the Kitwe Conference on *Apartheid* in 1967. Those proposals needed to be re-examined. It would be best, even now, to avoid a draft resolution which would remain inoperative. It was well that the six-Power draft resolution (S/9100) did not ask for measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, for his Government would not have agreed to commitments under that Chapter.

617. The representative of the United Arab Republic, speaking as the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, said that, in view of the General Assembly decision, the presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal and constituted an act of aggression which the United Nations must bring to an end by all the means provided under the Charter. Furthermore, South Africa's presence was an encroachment on United Nations jurisdiction and a defiance of its authority, as well as an impediment to the freedom of the Namibian people. As the report of the Council for Namibia had stated, the increasing conflicts resulting from South Africa's actions constituted a serious threat to world peace. Consequently, the immediate withdrawal of South Africa was the most fundamental demand if the people of Namibia were to become free and independent, and the Security Council was called upon to take all effective measures to put an end to the serious and deteriorating situation prevailing in Namibia.

618. The representative of Paraguay said that since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), which had terminated South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa (Namibia), the Security Council had so far not taken up the question as a whole and recognized the Assembly's action. The text of the six-Power draft resolution (S/9100) represented far less than many Members, particularly the African States, had expected from the Security Council. However, the text was based on the realistic recognition of the situation prevailing in the United Nations and the possible courses of action. More drastic formulas might only highlight the deep division of the Council in this important matter. A resolution without the support of all the permanent members of the Security Council might serve only to encourage South Africa. For these reasons his delegation urged wide support for the six-Power draft resolution.

619. The representative of Spain said that South Africa's policies in Namibia were completely unrealistic and contradicted the letter and spirit of the Charter and of the provisions of the Mandate. To maintain a just international order and to ensure the survival of the United Nations, compliance with the resolutions of the principal organs of the Organization was a basic requirement. His Government wished to believe that it was still possible for the Government of South Africa to accept the passage of time and cooperate with the United Nations in arriving at a peaceful solution of the problem. His delegation shared the views expressed in the operative part of the draft resolution and considered that the balance achieved stood as obvious proof of the constructive desires and efforts of the co-sponsors.

620. The representative of Colombia said that the draft resolution (S/9100) reflected the justice of the

case before the Council. It was a step forward in the assistance that the Council could give the people of Namibia to achieve their independence. It was well to make it known that the Security Council recognized and endorsed the termination by the General Assembly of South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa (Namibia) and that the continued presence of South African forces there was a threat to international peace and a challenge to peaceful coexistence in the world community. If South Africa were to refuse to withdraw immediately its administration and its forces from Namibia, then it would be well for the Council, as the draft had suggested, to meet that challenge and decide what effective answer it could take in that respect.

621. The representative of China said that the draft resolution now before the Council was the nearest thing to a consensus. As a first step, it rightly invited all States to exert their influence in order to obtain compliance by the Government of South Africa with its provisions. His delegation was convinced that the influence of the Western Powers on the Government of South Africa, if fully exerted, could go a long way towards a solution. It hoped that the Government of South Africa would find it in its own interest to make it unnecessary for the Council to take further steps of a more stringent kind.

622. The President of the Security Council, speaking as the representative of Hungary, said that his delegation had long believed that the Council must take effective measures should South Africa continue to defy the United Nations and world conscience. It was in that spirit that his delegation had examined the draft resolution. From the consultations preceding the current meeting and the discussion in the Council, his delegation knew that the sponsors had wished the Council to take much stronger measures. It was regrettable that the economic and military interests of certain Powers had not made it possible to adopt a text that would have met the requirements of the situation more adequately. Nevertheless, the current text of the six-Power draft resolution represented some modest progress; therefore, his delegation had decided to support it.

**Decision:** *At the 1465th meeting on 20 March 1969, the six-Power draft resolution was adopted by 13 votes in favour to none against, with two abstentions (France and the United Kingdom) (resolution 264 (1969)).*

### C. Subsequent communications to the Council

623. On 14 May the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report (S/9204) in pursuance of resolution 264 (1969). The report indicated that the Secretary-General had transmitted the text of the resolution by cable to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of South Africa on 20 March, and on 25 March by *notes verbales* to all States Mem-

bers of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies. As of 14 May, the Secretary-General had received seven simple acknowledgements of his communications, as well as substantive replies from Japan, Kuwait and South Africa, which were annexed to his report. In his reply dated 30 April, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of South Africa recalled his communication to the Secretary-General of 27 March 1968. Annexed to the letter was a statement made by him in the South African Senate on 20 March 1969, reiterating his position that United Nations efforts to terminate South Africa's administration of South West Africa (Namibia) was illegal and defending South Africa's actions in that Territory. Also annexed was an extract from a public address on 21 March by the South African Prime Minister, reiterating South Africa's position that it was prepared to receive a personal representative of the Secretary-General, if it could be assured that factual information put at his disposal would not be ignored, as had happened in the past, and that he was acceptable to both sides.

624. By a letter dated 28 May 1969 (S/9227), addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples transmitted the text of a consensus adopted by the Committee on 22 May 1969. The consensus, *inter alia*, drew the attention of the Security Council to the dangerous situation existing in Namibia as a result of South Africa's continued defiance of the United Nations and expressed the hope that the Council, in accordance with paragraph 8 of its resolution 264 (1969) would meet to determine upon necessary steps or measures, in accordance with the relevant provision of the United Nations Charter, in view of the failure on the part of South Africa to comply with that resolution.

625. By a letter dated 3 July 1969 (S/9313), addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples transmitted the text of a consensus adopted by the Committee on that day. The consensus expressed grave concern at the committing to trial of a further group of nine Namibians on charges under the South African Terrorism Act of 1967, in violation of a number of resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. It urged the Security Council to consider urgently effective steps or measures, in pursuance of its resolutions 245 (1968) and 246 (1968) and, especially, of paragraph 8 of its resolution 264 (1969) and in accordance with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter, in order to obtain the compliance of South Africa with its decisions.

## Chapter 5

### QUESTION CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA: LETTER DATED 6 JUNE 1969 ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF SIXTY MEMBER STATES; REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED IN PURSUANCE OF SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 253 (1968)

#### A. Communications and reports to the Security Council and request for a meeting

626. On 31 July 1968, the President of the Security Council announced (S/8697 and Add.1) that following his very extensive consultations concerning the estab-

lishment of a Committee of the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 20 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, it had been agreed that the members of the Committee would be Algeria, France, India, Paraguay, the



USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States.

627. On 28 August 1968 (S/8786), the Secretary-General submitted his first report to the Security Council, in pursuance of paragraph 19 of resolution 253 (1968), on the progress of the implementation of that resolution. He indicated that on 31 May he had drawn the attention of the Government of the United Kingdom to paragraphs 1, 2, 17 and 21 of the resolution addressed to it as the administering Power for Southern Rhodesia. Annexed to the report was the reply he had received on 19 July enclosing copies of the United Kingdom's Statutory Instrument made on 28 June 1968, implementing certain paragraphs of the resolution. In its reply the United Kingdom stated that it had made the necessary legislative provisions to meet its obligations under resolution 253 (1968).

628. In notes dated 7 June 1968 addressed to all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies, the Secretary-General had drawn attention to paragraph 18 of resolution 253 (1968), which called upon them to report to him by 1 August 1968 on measures taken to implement the resolution. As of 27 August, the Secretary-General had received sixty replies from Governments to his notes of 7 June, the substantive parts of which were reproduced in annex II of the report.

629. Also on 7 June the Secretary-General had addressed letters to the heads of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, drawing attention, in particular, to paragraphs 15, 20 and 22 of resolution 253 (1968). The substantive parts of nine replies received from the heads of specialized agencies were reproduced in annex III of the report. On 7 June the Secretary-General had also addressed a letter to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees drawing his attention to paragraph 15 of the resolution. The substantive part of the High Commissioner's reply was reproduced in annex IV of the report. The same annex contained the substantive parts of the replies to letters addressed by the Secretary-General on 24 June to the OECD, UNIDO, UNICEF, UNCTAD, ECA and UNDP.

630. In ten addenda to his report of 28 August (S/8786/Add.1-10), issued respectively on 25 September, 10 October and 1 and 27 November 1968, and 30 January, 3 and 19 March, 11 April and 6 and 17 June 1969, the Secretary-General submitted the additional replies he had received from Governments. It was indicated in the addenda that on 5 November the Secretary-General had renewed his request for information from those States which had not yet replied to his note of 7 June. Again, on 20 November 1968 and 22 January 1969, the Secretary-General, upon the request of the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968), had issued further appeals to those States which had still not reported to do so without delay and invited all Member States and members of the specialized agencies to provide information of any further measures taken by them since their last reports.

631. In a letter dated 18 September 1968 (S/8821), the representative of the United Kingdom, recalling that in Security Council resolution 221 (1966) of 9 April 1966, his Government was called upon to prevent, by the use of force if necessary, the arrival at Beira of vessels reasonably believed to be carrying oil destined for Rhodesia, considered it advisable to remind all Member States of those provisions in order to ensure that the masters of vessels and the operating companies gave advance notification to any United

Kingdom diplomatic or consular mission of a proposed call at Beira by an oil tanker.

632. By a letter dated 14 November 1968 (S/8897), the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council the text of General Assembly resolution 2383 (XXIII), adopted on 7 November 1968, on the question of Southern Rhodesia. In paragraph 9 of that resolution, the General Assembly drew the attention of the Security Council to the urgent necessity of applying the following measures envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter: "(a) The scope of the sanctions should be widened further to include all the measures laid down in Article 41 of the Charter with respect to the illegal racist régime in Southern Rhodesia; (b) Sanctions should be imposed on South Africa and Portugal, the Governments of which have blatantly refused to carry out the mandatory decisions of the Security Council".

633. By a letter dated 6 December (S/8920) to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics transmitted the text of a statement by the Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union (TASS) on the question of Southern Rhodesia which referred to talks that had taken place in October 1968 between the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Wilson, and the head of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, Mr. Smith. TASS stated that the published reports of the talks had shown clearly that their aim was to legalize the power of the racist white minority at the expense of the 4 million people of Zimbabwe, the indigenous population of the country. In spite of previous declarations of not dealing with the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom was, in fact, maintaining continuous contact with the Smith régime and had obviously handled the matter in such a way as to prevent any effective steps to put an end to that régime.

634. On 30 December 1968 the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) submitted to the Security Council its first report (S/8954). After noting the failure of a number of Member States of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies to report to the Secretary-General on measures taken by them to implement resolution 253 (1968), the report stated that the Committee had requested the Secretary-General to issue further appeals to those States which had not yet replied to do so without delay and to seek information on any further measures taken by those who had already reported.

635. At the request of the Committee, the report continued, the Secretariat undertook to prepare a statistical analysis to assist the Committee to identify possible violations of sanctions and to reveal areas where further information was necessary. The Committee also requested the Statistical Office to provide consolidated figures for world trade in the years immediately preceding and following the unilateral declaration of independence and, more particularly, following adoption of Security Council resolutions 232 (1966) and 253 (1968), concentrating on commodities in which Southern Rhodesia had traditionally traded on a substantial scale and showing, as far as possible, what changes had taken place in the pattern of international trade as a result of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The note prepared by the Secretariat and the relevant statistical tables were reproduced in annex I of the Committee's report to the Security Council.

636. The Committee, having particular regard to paragraph 21 of resolution 253 (1968), had requested the United Kingdom to provide the Committee with any information it might receive in order to make the sanctions more fully effective. In reply, the representative of the United Kingdom had transmitted to the Committee notes relating to tobacco certificates and television material, trade in tobacco and chrome sand, airlines which operated to or from Southern Rhodesia or linked up with airlines registered in Southern Rhodesia, and continuing consular and trade representation in Southern Rhodesia. Those notes were communicated to Governments concerned for their comments. On 29 November, the representative of the United Kingdom transmitted a note containing his Government's assessment of the effects of sanctions on the economy of Southern Rhodesia up to mid-1968. The note was reproduced in annex III of the report of the Committee.

637. The Committee then stated that the statistical data then available covered mainly the first half of 1968 and that much more data for the second half of 1968 were essential in order to analyse the effectiveness of the implementation of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). The trade of Southern Rhodesia had remained substantial in mid-1968, despite the Security Council resolutions of 1965 and 1966, because resolution 232 (1966) had called on States to cease trade with that territory only in certain commodities and because some States had continued to trade with Southern Rhodesia in contravention of that resolution. The data contained in the annexes of the report indicated that, besides South Africa and Portugal, there were some countries which had continued to trade with Southern Rhodesia. The Committee decided to investigate further the nature and quantum of that trade and to submit in later reports its findings on the extent to which it was in violation of the sanctions.

638. The Committee's report further stated that all available evidence indicated that South Africa had become the main trading partner of Southern Rhodesia. South Africa's imports from Southern Rhodesia had amounted to about \$80 million in 1967 and its exports to Southern Rhodesia to about \$160 million. The preliminary data for January-March 1968 also indicated that South Africa's exports to Southern Rhodesia must have been expanded during the first half of 1968.

639. Contrary to the provisions of the International Convention relating to Economic Statistics, South Africa had adopted the practice of showing a single aggregate for trade with African countries which did not disclose the individual countries of origin or destination. It had neither replied to the inquiries from the Secretary-General concerning measures taken by it to implement the provisions of Security Council resolutions 232 (1966) and 253 (1968) nor responded to his request to all States on 13 January 1967 to supply information on trade with Southern Rhodesia and on trade in certain commodities.

640. The Committee noted further that Portugal had failed to take any measures to implement resolutions 232 (1966) and 253 (1968) and had permitted free flow of goods to and from Southern Rhodesia. Portugal's trade statistics for the first half of 1968 indicated imports from Southern Rhodesia of commodities prohibited by resolution 232 (1966).

641. The Committee then pointed out that the statistics of reporting countries in certain cases had failed

to distinguish Southern Rhodesia as a country of destination of exports or as a country of provenance of imports. The Committee therefore decided to request the Secretariat to prepare a list of countries which had been trading with Southern Rhodesia but which had ceased to furnish current relevant statistics with a view to the matter being taken up with the Governments concerned.

642. As available information had indicated a gap of about \$80 million in 1967 between exports reported by the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia and the corresponding world trade, which might be accounted for partly by stocks of tobacco held in bond, the Committee decided to request the Secretary-General to seek information from all States on quantities of tobacco from Southern Rhodesia held in bond in their countries.

643. On 27 January 1969, the President announced (S/8697/Add.1) that owing to the expiry of India's term of office on the Security Council, it had been agreed that Pakistan should replace India as a member of the Committee.

644. On 6 June, a letter (S/9237 and Add.1-2) was addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of the following sixty Member States: Afghanistan, Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia. They requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to examine the situation in Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). The letter stated that for various reasons, in particular because of the lack of co-operation on the part of several Member States, notably South Africa and Portugal, the comprehensive mandatory sanctions imposed by Security Council resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968 had failed to bring about the desired result. The illegal racist minority régime continued to strengthen its authority over the Territory and its population and was contemplating new measures designed to formalize the system of *apartheid* already in operation in the territory. The rapid deterioration in the situation and the refusal of the United Kingdom to act in an appropriate manner—namely, to resort to the use of force—had created a serious situation which constituted an increasing threat to international peace and security. The sixty Governments requested the Council to take more energetic measures within the framework of Chapter VII of the Charter so that the people of Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) could exercise their right to self-determination in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

645. By a letter dated 10 June (S/9244) the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples transmitted the text of a resolution on the question of Southern Rhodesia adopted on that date by the Special Committee, in which the Special Committee drew the Council's attention to the gravity of the situation arising from the intensification of suppressive

activities against the people of Zimbabwe and from the danger of aggression against neighbouring States, which it said constituted a threat to international peace and security, as well as to the urgent necessity of applying the certain measures envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter.

646. On 12 June 1969 the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968 submitted to the Security Council the Committee's second report (S/9252 and Add.1), covering its work since the submission of its first report on 30 December 1968. In the course of twelve meetings, as well as through consultations by the Chairman with its members, the Committee, in pursuance of the tasks assigned to it by the Security Council, had dealt with the following: (a) examined the reports (S/8786 and Add.1-10) on the implementation of the resolution submitted by the Secretary-General; (b) considered the information provided by Member States of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies in response to requests by the Committee made through the Secretary-General on a number of matters relating to trade with Southern Rhodesia, on airlines operating to and from Southern Rhodesia, and on consular trade representation; (c) examined information on immigration into Southern Rhodesia made available by the Secretariat at the request of the Committee; (d) considered the detailed trade statistics of Southern Rhodesia for 1968, together with an analysis thereof prepared by the Secretariat and a note by the United Kingdom containing its assessment of the effects of the sanctions on the Southern Rhodesian economy and the outlook for 1969; and (e) devoted considerable attention to investigating a number of specific cases of suspected violations of the sanctions decided upon in resolution 253 (1968).

647. The Committee noted in its report that although the majority of States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies had reported taking measures to comply with the decision of the Security Council, certain States were either not complying at all or not yet complying fully with the measures imposed by the Security Council. On the basis of the facts available to it, the Committee stated that the Governments of South Africa and Portugal had not taken any measures to implement the provisions of resolution 253 (1968), had continued to maintain close economic, trade and other relations with the illegal régime and had permitted the free flow of goods from Southern Rhodesia through the territories of South Africa and the colony of Mozambique and their ports and transport facilities.

648. The Committee also noted that the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia had been carrying on trade with countries other than South Africa and Portugal in contravention of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council and that that illegal trade had amounted to approximately £44 million in 1968. The Committee believed that the halting of that trade would greatly increase the effectiveness of the sanctions and that by the exercise of greater vigilance and the application of more stringent requirements with regard to documents in the case of suspected transactions, much could be done by the States complying with sanctions to interrupt the flow of covert trade. In the light of the information available to it in the course of its investigation of the specific cases of suspected violations of the resolution, the Committee believed further that many States had not taken all possible measures to

prevent their nationals from engaging in activities to promote the export of goods of Southern Rhodesian origin and the import into Southern Rhodesia of goods needed by the illegal régime or the use of ships and aircraft of their registration or under charter to their nationals.

649. The Committee further stated that, as a result of the refusal of South Africa and Portugal to take measures in accordance with the Council's decisions and the failure of some other States to implement fully the provisions of resolution 253 (1968), it was compelled to observe that the sanctions established by that resolution against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia had not yet brought about the desired results. The Committee therefore felt that consideration should be given to more effective measures to ensure full implementation of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

## **B. Consideration by the Council at its 1475th to 1481st meetings (held between 13 June and 24 June)**

650. The letter dated 6 June 1969 from sixty Member States (S/9237 and Add.1-2) concerning Southern Rhodesia was included in the agenda of the 1475th meeting of the Security Council on 13 June.

651. At the request of Algeria the two reports (S/8954 and S/9252 and Add.1) of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) were also included in the agenda.

652. At the 1475th meeting of the Security Council on 13 June, the representative of Algeria said that a new examination of the problem of Southern Rhodesia seemed indispensable in order to evaluate the consequences of a policy which obviously had failed and also to decide upon new measures necessitated by a dangerous situation that was becoming progressively uncontrollable. Instead of facing insurmountable difficulties as a result of the Security Council's adoption of resolution 253 (1968), the illegal régime in Salisbury was on the verge of a new reaffirmation of its racist character in putting its draft constitution to a referendum. The ineffectiveness of the policy of economic sanctions was due to a large extent to the fact that Rhodesia had sources of supply offered by its allies, South Africa and Portugal, through Mozambique. Obviously, the sealing off of the Rhodesian frontiers could be ensured only if those import and export routes were closed or if the economic sanctions could be extended to the allies of Rhodesia. Since such a measure did not seem likely to obtain the agreement of those States that had important economic relations with South Africa and Portugal, the policy of economic sanctions was bound to fail. The administering Power, while proclaiming its will and desire to re-establish the situation in Rhodesia, was not applying means and measures that could lead to that end. It had refused constantly to resort to the determined measures urged by the African countries to put an end to the Ian Smith rebellion. The Security Council, which had all the necessary means to carry out a more energetic action, should do so with all the determination required by the situation and by bringing to bear its entire authority to ensure stricter application of its decisions.

653. The representative of Zambia said that the basic issue in Southern Rhodesia was the existence there of an illegal racist minority régime which was denying the majority of the people of Zimbabwe the right to self-determination. The main goal was to

remove that régime and to bring about the effective application of the principles of self-determination. To the surprise of nobody, the sanctions had failed. As long as South Africa and Portugal were determined to frustrate the sanctions, there was not the slightest chance of success. In the face of that defiance, the obvious course would be to extend the mandatory sanctions against those two countries. In order to succeed in Rhodesia the Council must be prepared to apply the provisions of Articles 41 and 42 of Chapter VII of the Charter. If, for some reason, Portugal and South Africa would not co-operate with the United Nations, and certain members were not prepared for a confrontation with them, the alternative would be to use force in Rhodesia. The United Kingdom had failed so far to use the only means by which it could bring down the illegal régime. However, in the face of the failure of the sanctions, no other choice was left.

654. The representative of Senegal said that the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia was able to defy the decisions of the organs of the United Nations because of the complacency of certain great Powers. Recent developments in Southern Rhodesia had shown that use of force was the only means by which the illegal régime could be put to an end and the Zimbabwe people enabled to exercise their right to self-determination. It would not be the first time the United Kingdom would be using force against one of its colonies, if it were to decide to do so. The representative of Senegal added that with each passing day the *apartheid* system was being strengthened further in Southern Rhodesia. The same detestable kind of torture used in South Africa was being employed in Southern Rhodesia, thousands of people were being detained in uninhabitable camps and, despite the decisions of the trust authorities, the illegal régime was still executing freedom fighters. It was time, he said, that Great Britain showed greater firmness and by every possible means, including the use of force, put an end to the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia.

655. The representative of the United Kingdom said that the Council was faced with a new development in Southern Rhodesia. The minority régime there had called for a referendum on 20 June 1969 in which only the minority in Southern Rhodesia would vote. The Council must act in unity and condemn the limitation of the referendum to a minority and the proposals for a new constitution. Nearly every clause of the proposed constitution disclosed racial discrimination and racial repression. Its provisions aimed at entrenching for ever the positions of the minority. There was no judicial safeguard to the so-called declaration of rights in the proposed constitution and no possibility of challenge by the courts to any legislation adopted by the minority-dominated parliament. The Council must call on all States, as it did in 1965, to refuse to recognize the illegal régime in every form. Such action should be taken prior to the referendum called for by the minority régime so as to have the maximum effect. As regards subsequent action, his Government, which already had begun consultations with Commonwealth Governments would wish also to consult other Governments, particularly African Governments. It was resolved to pursue steadily the current course of denying recognition and maintaining sanctions against the illegal régime. Keeping in mind the interests of all people of southern Africa, the most important principle was that no settlement should be accepted

which was not approved by the people of Rhodesia as a whole.

656. The representative of Pakistan said that the question before the Council was whether or not the sanctions imposed under resolution 253 (1968) had been effective, and, if not, how they could be reinforced by other possible measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. Thus, the issue before the Council was predominantly of an executive nature. It concerned the action that the Council could take against the illegal régime which had defied sanctions and had thrown a challenge to the entire international community by planning a constitution aimed at perpetrating the domination of the small white minority and the system of *apartheid*. His delegation would urge the Council to condemn the impending so-called referendum and to rule that any verdict in favour of the so-called constitution would be null and void. It should then proceed to the consideration of further measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to strengthen and reinforce the sanctions in order to end the settler régime and to remove the threat to peace. The economic sanctions so far had failed to make any decisive impact on the economy of Rhodesia principally because of the defiant attitude of South Africa and Portugal. It was the view of his delegation that unless the Security Council turned its attention to consideration of extending the sanctions to South Africa and Portugal, at least in respect of the major commodities imported and exported by Rhodesia, the sanctions would not succeed. It was essential that all the twelve countries which had continued to maintain consular representation should withdraw it without delay. His delegation would also urge that ways and means be devised forthwith to stop the inflow of capital into Rhodesia. The United Kingdom had a solemn responsibility under its constitutional law and the Charter of the United Nations to quell the racist minority rebellion in Southern Rhodesia by all necessary means without exception. With its long experience of an imperial role, it should have known that armed rebellion could not be confronted by argument and persuasion.

657. The representative of the United States said that the referendum on the proposed constitution in Southern Rhodesia would be voted upon not by an electorate representative of the 4.5 million people of the Territory, but by some 90,000 voters, nine tenths of whom were white, in a country whose population was about 95 per cent black. The provisions on franchise and on the composition and powers of the legislature were written to assure that the decisive political power would remain for ever in white hands. Its provisions of land tenure stipulated that the European and African areas were to be approximately equal in size, if not in quality, meaning the same quantity of land for the 5 per cent whites as for the 95 per cent blacks. A chapter entitled "Declaration of Rights" explicitly authorized, among other things, preventive detention, restriction of individuals without bail or trial, the power to require an accused person to testify against himself and censorship of broadcasting, newspapers and other publications. The deliberate aim of the new constitutional proposals, conceived in racism, was clearly to render the attainment of political equality by members of the black majority for ever impossible. The political significance of those proposals was a matter of grave concern. The Salisbury authorities seemed literally to see all events in terms of black against white and to perceive no alternative except

that one must dominate the other. If this were to become the ruling principle of political life in Africa, the destiny of that continent would be tragic. The Council could not but condemn the referendum before it took place and renew its condemnation of the régime itself. Members of the Council could then consult about future steps to be taken with regard to Southern Rhodesia.

658. At the 1476th meeting, also held on 13 June, the representative of France said that his delegation had always considered that the responsibility for putting an end to the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia belonged to the administering Power, and in that respect France, from the very beginning, had been ready to give every assistance to the United Kingdom. At the same time, France often had expressed its doubts regarding the consequences that might follow from an intervention by the United Nations in a matter which clearly fell within the competence of a Member State. In spite of those concerns, however, France had not dissociated itself from the Security Council action against Rhodesia. It had scrupulously complied with the economic sanctions decided by the Council in its resolution 253 (1968). Even in the current situation, France, without setting aside its position of principle with regard to the competence of the United Nations, would be willing to join the unanimous condemnation of the draft constitution proposed by the illegal Salisbury régime and to participate in an appeal to all States not to recognize the authority of that régime. France was also ready to consider any realistic and effective proposal likely to remedy the existing situation.

659. The representative of Nepal said that although the matter of the constitutional referendum proposed by the illegal régime was important, the Council should not lose sight of the fact that that was but one aspect of the broader question of Southern Rhodesia which portended the risk of a prolonged and bitter racial conflict, not only involving the whole of southern Africa but the rest of the world. The issues involved in that question were such as affected the very existence of human beings everywhere. Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal had formed a triangle of unholy alliance whose purpose was to perpetuate colonialism, racism and discrimination in the whole of southern Africa. His delegation would strongly urge immediate adoption of all measures envisaged under Article 41 and the extension of the sanctions to South Africa and Portugal who, in violation of Article 25 of the Charter, had openly provided cover for Southern Rhodesian imports and exports. It was the firm and consistent view of the Nepalese delegation that the administering Power had the primary responsibility to take all necessary measures, including the use of force, to end the rebel régime and to ensure self-determination for the people of Southern Rhodesia.

660. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the plans of the Southern Rhodesian racists were not limited only to political inequality and the deprivation of all rights of the indigenous African population but extended to perpetuating the economic bondage and the shameless exploitation of the wealth of the people of Zimbabwe. The birth of that racist régime was the direct consequence of the colonialist policy of the imperialist Powers. The British authorities in 1961 had granted a racist constitution to the exploiting minority in Southern Rhodesia. After that it received an air force, tanks and other armaments which were later used to oppress the

national liberation movement of Zimbabwe. Then, there was the friendly attitude towards that racist régime at the British Commonwealth Conference held in January 1969. It was because of such approval and connivance that the existing situation in Southern Rhodesia had reached a critical stage involving a threat to international peace and security. He stated that some Members of the United Nations apart from South Africa and Portugal had been undermining the measures decided upon by the Security Council. In fact, the United Kingdom and some of its partners in NATO had done nothing to ensure the effective implementation of the Council's resolution on sanctions. The miserly reduction in trade with Southern Rhodesia on the part of Britain and some other Western countries was being more than compensated for by the expansion of their trade with South Africa and Portugal, through which, in fact, trade with the Smith régime was continuing. It was an established fact that the monopolies of the Western countries were continuing to be active in Southern Rhodesia.

661. As regards the proposed constitution, the Soviet delegation would urge the Security Council to reject it decisively as illegal and confirm that until the right of the people of Zimbabwe to self-determination and independence was carried out the situation in that country would continue to constitute a serious threat to international peace and security. The Council must also demand that all States cease economic, trade and military or any other relations with the racist Salisbury régime. The Soviet delegation would also support the recommendation of the General Assembly that the scope of sanctions be expanded with the inclusion of all measures provided for under Article 41 of the Charter against the illegal régime and that sanctions be extended to South Africa and Portugal, whose Governments had openly refused to carry out the mandatory decisions of the Security Council. As administering Power, the United Kingdom must take effective measures to ensure unconditional implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by carrying out in Southern Rhodesia general elections on the basis embodied in the principle of "one man, one vote".

662. The representative of Finland stated that the constitutional proposals to be voted upon on 20 June were clearly as illegal as the régime itself. They were designed to provide a cloak of legality for the continued suppression of the African majority and to perpetuate the supremacy of the white minority. They held no prospect for any political advancement for the African people, but would in fact bar any majority rule for all time. The proposed constitution would be enforced by all the measures of a police state, including arbitrary arrest, preventive detention and censorship of news media. On another level the constitutional proposals claimed to establish an independent republic, and it was obviously the hope of the illegal régime that that would lead to international recognition of Southern Rhodesia as an independent state. It was therefore essential that the Security Council should unanimously condemn the constitutional proposals and call on all States not to recognize the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. The members of the Security Council, having made clear their attitude to the referendum and to the constitutional proposals, should then agree in consultations on how to proceed. As had been suggested by the Sanctions Committee in its second report, consideration should be given to more effective measures to

ensure full implementation of resolution 253. For that purpose the report of the Committee as well as its annexes should be thoroughly studied by Governments. Although the policy of sanctions was evolving slowly, and had obvious deficiencies, that should not lead Member States to underestimate the historic significance of the unanimous decision by the Security Council to apply universal and total economic sanctions, not to stop aggression in a classical sense of the word, an aggression of one State against another, for which the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter were originally intended, but to stop what might be called aggression against human rights committed by one race against another. As a result of the United Nations action, the illegal régime, although surviving in an economic sense, had otherwise become an outcast with no hope of ever gaining international recognition. The Council should make efforts to reach agreement on further practical and effective means to achieve the desired objective in Southern Rhodesia.

663. The representative of Colombia said that the Council should proceed without delay to condemn the terms of the planned constitutional referendum in Southern Rhodesia, without prejudice to the fact that as soon as possible, it should examine and decide upon further measures to re-establish the rule of law concerning all aspects of life in Southern Rhodesia.

664. The representative of Spain said that his delegation considered the question of the referendum in Southern Rhodesia as most serious. Not only did it imply arbitrary and illegal application of a constitutional form, but it appeared to be intended to legalize a situation and consolidate it simply on the basis of that so-called referendum. Spain was greatly concerned at seeing the constant deterioration of the situation, which was not combated with sufficient effectiveness by the Administering Authority. As long as that Authority remained responsible, legally, for the Territory it must continue to adopt all forms of measures to complement the decisions of the United Nations. His delegation believed that in the circumstances there were two main issues among the many problems which were afflicting the world situation; one was the use of imported populations to replace indigenous inhabitants and to perpetuate odious situations, and the other was the ability of the United Nations Organization to ensure respect for its own resolutions and decisions. Without ensuring that respect, all efforts of the United Nations, whether in Rhodesia or elsewhere, would fail.

665. The representative of Hungary said that it was clear that the road charted by the United Kingdom to meet the challenge of the Smith régime had completely failed. Instead of using force to subdue the rebellion, the administering Power through the policy of piecemeal sanctions, had reduced the Security Council to the role of passive on-looker and thus helped the Smith régime to gain precious time to strengthen its domination, reinforce the system of *de facto apartheid* prevailing in the Territory and, finally, prepare for the codification of such a system. The resulting situation required determined action by the Security Council and by the administering Power.

666. The representative of China said that the first order of business before the Council was to condemn the projected referendum and constitution in the strongest terms possible. The world community could not be satisfied until the illegal régime was overthrown and the indigenous inhabitants were enabled to exercise their right to self-determination. Until then, the respon-

sibility of the United Nations would continue. The mandatory sanctions embodied in resolution 253 (1968) having produced no decisive impact, consideration must be given as to how that resolution could be supplemented by more effective measures.

667. The President, speaking as the representative of Paraguay, said that the acts which the illegal régime was about to take deserved unreserved condemnation and should be declared null and void. His delegation was ready to hold whatever consultations might be necessary to give shape to an opinion that would express the views of the Council and, particularly, of the international community. He trusted that the international community would be able to expedite the delayed hour when the people of Zimbabwe would be able freely and without restriction to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination.

668. At the 1477th meeting on 17 June, the representatives of Mauritania, the United Republic of Tanzania, Guinea and Somalia were invited at their request to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

669. At the outset of the meeting, the President made the following statement:

"In the debate on the question under consideration, so far all members of the Security Council have expressed their views. In the course of their statements, the members of the Security Council unanimously regarded the proposed referendum that the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia is planning to hold on 20 June as illegal, considered that the so-called constitutional proposals are invalid, and declared that any constitution promulgated by the régime of the racist minority could have no legal effect.

"In view of the continuing danger to international peace and security presented by the situation in Southern Rhodesia, the Council will now continue its consideration of this question."

670. The representative of Mauritania stated that the referendum was an affront to African dignity, an affront which everyone valuing justice must condemn. And yet the proposed referendum was only one of the aspects of the Rhodesian problem. It was absolutely necessary that the condemnation of that act should not replace the duty and responsibility of the Security Council to find adequate means to confront the illegal and inhuman acts of the white minority in Southern Rhodesia. The Security Council, while reaffirming its condemnation of the régime imposed by the racist minority, must also strongly ensure the implementation of the sanctions already decided upon and should extend them to South Africa and Portugal. It should also stress the heavy responsibility which was incumbent upon the United Kingdom as administering Power in the question of Southern Rhodesia.

671. The representative of Tanzania said that the United Kingdom had consistently failed to protect the rights of the African people of Southern Rhodesia and appeared to be abdicating its legal and political responsibilities in that country. Apart from calling upon the United Kingdom to discharge its responsibilities and to use force to end the minority rebellion, the Council must also impose full economic sanctions, a military blockade of sanction-breaking ports and use the United Nations troops to enforce sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. The scope of sanctions against Rhodesia should be widened to include all measures provided for in Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter. Furthermore,

the Council should extend those sanctions to South Africa and Portugal as well.

672. The representative of Guinea said that in South Africa, in the Portuguese colonies of Angola and Mozambique and in Southern Rhodesia, the premises of a new colonial policy to replace the former colonial systems were being set out. He stated that in the tragic situation prevailing in Africa, the primordial responsibility lay with the United Kingdom. If the latter refused to assume its responsibilities, the Council should remind it of them. He appealed to all Powers to sever all relations of any kind with Southern Rhodesia. No economic sanctions could be effective unless they were applied to South Africa and Portugal. The Organization still had time to act before it was too late.

673. The representative of Somalia said that in the view of his delegation the Council should: (a) reaffirm the determination of the United Nations to defend with all the resources at its command the political, social and economic rights of peoples when those rights were in jeopardy; (b) recognize that the steps taken so far deal with the situation in Southern Rhodesia had been inadequate and needed to be reinforced; and (c) decide to take further measures commensurate with the demands of the situation. The problem of Southern Rhodesia, which was a component part of the general problem of colonialism and imperialism in southern Africa, had challenged many of the fundamental principles upon which the United Nations was based. His delegation felt that the continued failure of the United Nations to meet that challenge in a forthright manner indicated that it was at a dangerous cross-road. In southern Africa the United Nations was committed to a course of action but had been unable to carry that through to a logical conclusion because of the conflict between its decisions and the economic and other interests of powerful Member States.

674. At the 1478th meeting on 18 June, the representatives of India, Sudan and Saudi Arabia also were invited, at their request, to participate in the debate without the right to vote.

675. The representative of India stated that although the United Kingdom had continued to claim responsibility for restoring legality in Zambabwe, it had so far been unable to bring down the illegal Smith régime and punish those responsible for that rebellion. The fact constituted the most outstanding among the main features of the problem before the Council. It was quite obvious that the sanctions, as currently applied, had proved ineffective. The confrontation was not merely with the Smith régime but with a collusive and offensive pact and philosophy forged by Mr. Smith, together with South Africa and Portugal, who should be treated on the same basis. Apart from condemning the proposed constitution, the Council must also extend most stringent and extensive sanctions against the Smith régime, South Africa and Portugal. It should also make it clear that if the Smith régime were to refuse to accept a civilized coexistence with Africans, the Council would use force to the extent necessary in terms of Article 42 of the Charter. Those measures should not inhibit the United Kingdom from taking such other steps it might consider necessary to carry out its pledge of no independence before majority African rule and to bring an end to the rebellion of the Smith régime.

676. The representative of Sudan said that it was incumbent on the Council to try to prevent the racial confrontation which seemed inevitable in southern

Africa. The economic sanctions, as they had been applied to Southern Rhodesia, had failed. The United Nations would have to bear a heavy responsibility if it were to decide once again on mere condemnation, which offered no solace to the oppressed people of Africa. Articles 41 and 42 alone contained the measures which could be considered adequate to meet the situation. The Security Council should pursue that course because its objective would not be achieved by any other means short of use of force.

677. The representative of Saudi Arabia said that what was most needed in the Council was creative thinking that could be translated into action. Financial and other considerations had made any settlement of the Southern Rhodesian question very difficult. As the United Kingdom was not willing, or was not in a position, to use force to solve the problem, it was necessary that new creative action should be taken by the Council. In the opinion of his delegation, the United Nations should create a fund, financed by those directly concerned, for the purpose of wide publicity, including broadcasts and dropping leaflets and pamphlets, advising the indigenous people of Africa about their human rights and telling the white population that they were alienating themselves from the rest of the world by practising *apartheid*. Subsequently, a corps provided by the member States of the Organization of African Unity should see to it that there was a cordon around Southern Rhodesia to make sure that no goods were transported. Should those measures fail, then, with the permission of the United Kingdom, the two great Powers and any other Powers concerned, in co-operation with certain African States, could take steps to seize and remove the leaders of the illegal régime.

678. The representative of Algeria referred to the two reports (S/8954 and S/9252 and Add.1) submitted to the Council by the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). Those reports, he stated, showed the extent to which the Smith régime had been strengthened through the assistance of certain member States, particularly South Africa and Portugal. In fact, those two countries were deliberately continuing to defy the decisions of the Security Council. The Council must therefore take steps to put an end to such a provocative stand by applying sanctions against them.

679. At the 1479th meeting on 19 June, the following joint draft resolution (S/9270/Rev.1) was submitted by Algeria, Nepal, Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling and reaffirming its resolutions 216 (1965) of 12 November 1965, 217 (1965) of 20 November 1965, 221 (1966) of 9 April 1966, 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966 and 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968,*

*"Reaffirming in particular its resolution 232 (1966) in which it determined that the situation in Southern Rhodesia constitutes a threat to international peace and security,*

*"Taking into account reports of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/8954 and S/9252),*

*"Gravely concerned that the measures so far taken have failed to resolve the situation in Southern Rhodesia,*

"*Gravely concerned further* that the measures taken by the Security Council have not been fully complied with by all States,

"*Noting* that the Governments of the Republic of South Africa and Portugal, in particular, in contravention of their obligation under Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations, have not only carried on trade with the illegal racist minority régime of Southern Rhodesia contrary to the terms of Security Council resolutions 232 (1966) and 253 (1968) but have, in fact, given active assistance to that régime, enabling it to counter the effects of measures decided upon by the Security Council,

"*Affirming* the primary responsibility of the Government of the United Kingdom to enable the people of Zimbabwe (Southern Rhodesia) to exercise their right of self-determination and independence,

"*Reaffirming* its recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of Zimbabwe (Southern Rhodesia) for freedom and independence,

"*Acting* under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

"1. *Emphasizes* the responsibility of the Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, for the situation that prevails in Southern Rhodesia and condemns the so-called constitutional proposals of the illegal racist minority régime aimed at perpetuating its power and sanctioning the system of *apartheid* in Southern Rhodesia;

"2. *Urges* the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, to take urgently all necessary measures, including the use of force, to bring an end to the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia and enable the people of Zimbabwe (Southern Rhodesia) to exercise their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV);

"3. *Decides* that all States shall sever immediately all economic and other relations with the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia, including railway, maritime, air transport, postal, telephonic and wireless communications and other means of communication;

"4. *Censures* the assistance given by the Governments of Portugal and South Africa to the illegal racist minority régime in defiance of resolutions of the Security Council;

"5. *Decides* that Member States and members of the specialized agencies shall carry out the measures dealing with imports and exports envisaged in resolution 253 (1968) and in the present resolution against the Republic of South Africa and the Portuguese colony of Mozambique;

"6. *Calls upon* all Member States and members of the specialized agencies to carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations;

"7. *Calls upon* Member States and, in particular, those with primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security to assist effectively in the implementation of the measures called for by the present resolution;

"8. *Urges* all States to render moral and material assistance to the national liberation movements of Zimbabwe (Southern Rhodesia) in order to enable them to achieve their freedom and independence;

"9. *Requests* all States to report to the Secretary-General on the measures taken to implement the present resolution;

"10. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the progress of the implementation of this resolution."

680. The representative of Algeria, introducing the above draft resolution on behalf of its five co-sponsors, said that the course of action recommended in the operative portion of the draft resolution proceeded from three principal points: (a) the sanctions previously decided upon by the Council having failed, the Council should agree on effective measures involving complete and mandatory sanctions; (b) other measures should be taken to forestall all activities aimed at hindering the efforts of the Council; (c) the United Kingdom as the administering Power had the duty to take all necessary action to put an end to the minority régime and to make it possible for the people of Zimbabwe to exercise their right to self-determination.

681. The representative of Nepal said that the draft resolution reflected views expressed during the current debate on Southern Rhodesia. The report of the sanctions Committee and the debate in the Council had left no doubt whatsoever about the failure of the measures taken and about the reasons for that failure. The African and Asian representatives had pointed out the risk of a bitter and prolonged racial conflict if the current situation continued. To ward off that danger it was essential for the Council to take adequate measures and put an end to the prevailing policies of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia.

682. The representative of the United Kingdom said that he wished to deal with the question of using force against Rhodesia. Many had wondered whether the British army could invade that country or if an embargo and a naval blockade of all southern Africa could be mounted. He recalled that since 1923, when Rhodesia was first formed as a self-governing colony, there had never been a British army there or any British official in administrative authority. The question, therefore, was not one of merely deciding to adopt a new local policy or of taking local action in order to maintain order as the British Government did in other colonies it was administering. The actual question was of an invasion and of starting a war. Once force was used, escalation could easily ensue, and the results of such violent action were always incalculable.

683. As regards the question of extending the sanctions to South Africa and Portugal, it was a question upon which his Government had never failed to make its position clear. Quoting from a statement he had made in the Special Political Committee in 1965 with reference to the possibility of imposing full economic sanctions against South Africa, the representative of the United Kingdom said that because of the legal, financial and economic, as well as the political considerations, it was impossible for his Government to go beyond the arms embargo that it had already imposed. Moreover, his Government felt that a full campaign of economic sanctions backed by a blockade would require resources beyond the current capacity of the United Nations itself. Those considerations were still valid in 1969 and his country was not better placed to face military and economic wars at the current time than it had been in 1965. Improvement of its international trade was still absolutely vital to the United Kingdom.



684. As regards the question of whether the economic sanctions against Rhodesia should be continued and, if possible, intensified, the representative of the United Kingdom recalled a statement by his Foreign Secretary that the British Government must resolve to pursue steadily the course taken of denying recognition and maintaining sanctions against the illegal régime which was denying human rights. In the opinion of the United Kingdom Government the pressure on the illegal régime should be intensified, and it would be ready to consider with other members of the Council what further measures in that respect could be taken to make that policy more effective.

685. At the 1480th meeting on 23 June, the representative of Burundi was invited, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

686. The representative of Finland, referring to the reports of the sanctions Committee, said that while it was obvious that the policy of South Africa and Portugal had been causing the greatest damage to the system of sanctions, the reports showed that other States also had been carrying on trade with Southern Rhodesia. The estimate mentioned of illegal trade amounted to approximately £44 million in 1968. The reports had suggested a number of steps that could be taken by States complying with Security Council resolution 253 (1968) to increase the effectiveness of the sanctions and thus to stop that illegal trade. In view of the relatively simple structure of Southern Rhodesian exports, it should also be worth exploring whether it would not be possible to agree on ways and means designed to interrupt or at least appreciably cut down the export of certain key commodities from Southern Rhodesia through South Africa or Mozambique. In the view of his delegation those were the questions that could be examined by members of the Council, who should concentrate on finding more effective measures to ensure full implementation of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) rather than on the far-reaching proposals as contained in the five-Power joint draft resolution, which were bound to divide the Council and consequently remain without practical effect.

687. The representative of Hungary said that it appeared from the debate of the Security Council that world public opinion was demanding further energetic measures to bring self-determination to the oppressed people of Zimbabwe. The measures already taken having proved inadequate, the proposed draft resolution provided for new and resolute measures. If the United Kingdom were to exercise properly its responsibilities and were to take all necessary measures, including the use of force, to bring an end to the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia, there would not be any need for further United Nations action. If the United Kingdom were unable to take appropriate action, the Security Council would be left with no alternative but to adopt measures to meet the situation adequately. The United Kingdom delegation often had appealed for unity in the Council with regard to its action on Southern Rhodesia. The Council, however, should seek unity not on the basis of expedience but to advance the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

688. The representative of Burundi said that since the road of conciliation adopted by the United Kingdom had led to an impasse, the adequate solution must be sought in force. He said that the apostles of the deification of the white race were planning the re-absorption of all southern Africa. Because of the profits that they derived, certain circles and their Govern-

ments had close ties with the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia. However, those benefits would be short-lived because the *apartheid* system could not escape the liberation movement which was taking hold of the whole world.

689. At the 1481st meeting on 24 June, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that his delegation would have preferred to see the Council adopt a stronger draft resolution than the one before it. The provision of paragraph 5 should have referred to Portugal itself and not merely to its colony, Mozambique. Some provisions of the draft resolution called upon all States, not only States Members of the United Nations, to carry out the obligation to enforce the sanctions. In fact, appeals by the Security Council for the implementation of such decisions must be addressed also in all other substantial provisions to all States without exception and not only to States Members of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency. As a whole, the draft resolution was acceptable to his delegation. Approval of that draft would be of importance for the implementation of the Security Council's decisions and the resolutions of the General Assembly directed against the racist régime of Southern Rhodesia and for assisting the people of Zimbabwe in their just struggle for independence.

690. The representative of Spain said that his delegation had serious objections to the draft resolution, as it could not agree that the main thrust of the proposed measures was of a discriminatory nature. The United Kingdom, which had a special responsibility, was only asked to do one thing or the other, but the Council would be deciding that other States should immediately adopt certain measures. Moreover, instead of separating the responsibilities among various States, the proposed draft should have concentrated on what was required of the United Kingdom in order to protect the interests of the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory. He said that if a separate vote was allowed to be taken on the sixth preambular paragraph, beginning with the words: "Noting that", and on operative paragraphs 4 and 5, his delegation would be able to vote for the draft resolution.

691. The representative of China said that his delegation's views were, in large measure, reflected in the draft resolution. However, it had some reservations with regard to paragraph 5 and was not convinced that commercial relations with Rhodesia had been maintained only by the two countries named in that paragraph; nor was it satisfied that the extension of sanctions to those two countries was the most effective way of overthrowing the illegal régime.

692. The President stated that the sponsors of the joint draft had objected to separate votes on parts of the draft resolution.

**Decision:** *At the 1481st meeting on 24 June the five-Power draft resolution (S/9270/Rev.1) was put to the vote. It received 8 votes in favour (Algeria, China, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Senegal, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Zambia), none against, and 7 abstentions (Colombia, Finland, France, Paraguay, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States) and was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required majority.*

693. The representative of the United Kingdom said he greatly regretted that the members of the Council

had not acted together unanimously and within their clear capacity. He said that his Government would stand by its commitment not to recognize the illegal régime of the racist minority or any of its illegal acts. It would maintain and whenever possible intensify sanctions and would continue its consultations with Commonwealth and other Governments, particularly with African Governments.

694. The representative of Zambia said that his delegation had never been convinced that efforts by the United Nations could succeed unless the United Kingdom, as the Power responsible for Rhodesia, changed its policy. The United Kingdom had treated the rebellion with duplicity. On the one hand it had told the world that it sought to quell the rebellion, while on the other hand it gave the rebel régime assurances of success and survival by stating unambiguously that the use of force against the rebels was out of the question. He rejected the assertion by the representative of the United Kingdom that the use of force by that country against Rhodesia, which was a colony, would be tantamount to an invasion. It was not meaningful to propose intensifying the sanctions when the Council was not prepared to take action against South Africa and Portugal, which were continuing to frustrate those measures. By rejecting the resolution, the Council had chosen to postpone a decision to act in the only way a meaningful solution to the Southern Rhodesian question could be found.

695. The representative of France recalled that his delegation had already, on several occasions, stated the views of his Government concerning the illegal nature of the Salisbury régime. He stated that his country had scrupulously applied the measures adopted in resolution 253 (1968) without, however, abandoning its doubts as regards a somewhat unrealistic enterprise from which the prestige of the United Nations might have emerged reduced. His delegation's concern had only been strengthened by the draft resolution on which he had just abstained, which appeared aimed at declaring economic war on southern Africa as a whole.

696. The representative of Colombia said that if his delegation had felt compelled to abstain on the vote on the draft resolution it was because the use of force constituted a measure of such extreme gravity and of such unforeseeable consequences that it could be adopted

only after all other measures, as recommended by the Charter, had been fully exhausted.

697. The representative of the United States said that the Council had exerted an effective influence on the Rhodesian situation only when it had worked on the basis of unanimity. Although his delegation had found itself in broad agreement with the aims of the draft resolution and agreed fully with many of its provisions, it had objections to some other portions of it. Particularly, it had always maintained that the use of force was not the appropriate way to bring the problem to a solution. Another provision with which his delegation was not in agreement was the extension of economic sanctions to South Africa and Portugal, which would have only introduced additional grave complications into an already complicated situation. Finally, his Government had difficulty with paragraph 3 in view of its traditional policy supporting a free flow of information throughout the world.

698. The representative of Pakistan said that there was no ambiguity in the Council whatsoever regarding the facts of the case or its merits from the point of view of the Charter or of the vital interests of the international community. All had agreed that the dangerous and tragic trend of events in southern Africa must be reversed. Yet there was a lamentable lack of political will to take appropriate measures to meet that situation. National economic interests had supervened. It was necessary, however, that efforts to achieve a just solution of the problem must be continued.

699. The representative of Paraguay said that some of the provisions of the draft resolution had stood in the way of his delegation's casting a positive vote. Although South Africa and Portugal were the countries primarily trading with Southern Rhodesia, they were not the only ones. Moreover, the extension of the sanctions to South Africa and Mozambique was a matter which could be decided only after careful and thorough analysis of such a step. That had not been the case at the moment. There were, however, many roads still open for ensuring universal compliance with the sanctions already adopted in the Council's resolution 253 (1968), and in the light of its two reports he believed that the sanctions Committee should diligently explore those roads.

## Part II

### OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE COUNCIL

#### Chapter 6

##### ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

###### A. Application of Swaziland

700. In a letter dated 6 September 1968 (S/8808) the Prime Minister of Swaziland submitted the application of Swaziland for admission to membership in the United Nations, together with a declaration bearing his signature, accepting the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations.

701. The Security Council considered the application of Swaziland at its 1450th meeting on 11 September. The following draft resolution (S/8810) was submitted by Algeria, Canada, Ethiopia, India, Pakistan, Senegal and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having examined the application of Swaziland for admission to the United Nations (S/8808),*

*"Recommends to the General Assembly that Swaziland be admitted to membership in the United Nations."*

**Decision:** *At the 1450th meeting on 11 September 1968, the draft resolution was adopted unanimously (resolution 257 (1968)).*

###### B. Application of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea

702. In a letter dated 25 October 1968 (S/8883) the President of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea submitted the application of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea for admission to membership in the United Nations, together with a statement bearing his signature, accepting the obligations set out in the United Nations Charter.

703. The Security Council considered the application of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea at its 1458th meeting on 6 November. The following draft resolution was submitted by Algeria, Brazil, Ethiopia, India, Pakistan, Paraguay and Senegal (S/8888):

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having examined the application of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea for admission to the United Nations (S/8883),*

*"Recommends to the General Assembly that the Republic of Equatorial Guinea be admitted to membership in the United Nations."*

**Decision:** *At the 1458th meeting on 6 November 1968, the draft resolution was adopted unanimously (resolution 260 (1968)).*

###### C. Other communication concerning the admission of new Members

704. In a letter dated 14 July 1969 (S/9327), the representative of the United States informed the President of the Security Council that his Government was interested in having the Security Council and its Committee on the Admission of New Members give early consideration to the subject of the so-called micro-States. In that connexion he recalled that the subject had been raised by the United States in December 1967 and that the Secretary-General had made special reference to it in the introduction to his annual reports of 1967 and 1968 (A/6701/Add.1 and A/7201/Add.1). The problems raised by the Secretary-General and his suggestion for a comprehensive study of the criteria for membership in the United Nations with a view to laying down the necessary limitations on full membership for the emerging States that were exceptionally small in area, population and human and economic resources, and, at the same time, defining other forms of association which would benefit both the micro-States and the United Nations, were matters the consideration of which was long overdue, in his Government's opinion. Accordingly, the letter requested the President to initiate appropriate consultations looking towards an early meeting of the Council and its Committee on that subject.

#### Chapter 7

##### **QUESTION OF THE WORKING LANGUAGES OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL: LETTER DATED 9 JANUARY 1969 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL TRANSMITTING THE TEXT OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 2479 (XXIII) OF 21 DECEMBER 1968 (S/8962); NOTE VERBALE DATED 16 JANUARY 1969 FROM THE PERMANENT MISSION OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/8967) AND NOTE VERBALE DATED 16 JANUARY 1969 FROM THE PERMANENT MISSION OF SPAIN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/8968)**

705. In a letter dated 9 January 1969 (S/8962) the Secretary-General transmitted to the President of the Security Council the text of resolution 2479 (XXIII), adopted by the General Assembly on 21 December

1968, in which the Assembly, *inter alia*, considered it desirable to include Russian and Spanish among the working languages of the Security Council.

706. In *notes verbales* addressed to the President

of the Security Council on 16 January (S/8967 and S/8968), the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of Spain, referring to the Secretary-General's letter, requested that a meeting of the Security Council be convened to consider measures that should be adopted in accordance with the provision of the above-mentioned Assembly resolution in so far as it directly affected the Security Council.

707. On 22 January, the delegations of Algeria, Colombia, Hungary, Pakistan, Senegal, Spain, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Zambia submitted a draft resolution (S/8976), which read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having considered the notes of the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations (S/8967) and of the Permanent Mission of Spain to the United Nations (S/8968),*

*"Taking into account General Assembly resolution 2479 (XXIII) of 21 December 1968, which pointed out that the use of several languages by the United Nations could constitute an enrichment and a means of attaining the objectives of the Charter of the United Nations and that the General Assembly considers it desirable to include Russian and Spanish among the working languages of the Security Council,*

*"Decides to include Russian and Spanish among the working languages of the Security Council and, in this connexion, to amend rules 41, 42, 43 and 44 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, in accordance with the annex to the present resolution."*

The annex to the eight-Power draft resolution read as follows:

*"Revised text of rules 41, 42, 43 and 44 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council*

*"Rule 41*

*"Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish shall be the official languages of the Security Council, and English, French, Russian and Spanish the working languages.*

*"Rule 42*

*"Speeches made in one of the working languages shall be interpreted into the other working languages.*

*"Rule 43*

*"Speeches made in the official languages shall be interpreted into the working languages.*

*"Rule 44*

*"Any representative may make a speech in a language other than the official languages. In this case he shall himself provide for interpretation into one of the working languages. Interpretation into the other working languages by an interpreter of the Secretariat may be based on the interpretation given in the first working language."*

708. The Security Council included the question in its agenda at the 1463rd meeting on 24 January, and

the President drew attention to a note submitted by the Secretary-General on 23 January (S/8977) in accordance with financial regulation 13.1, informing the Council of the administrative and financial implications of any decision the Council might take to include Russian and Spanish among its working languages. The Secretary-General indicated that since all documents for the Council were already produced in the official languages, the additional costs of including Russian and Spanish among its working languages would relate solely to the provision of full verbatim records of Council meetings in each language. Taking into account language staff already available, three additional verbatim reporters and nine typists in Russian would be needed at an estimated annual cost of \$159,100, and eight verbatim reporters and nine typists in Spanish, at an estimated yearly cost of \$240,200.

709. In discussing the question, all members of the Security Council indicated that they would support the eight-Power draft resolution. The representatives of Colombia and Pakistan noted that the proposal might involve certain procedural difficulties affecting efficiency and economy, which appeared to be out-weighted by considerations of a political nature, since the United Nations reflected not only the principle of balance among the major Powers of the world, but that of respect for the equality of peoples and the main forms of civilization. The representative of Nepal indicated that his favourable vote should not be regarded as derogating in any way from the recognition of the status of Chinese as one of the five Charter languages. The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland expressed concern lest the marrying of four working languages with out-of-date rules of procedure might give rise to opportunities for obstruction in the work of the Council itself. He believed others were equally well aware of those dangers and would work with the Council to avoid them. The representative of the United States of America drew attention to the fact that consecutive interpretation dated from before the existence of technical facilities for simultaneous interpretation and was a problem with which the draft resolution failed to deal. He noted that by doubling the number of working languages but failing to grapple with the anachronism of consecutive interpretation, the Council was leaving open the possibility that its work might be seriously impeded. He expressed the hope that at an early date the Council might see fit to re-examine and adopt a further amendment to its rules of procedure which would provide for consecutive interpretation only at the prior request of a member of the Council, perhaps with the further understanding that if consecutive interpretations were desired in more than one working language, such interpretations might be carried out at the same time.

710. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics noted that the twenty-third session of the General Assembly had adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution concerning the inclusion of Russian among the working languages of the General Assembly, and the representatives of many States had noted that Russian had now become an important instrument of communication between States and peoples, that it had made and was making a distinguished contribution to world civilization and that it was one of the leading languages in present day writing on a very wide range of scientific, technological and cultural questions. Russian was the language of Lenin—the hundredth anniversary of whose birth was to be cele-

brated in 1970, and who had proclaimed the noble principles of peace among States, the self-determination of peoples and the equality of all nations—and it could and should rightfully become a working language of the Security Council. He further noted that the proposed amendments to the provisional rules of procedure were limited only to reflecting the increase in the number of the Council's working languages and that the rules must be amended only to the extent that was absolutely necessary. It went without saying, he added, that the changes in those rules of procedure would have no effect whatever on the existing practice concerning simultaneous interpretation of all statements in the Council into all the official languages. As for any other possible changes in the practice concerning consecutive interpretation of statements, in his view, only the future practice in the work of the Council could provide an answer to that question, and it would be inappropriate to introduce any innovation into that practice prematurely.

**Decision:** *At the 1463rd meeting on 24 January 1969, the President consulted the Council and, in the absence of objection, declared that the draft resolution had been adopted unanimously (resolution 263 (1969)).*

711. The President then stated that the Council's provisional rules of procedure dealt with consecutive interpretation of statements into the working languages, and the revisions just made were the consequence of the decision to add Russian and Spanish to the Council's working languages. The established practice of simultaneous interpretation of statements into all the official languages of the Security Council remained unchanged. In the light of subsequent experience of the practical effects of the decision to increase the number of its working languages, the Council might wish to consider at a later stage whether any improvements in its practices could be made in order to enable it to carry out its tasks as effectively as possible.

## **Part III**

### **THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE**

#### ***Chapter 8***

#### **WORK OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE**

712. The Military Staff Committee has been functioning continuously under the draft rules of procedure during the period under review and has held a total of twenty-six meetings without considering matters of substance.

## Part IV

# MATTERS BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL BUT NOT DISCUSSED IN THE COUNCIL DURING THE PERIOD COVERED

## Chapter 9

### THE QUESTION OF RACE CONFLICT IN SOUTH AFRICA RESULTING FROM THE POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

#### A. Report of 4 October 1968 from the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa

713. Pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 1761 (XVII) and 1978 A (XVIII) requesting the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa to follow constantly the various aspects of the question of *apartheid* and to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council whenever necessary, the Special Committee submitted a report (S/8843) to the Security Council on 4 October 1968.

714. Reviewing its work during the period under consideration, the Special Committee reported that it had held a session from 14 to 29 June 1968, in Stockholm, London and Geneva, with the participation of representatives of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, leaders of South African liberation movements and other non-governmental organizations opposed to *apartheid* and a number of individuals prominent in the struggle against *apartheid*. Among the matters raised during the session and the main points that had emerged from the representations made to the Special Committee, it was stated that the continued and intensified application of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa had caused a further deterioration in the political situation in South Africa and in other areas of southern Africa; that these developments had increased the threat to the peace and security of the region as a whole; that the problem of *apartheid* must be dealt with within the context of the colonial and imperialistic problem of southern Africa as a whole; and that a complete and effective embargo on all trade and economic relations with South Africa constituted the only peaceful way by which the international community could induce the South African Government to abandon *apartheid*.

715. The Special Committee also reported that it had set up the Sub-Committee on Information on *Apartheid*, which had submitted a report pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2307 (XXII), which called for a report on measures that might appropriately be taken to ensure the widest dissemination of information on the evils of *apartheid* and on efforts of the international community to secure its elimination. The report of the Sub-Committee was annexed to the report of the Special Committee.

716. In the light of the new developments in the Republic of South Africa, the Special Committee

emphasized the extreme gravity of the deteriorating situation in South Africa and the increased potential danger of a wider conflict arising from the extension of the policy of *apartheid* to neighbouring areas. The Committee considered that the need for effective international action to eradicate *apartheid* had become more imperative because the aggressive policies and actions of the South African Government had heightened tensions in the whole of southern Africa, thereby constituting a grave threat to international peace and a challenge to the United Nations. It reaffirmed its conviction that the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council provided an appropriate framework for international action, if fully implemented by all States. It recommended that the General Assembly should invite the Security Council once again to resume the consideration of the question of *apartheid* and that the Security Council should adopt effective measures to ensure the full implementation of the arms embargo and decide, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to call on all States to stop the flow of all capital investment and migrants, particularly skilled and technical personnel, to South Africa.

#### B. Resolution 2396 (XXIII) adopted by the General Assembly on 2 December 1968

717. By a letter dated 12 December (S/8931), the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council the text of resolution 2396 (XXIII), adopted by the General Assembly on 2 December 1968, with regard to the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. In paragraph 4 of the resolution, the General Assembly drew the attention of the Security Council to the "grave situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole", and requested the Council "to resume urgently the consideration of the question of *apartheid* with a view to adopting, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, effective measures to ensure the full implementation of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa".

#### C. Other communications

718. In a letter dated 20 February 1969 (S/9019) addressed to the Secretary-General, the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa stated that the Committee had noted with grave concern the rapid extension of the international services of the South African Airways made possible by increased

facilities which had been provided to the South African Government by a number of Governments, contrary to the request to Member States, contained in General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII), that they should refuse landing and passage facilities to all aircraft belonging to the Government of South Africa and to companies registered under the laws of South Africa. The provision of such increased and new facilities by States not only undermined the request to Member States contained in General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) but was contrary to the requests, in subsequent resolutions, calling on States to cease collaboration with the South African Government. Such collaboration enabled the South African Government to defy world opinion and to intensify its policies of *apartheid*. The latest development in this connexion, the letter added, was the announcement of the inauguration of new services of the South African Airways to New York via Rio de Janeiro with effect from 23 February 1969. That new service was being launched through the provision of new facilities to the South African Airways by the Governments of Brazil and the United States of America. The Special Committee viewed this development with particular distress and urged the Governments concerned to consider withholding the provision of these facilities. In conclusion, he requested the Secretary-General to convey to the Governments of all States which provided facilities to the South African Airways the Special Committee's grave concern in the matter and its earnest hope that those Governments would take the necessary steps for the observance of the provisions of General Assembly resolutions on this question.

719. In a letter dated 5 March (S/9050), the representative of the United States of America referred to the above-mentioned communication and stated that the 1947 United States-South Africa Air Transport Agreement had given the United States two air routes to Johannesburg and had granted South Africa rights to serve New York, with actual routing to be defined at a later time. The South African Airways link to New York, therefore, had represented the fulfilment by the United States of a contractual undertaking going back to 1947, and, accordingly, it was incorrect to state, as the Special Committee had done, that the South African Airways link to New York represented the grant of a "new" facility or right by the United States to South Africa. He also pointed out that General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) was non-mandatory in character and had not received United

States support. In fulfilling its long-standing contractual obligation to South Africa, the United States had in no way acted contrary to its obligations under the United Nations Charter; nor did implementation of the agreement represent any change in the well-known United States policy with respect to *apartheid*.

720. By a letter dated 18 March (S/9096), the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa transmitted the text of a resolution adopted by the Special Committee concerning the trial of twelve Africans in Pietermaritzburg, South Africa. The Special Committee, after expressing its "indignation" at the current trial "under the notorious Terrorism Act of 1967 and the Suppression of Communism Act", noted, *inter alia*, that the twelve Africans were being tried for participation in the legitimate struggle for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all people of South Africa; that the trial represented a further defiance by the racist Government of South Africa of the General Assembly and the Security Council resolutions calling on that Government to abandon its inhuman policy of *apartheid*, and the trials under its arbitrary laws, and to release all persons imprisoned or restricted for their opposition to *apartheid*; and that several of the accused and State witnesses had been captured in Southern Rhodesia and handed over to the South African Government and had been kept for long periods in solitary confinement. The Special Committee, after further recalling, in particular, that in resolution 2396 (XXIII) of 2 December 1968, the General Assembly had expressed its grave concern over the ruthless persecution of opponents of *apartheid*, considered that the new trial was a step towards the aggravation of racial conflict and urgently appealed to all States to exert all efforts to secure an end to the trial and the unconditional release of the prisoners.

721. By a letter dated 9 May (S/9203), the Secretary-General drew the attention of the Security Council to paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 of General Assembly resolution 2442 (XXIII) on the International Conference on Human Rights, which cited appropriate provisions of the resolutions which had been adopted by that Conference, including a recommendation that the Security Council resume consideration of the question of *apartheid* and, under Chapter VII and, in particular, under Article 41 of the Charter, take appropriate action against South Africa, including strong economic sanctions.

## Chapter 10

### COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING RELATIONS BETWEEN ZAMBIA AND PORTUGAL

722. In a letter dated 8 November 1968 (S/8895) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Zambia stated that on 6 November, Portuguese armed forces had violated Zambian territory and had taken up positions at Kameta Village, near the Mozambique border. Zambian security forces on regular patrol had been engaged by Portuguese forces and in the clash that ensued one Portuguese soldier was killed and four others seriously wounded and one Zambian soldier was also wounded. The letter added that that incident was one in a series of similar unprovoked aggressive acts by Portuguese forces against Zambia.

723. In another letter dated 4 February 1969 (S/8993), addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Zambia stated that Portuguese armed forces had been violating Zambia's territory for some years and added that a new skirmish had taken place near Ching, a Zambian police camp, on 24 January, when a patrol of four armed Portuguese soldiers had crossed into Zambia and were engaged by Zambian soldiers. As a result of that clash three Portuguese soldiers were killed. That incident, which had taken place on Zambian soil, was further proof of Portugal's unwarranted provocations against Zambia.



724. In a letter dated 15 July (S/9331) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Zambia requested a meeting of the Security Council to discuss "the recent Portuguese calculated violations of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Zambia", the bombing, destruction of property, and the wounding and killing of two unarmed civilians in a village near the Mozambique border in the Katete

district of the eastern province of Zambia on 30 June. The letter added that it was incumbent upon the Security Council to envisage measures which would bring an end to those acts which constituted a threat to international peace and security.

[As of the date of the closure of the report, the Security Council had not met in response to the above request.]

## **Chapter 11**

### **COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN TERRITORIES UNDER PORTUGUESE ADMINISTRATION**

725. By a letter dated 27 September 1968 (S/8835) the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples transmitted to the President of the Security Council the text of a resolution on the question of Territories under Portuguese Administration, adopted on 23 September 1968, by which the Special Committee condemned the Government of Portugal for the use of napalm and white phosphorus and for its preparations for the use of chemical defoliants and poison gas in pursuance of its colonial war against the people of Guinea (Bissau); requested its Rapporteur to take all appropriate measures to study and report on the use of weapons of mass destruction and all other aspects of the colonial war, particularly in Guinea (Bissau); appealed to all States to do everything in their power to prevent the possible use of weapons of mass destruction in, and to bring about the cessation of that inhuman war; and requested its Chairman to transmit the text of the resolution to the President of the Security Council and to the Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights.

726. By a letter dated 6 December (S/8924), the Secretary-General transmitted to the President of the Security Council the text of resolution 2395 (XXIII) concerning the question of Territories under Portuguese

administration, adopted by the General Assembly on 29 November 1968. By paragraph 4 of that resolution, the General Assembly drew the attention of the Security Council to the grave situation in the Territories under Portuguese domination, which had also aggravated the explosive situation in southern Africa.

727. By a letter dated 24 June 1969 (S/9279), the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples transmitted to the President of the Security Council the text of a resolution adopted on that date. By operative paragraph 8 of that resolution the Special Committee drew attention to the further deterioration of the situation in the Territories under Portuguese domination, which it said constituted a serious threat to international peace and security, and to the serious consequences of the assistance provided by Portugal to the illegal racist minority régime of Southern Rhodesia in defiance of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council; and by paragraph 9 it drew the attention of the Security Council to the urgent need for adopting the necessary measures to make mandatory the provisions of resolution 218 (1965) and those of General Assembly resolutions 2107 (XX), 2184 (XXI) and 2270 (XXII).

## **Chapter 12**

### **COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN EQUATORIAL GUINEA AND REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL**

728. In a cable dated 27 February 1969 (S/9034), addressed to the Secretary-General, the President of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea charged that Spanish forces stationed in his country had committed provocative acts violating the sovereignty of Equatorial Guinea "merely because Spanish Diplomatic Mission accredited to this Republic was asked to reduce number of flags to same number as other accredited embassies". According to the cable, the Spanish Embassy had ordered a general mobilization of Spanish forces stationed in the country, which had violently displaced the national forces of Guinea, had occupied the airport of Santa Isabel and the telegraph and post offices and had been patrolling the towns. A Spanish vessel also had moved to Bata with forces on board.

729. The Government of Equatorial Guinea, after calling the attention of the Security Council to the above developments for which it held the Govern-

ment of Spain responsible, requested United Nations peace forces.

730. In a cable dated 28 February (S/9034/Add.1) addressed to the Secretary-General, the President of Equatorial Guinea requested the urgent dispatch of mixed United Nations forces numbering 150, adding that a larger contingent would be requested if the Spanish aggression persisted.

731. By two letters dated 28 February and 1 March (S/9035 and Add.1) addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Spain stated that the authorities of Equatorial Guinea had recently asked the Spanish Consul at Bata to remove the Spanish flag from the Consulate. The Spanish Consul had replied that the request should be directed, through diplomatic channels, to the Government of Spain. On 23 February, the letter continued, soldiers of the Territorial Guard of Equatorial Guinea had entered the

Spanish Consulate and had removed the flag. The Spanish Ambassador had submitted a protest. On 25 February the flag was hoisted again, and the Consul had taken necessary steps to avoid any further violations.

732. The letters said that to present those measures as a general inobilization of the small force stationed in the country, which consisted of two companies totalling 260 men, was completely contrary to the facts. The Spanish forces stationed in Equatorial Guinea in accordance with the Transitory Agreement signed by the two Governments were not intended to impair the independence or intervene in the domestic affairs of that country. The only concern of the Spanish Government was to guarantee the safety of the Spaniards residing in Guinea, inasmuch as the Government of Equatorial Guinea had notified the Spanish Government that it was unable to provide such guarantee.

733. In a further letter dated 1 March (S/9036) addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Spain said that the atmosphere of insecurity created by threats against a number of Spanish citizens and the fatal shooting of a Spanish national had prompted the Spanish citizens living in the interior to come to Bata and to seek protection from the Spanish consular authorities. In those circumstances the Spanish Government had been obliged to dispatch to Bata two passenger ships, together with a small escort vessel, to provide accommodations for the Spaniards who had taken refuge in Bata. However, the Spanish forces stationed in Equatorial Guinea had at no time carried out any action which could in any way be interpreted as an attempt to impair the sovereignty of Equatorial Guinea.

734. The letter reaffirmed the Spanish Government's policy of respecting the integrity, unity and sovereignty of Equatorial Guinea and its firm intention to avoid becoming involved in any of that country's domestic political problems. It stated that the Spanish Government wished to withdraw its limited police units at the earliest possible date and would be most pleased if the Secretary-General would designate one or more personal representatives or observers who could make an on-the-spot inquiry into the accuracy of the information transmitted to him.

735. By a cable dated 2 March (S/9037) addressed to the Secretary-General, the President of Equatorial Guinea reiterated his demand for the immediate withdrawal of Spanish forces and his request for the urgent dispatch of a mixed United Nations peace force of not more than 150 soldiers.

736. By a letter dated 3 March (S/9036/Add.1) addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Spain stated that the nationals of Spain who had wished to be evacuated were being harassed by the authorities of Equatorial Guinea. By a letter dated 4 March (S/9040), the representative of Spain transmitted the texts of a cable from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Equatorial Guinea and the reply thereto from the Spanish Foreign Minister. In his cable the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Equatorial Guinea had stated that the situation was under the control of his Government and that permission had been granted for the voluntary departure of Spanish citizens. He requested urgent study of the withdrawal of Spanish forces. In his reply the Foreign Minister of Spain requested the Guinean authorities to allow Spanish diplomatic and consular representatives in

Guinea to perform their duties and to enjoy freedom of communication. He stated further that if those requirements were fulfilled, Spanish forces would leave Guinea within fifteen days.

737. In three cables of 5 March (S/9046 and S/9047), the President of Equatorial Guinea informed the Secretary-General that a coup d'état headed by Atanasio Ndongo Miyone, ex-Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Saturnino Ibongo Iyanga, ex-Deputy, against his Government had failed and that he had assumed the functions of the Minister for Foreign Affairs. The President reiterated his request for the withdrawal of Spanish forces and the dispatch of United Nations peace forces.

738. In a letter dated 6 March (S/9049) addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Spain stated that in view of recent events, which seemed to reflect the existence of internal strife between political groups in Equatorial Guinea, it was becoming essential to evacuate all Spaniards who wished to leave the country. He also reiterated his Government's request to the Secretary-General to designate one or more personal representatives or observers who could make an on-the-spot inquiry. Spain also requested the Secretary-General's assistance in the rapid evacuation of the Spaniards who had not yet been authorized by the Government of Equatorial Guinea to leave that country.

739. In a report dated 7 March (S/9053), the Secretary-General gave the text of his replies to the cables from the President of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea.

740. On 1 March, the Secretary-General had informed the President of Equatorial Guinea that the request for the dispatch of the United Nations peace forces to Equatorial Guinea would require the authorization of the Security Council, which would have to be convened for that purpose by an interested party. On 2 March and, again, on 5 March, following the repeated request for United Nations peace forces, the Secretary-General had indicated in reply that if the President had no objections, he was prepared to send a personal representative to Equatorial Guinea in order to help in solving the problems and reducing tension.

741. In this report the Secretary-General also stated that, in the absence of objection from Equatorial Guinea, he had decided to dispatch Mr. Marcial Tamayo to Equatorial Guinea as his Representative. Mr. Tamayo would lend his good offices to help in the solution of the difficulties which had arisen between Equatorial Guinea and Spain so as to reduce the tension created as a consequence of those difficulties. In a cable dated 7 March (S/9053/Add.1), the Secretary-General also had informed the President of Equatorial Guinea of his decision and that Mr. Tamayo would arrive at Santa Isabel (Fernando Póo) on 10 March.

742. In a letter dated 7 March (S/9054), the President of the Security Council informed the Secretary-General that he had brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council the content of the consultation that he and the Secretary-General had had regarding the Secretary-General's sending of Mr. Marcial Tamayo to Equatorial Guinea as his Personal Representative. The letter stated further that the members of the Council had taken note of the information and had had no comment to make.

743. In a reply of the same date (S/9055), the Secretary-General stated that what he had told the President of the Security Council was a matter of information and could not be considered a consultation in any sense. He added that he had taken similar action several times in the past without prior consultation with the President or members of the Security Council. He had only reported without delay to the Council the action taken on his own initiative and had not intended to establish any precedent of prior consultation.

744. In a letter dated 10 March (S/9066), the President of the Security Council stated that whatever interpretation was given to the character of their meeting and conversation of 7 March, he considered it as an exchange of information and views connected with the maintenance of international peace and security, which, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, fell within the competence of the Security Council. On his part as President of the Security Council he had considered it his duty, in conformity with the general practice of the Security Council, to inform the members the same day of the above-mentioned conversation.

745. In a reply of the same date (S/9067), the Secretary-General stated that he had nothing to add to his letter of 7 March (S/9055), which had explained his position on the subject.

746. By a letter dated 8 March (S/9056), the representative of Spain transmitted the text of a cable sent on the same day by the Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs to the President of Equatorial Guinea denying the charges of intervention by the Spanish representative in the reported abortive coup d'état against the President of Equatorial Guinea.

747. In another letter dated 8 March (S/9058), addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Spain thanked the Secretary-General for appointing Mr. Marcial Tamayo as his Representative in Equatorial Guinea. The letter also stated that as a result of the arming of a youth militia, the situation for Spanish nationals residing in Equatorial Guinea had grown worse. Many of them were ill treated and there were injured in the hospital at Bata. Spanish doctors wished to be evacuated as soon as possible, because of the risks they had to face in carrying out their humanitarian work. Consequently, the Spanish Government had applied to the International Committee of the Red Cross for assistance, and it would also request the Secretary-General to consider whether the World Health Organization (WHO) could help in some way in operating the hospital and health services in Equatorial Guinea.

748. In a further report dated 13 March (S/9053/Add.2), the Secretary-General stated that his Representative, on arrival in Equatorial Guinea, had held a series of meetings with the President of Equatorial Guinea during the latter part of which the Spanish Ambassador had also been present. In those meetings, the President of Equatorial Guinea had stated that he had given guarantees for those Spanish citizens who had expressed a wish to remain in Equatorial Guinea and those who wished to leave the country. The Spanish Ambassador would be given an escort to travel into the interior of the country for the purpose of contacting Spanish nationals living there.

749. In a letter dated 14 March (S/9082) addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Spain said that according to information received from his Government, difficulties were being encountered in the departure of Spaniards who wished to leave the country, and the Spanish diplomatic and consular representatives had not yet been granted facilities for travelling into the interior of Equatorial Guinea.

750. By a letter dated 19 March (S/9101), addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics transmitted the text of a letter of the same date that he had addressed to the Secretary-General, in which it was stated that the Permanent Mission of the USSR to the United Nations could not refrain from drawing attention to the fact that the Secretary-General had sent his Personal Representative to Equatorial Guinea with such extensive powers, including the power to assist Equatorial Guinea "in the solution of its differences with Spain", "to help the parties in settling the difficulties" and "in lessening the tension in Equatorial Guinea". The fact that Mr. Tamayo had been given those powers had become known from a letter addressed by the Secretary-General to the Emperor of Ethiopia on 10 March 1969 and published as a press release of the United Nations Secretariat on 11 March 1969. Under the United Nations Charter decisions on matters connected with action by the United Nations relating to the maintenance of international peace and security were taken by the Security Council. The Soviet Union's position of principle regarding action of that kind relating to the maintenance of international peace and security had already been stated on previous occasions, particularly in the letter from the Permanent Representative of the USSR to the United Nations to the President of the Security Council dated 27 August 1966 (S/7478).

751. In a letter dated 20 March (S/9103), the permanent representative of Equatorial Guinea stated that the disorders which had developed in his country were provoked by the Spanish troops, which, in accordance with the Transitory Agreement, could intervene only if the Guinean Government so requested.

752. By a letter dated 21 March (S/9104) addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Spain transmitted the text of a cable addressed to the Spanish Government by the President of Equatorial Guinea requesting that evacuation of the Spanish troops should start on 23 March in conformity with the Spanish Foreign Minister's cable of 8 March. That request, the letter stated, was at variance with the undertaking entered into by the President of Equatorial Guinea on 18 March when he had agreed to the proposal addressed to him by Mr. Tamayo. That proposal was intended to ensure that the withdrawal of the Spanish Civil Guard would not affect the country's socio-economic position and had provided for a moratorium which would last two months but which could be reduced to a minimum of one month. The letter added that none of the Spanish communications had contained any statement or promise that the withdrawal of the Spanish forces would begin on 23 March. However, the attitude adopted by the Government of Equatorial Guinea had compelled the Spanish Government to take a final decision to withdraw the public security forces forthwith, following the departure of all Spanish citizens. The Spanish Government was therefore prepared to begin the evacuation on 23 March

if the Secretary-General could send appropriate officials to supervise the evacuation to be present in Equatorial Guinea by that date.

753. In another letter dated 22 March (S/9105), addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Spain said that when Mr. Tamayo's efforts seemed close to producing an understanding and when his Government was ready to consider sympathetically the continuation of its technical and economic assistance to Equatorial Guinea, the attitude of that Government had destroyed the possibility of co-operation.

754. In a report dated 24 March (S/9053/Add.3) based on information received from his Representative in Equatorial Guinea, the Secretary-General said that the meetings between the authorities of Equatorial Guinea and the Chargé d'Affaires of Spain, which Mr. Tamayo had been instrumental in arranging, had led to the arrival in Equatorial Guinea in mid-March of a special economic mission sent by the Government of Spain to discuss a number of economic matters between the two Governments. During the following days, the Secretary-General's Representative was in contact with officials of both countries. In his discussion with the Guinean authorities, certain ideas had emerged as a framework for a peaceful solution to some of the more pressing difficulties between Equatorial Guinea and Spain. Those ideas were conveyed by Mr. Tamayo, in the exercise of his good offices, to the Spanish Chargé d'Affaires. He also had occasion to discuss them with representatives of the Organization of African Unity. The main purpose was to ensure that the withdrawal of the Spanish Civil Guard should take place without impairing the economic and social situation of Equatorial Guinea or its international policy. Some steps were outlined, such as maintenance of the political *status quo* in view of the initial economic agreements, a study by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees of the situation which would arise in the event of the departure of Spanish plantation owners and businessmen, the dispatch of experts by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the appointment by Equatorial Guinea of a Permanent Representative to the United Nations and consultation with the Secretary-General concerning the possibility of sending a military adviser to supervise the evacuation and to assess the internal security situation resulting from the withdrawal of the Civil Guard.

755. On 21 March, the report continued, the Guinean Government had withdrawn its previous agreement to the moratorium outlined above and had requested the Spanish Government to withdraw its troops by 23 March. The Spanish Chargé d'Affaires, on the same date, had informed Mr. Tamayo that in view of those circumstances, Spain had decided to withdraw its forces immediately on the understanding that all Spaniards who wished to leave would be allowed to do so prior to the withdrawal of the Civil Guard. The Permanent Representative of Spain, by a letter dated 21 March, had requested the dispatch to Equatorial Guinea of appropriate officials to supervise the evacuation of Spanish troops and citizens. The President of Equatorial Guinea, in a cable dated 22 March, had requested the urgent dispatch of military observers. The Secretary-General had replied that owing to lack of time, it would not be possible to comply with those requests.

756. In a report dated 25 March (S/9053/Add.4), the Secretary-General stated that all necessary mea-

asures had been taken by the Government of Equatorial Guinea in Santa Isabel for the peaceful withdrawal of Spanish troops and Spanish citizens, which was to start on 25 March 1969.

757. In a further report dated 28 March (S/9053/Add.5), the Secretary-General stated that the boarding of Spanish troops and equipment began in Bata on 26 March and had proceeded uninterrupted in a calm atmosphere. In Santa Isabel, preparations had begun to facilitate withdrawal immediately following the evacuation from Bata.

758. The Secretary-General also stated that in order to meet the urgent need for medical and ancillary personnel, he had communicated to the Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO) a request for assistance from the President of Equatorial Guinea and that it had been agreed that WHO would send a team of experts to assess the situation and to plan for the immediate future. In addition, it was planned that the Regional Representative of UNDP in the area would visit Equatorial Guinea shortly in order to assist in an over-all assessment of the urgent needs of the country. The Secretary-General also referred to certain medical and health measures to be taken by the International Committee of the Red Cross and by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in response to a request from Equatorial Guinea with regard to the situation of Nigerian workers in that country. The Secretary-General further stated that the Organization of African Unity had been kept informed of the action being taken by the United Nations and its family of agencies.

759. In his report of 31 March (S/9053/Add.6), the Secretary-General stated that the withdrawal of all Spanish forces stationed in the Province of Río Muni had started on 26 March and had been completed on 28 March. It had been agreed by both parties that the withdrawal of forces was to be simultaneous with the departure of Spanish civilians wishing to leave the country. The Secretary-General further stated that the second stage of the operation had begun on 29 March in Santa Isabel, both parties having agreed on the time-table and other details for the withdrawal from Fernando Póo of Spanish forces and those Spanish residents wishing to leave. That stage of the operation would be completed on 5 April.

760. In a report dated 1 April (S/9053/Add.7), the Secretary-General said that on 8 March he had addressed a letter to the President of Equatorial Guinea, to be delivered personally by Mr. Marcial Tamayo, in which the Secretary-General stated that his Representative would offer his good offices in order to help in solving the difficulties which had arisen between the Governments of Equatorial Guinea and Spain. The President of Equatorial Guinea, in his reply of 30 March, thanked the Secretary-General for sending his personal Representative, whose presence had been crucial for the restoration of calm in his country.

761. In reports dated 1, 4 and 7 April (S/9053/Add.8, Add.9 and Add.10), the Secretary-General gave details of the progress made concerning the withdrawal operations from Santa Isabel of the Spanish armed forces and Spanish nationals, which had been concluded on 5 April. The reports also stated that the Regional Representative of UNDP had arrived

in Santa Isabel from Gabon on 2 April in order to make an assessment of the needs of Equatorial Guinea.

762. In a letter dated 8 April (S/9142), addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Representative of Spain stated that the evacuation of the Spanish forces and of the Spanish civilians had been carried out in an orderly and peaceful manner through the agency of Mr. Tamayo and members of his mission, who had at all times been motivated by the highest spirit of impartiality and dedication.

763. In a report dated 14 April 1969 (S/9053/Add.11), the Secretary-General stated that his Rep-

resentative, Mr. Marcial Tamayo, had left Santa Isabel on 9 April and had arrived in New York on 11 April. In a further report dated 5 May (S/9053/Add.12), the Secretary-General stated that the United Nations personnel who had remained in Equatorial Guinea after the departure of his Representative, had left that country on 21 April 1969. With their departure the work of the Mission of his Representative had been completed. The report also stated that in response to requests from the President of Equatorial Guinea, arrangements were being made to provide that country with technical assistance in several fields without delay.

### Chapter 13

## COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO COMPLAINTS BY CAMBODIA CONCERNING ACTS OF AGGRESSION AGAINST THE TERRITORY AND CIVILIAN POPULATION OF CAMBODIA

764. During the period under review Cambodia addressed over sixty communications to the President of the Security Council charging the armed forces of the United States and the Republic of Viet-Nam with a series of aggressive actions involving violations of Cambodian territory, air space and territorial waters and demanding that the Governments of the United States and the Republic of South Viet-Nam immediately put an end to those acts.

765. The United States replied to the President of the Security Council that it recognized the sovereignty, independence, neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia within its current frontiers. Cambodian charges of violations of its territory had been investigated and responded to through normal diplomatic channels. The main cause of those incidents which did occur was the presence of Viet Cong and North Vietnamese forces in the frontier region and their use of Cambodian territory in violation of that country's neutrality.

766. The Cambodian letters frequently contained complaints that elements of the armed forces of the United States and the Republic of Viet-Nam had fired across the frontiers at Cambodian guard posts, villages and peasants working in their fields or had penetrated Cambodian territory attacking similar targets as well as abducting villagers and planting mines and other booby traps. There were also accusations that airborne elements had perpetrated similar aggressive actions with machine guns, rocket fire and delayed-action bombs and had, on occasion, dropped mines and poisonous chemical products over Cambodian villages and crops. Numerous deaths and injuries, as well as destruction of livestock, houses and other property, were reported as a result of these attacks. There were also complaints that United States and South Viet-Nameese naval vessels had penetrated Cambodian territorial waters, firing on Cambodian fishermen and, on occasion, seizing fishing junks and crew members.

767. Some communications reported that at the invitation of the Cambodian Government, the International Control Commission, the military and press attachés of diplomatic missions in Phnom Penh and the representatives of the national and international Press had visited the scene of the attacks referred to and had viewed the effects of the aggression at first hand.

768. By a letter dated 16 July (S/8682), the representative of Cambodia transmitted to the Security Council details and photographs of a reported machine-

gun attack on 29 June by two helicopters of the United States and South Viet-Nameese armed forces on the Cambodian village of Svay A Ngong, one kilometre from the Viet-Nam frontier. According to the Cambodian letter, fourteen inhabitants working in the field had been killed in that attack.

769. By a letter dated 31 July (S/8707), the representative of Cambodia transmitted to the Security Council the text of his Government's reply to a note from the United States, transmitted through the Australian Embassy in Phnom Penh, requesting the release of a river vessel of the United States armed forces captured on 17 July along with members of its crew, by a vessel of the Royal Khmer Navy. The Cambodian Government's reply, after rejecting the United States claim that the boat had violated Cambodian territorial waters inadvertently, stated that that was not the first time that the United States had invoked the excuse of navigational error to justify its violation of Cambodian territory. The reply added that the boat and its crew would be dealt with in the manner prescribed by Cambodian law.

770. By a letter dated 13 August (S/8748), the representative of Cambodia transmitted to the Security Council the text of a statement issued by his Government which referred to a report appearing in *The Daily Telegraph* of London on 25 July to the effect that the United States armed forces were contemplating reprisal actions against alleged bases of the National Liberation Front in Cambodia and preparing new measures against Cambodia for providing sanctuary for from nine to ten North Viet-Nameese regiments. Cambodia, after rejecting those charges, stated that the contemplated measures against it had no justification at all. The statement added that the reported reprisal actions underscored the intention of the United States to extend the Viet-Nam conflict to neighbouring countries.

771. In a letter dated 27 August (S/8781), the Cambodian representative informed the President of the Security Council that his Government had submitted the question of alleged Viet-Cong sanctuaries to the International Control Commission and had requested it to make an investigation within Cambodian territory in order to determine if the United States charges were true.

772. In a letter dated 10 September (S/8813), the representative of Cambodia transmitted the text of a Cambodian reply to a message from the United States Government in which the latter expressed "deep con-

cern regarding the widespread activity of the Communist Viet-Nameese forces in the South-East of the province of Svay Rient". The Cambodian reply charged the United States with unwarranted interference in relations between Cambodia and South Viet-Nam and asserted that Cambodia, a sovereign State, was not obliged to justify itself to the United States with regard to its neutrality and territorial integrity or with regard to the alleged use of its territory by the Viet-Cong. The statement added that Cambodia was well aware that armed elements of the National Liberation Front, as well as those of the United States special forces, periodically infiltrated into Cambodian territory, but that the existence of permanent Viet-Cong bases in Cambodia was only a myth invented by the United States military authorities to justify the failure of their operations against the Viet-Cong. The statement concluded by asserting that the Cambodian armed forces did not tolerate the presence of any foreign military installations on Cambodian territory and would repel all foreign elements violating Cambodian borders.

773. By a letter dated 30 October (S/8881), the representative of Cambodia transmitted to the Security Council the text of his Government's reply to two further messages from the United States Government pertaining to the vessel seized on 17 July. The Cambodian note, referring to United States contention that it was customary among States to take immediate measures for the release of a vessel or aircraft and its crew, stated that those measures applied only between States enjoying peaceful coexistence and normal relations based on respect for each other's sovereign rights. Furthermore, the note added, the interned vessel was a military vessel implicated in numerous acts of aggression against Cambodia. A goodwill gesture on the part of Cambodia, involving a release of the vessel, would not be justified unless the United States had admitted its responsibility for the Svay A Ngong attack.

774. In a letter dated 16 December (S/8939), the representative of Cambodia stated that on 16 November three motor-boats of United States-South Viet-Nameese armed forces navigating on the river Giang Thanh had opened fire on Cambodian peasants working in paddies about 200 metres from the Cambodian-South Viet-Nameese frontier. According to the letter nine women and three children were killed in the attack and six other persons were injured.

775. In a letter dated 1 April 1969 (S/9127), the representative of Cambodia complained that five helicopters of the United States-South Viet-Nameese air force had attacked a Cambodian village with machine-gun and rocket fire twice on 11 March, resulting in the deaths of four villagers and the injury of ten persons, five seriously. The letter added that members of the International Control Commission had visited the scene of the attack and transmitted photographs taken during their inquiry.

776. In a letter dated 17 June (S/9263), the representative of Cambodia gave the particulars of damage to Cambodian rubber plantations, crops and forest resources as a result of defoliants dropped by aircraft of the United States Air Force between 19 April and 12 May. The letter added that the defoliants were dropped over an area comprising approximately 85,000 hectares, including over 15,000 hectares of rubber plantations. The total damage to Cambodia's economy was put at \$8,684,810.

777. By a letter dated 11 July (S/9324) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the United States transmitted the text of a statement by the United States Government of 16 April. The statement declared that the United States, in conformity with the United Nations Charter, recognized and respected the sovereignty, independence, neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia within its current frontiers.

778. Referring to Cambodia's charges concerning violations of its territory by United States forces based in the Republic of Viet-Nam, the statement said that the United States had, where appropriate, responded to the Cambodian Government through diplomatic channels. Full investigations of the alleged incidents had been undertaken and the pertinent facts conveyed to the Cambodian Government. In those cases where an intrusion into Cambodian territory by United States forces had appeared to have occurred, the United States Government had taken the appropriate steps of apology and redress. The statement further said that the United States Government had made it clear to the Government of Cambodia that the United States forces had no hostile intentions toward Cambodia or Cambodian territory. The main cause of those incidents which had involved Cambodian territory was the presence of Viet-Cong and North Viet-Nameese forces in the frontier region and their use of Cambodian territory in violation of the neutrality of Cambodia. The statement concluded by asserting that the United States fully shared the concern of the Cambodian Government over violations of its neutrality and territorial integrity from any source whatsoever. For its part, the statement added, the United States Government had taken and intended to continue taking all steps available to it to prevent the spread of the hostilities in Viet-Nam into Cambodia.

779. Listed below are letters other than those already mentioned above, from the representative of Cambodia to the President of the Security Council for the information of the Council.

Letter dated 30 July 1968 (S/8703), charging South Viet-Nameese soldiers with firing smoke bombs, causing toxic effects on the occupants of a Cambodian post.

Letter dated 30 July (S/8704), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with violations of Cambodian air space between 28 May and 8 June 1968.

Letter dated 31 July (S/8706), transmitting the text of a Government statement concerning an attack by United States-South Viet-Nameese aircraft against Cambodian villagers on 10 July.

Letter dated 1 August (S/8712), charging that United States forces had introduced an electronic monitoring system in the Cambodian frontier region.

Letter dated 12 August (S/8745), concerning seizure by the Cambodian Navy on 17 July, of an American vessel and its crew which had violated Cambodian territorial waters.

Letter dated 12 August (S/8746), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with attacks and violations of Cambodian territory between 9 and 30 June.

Letter dated 21 August (S/8763), charging the United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with firing incidents against Cambodian territory between 4 June and 20 July.

- Letter dated 27 August (S/8782), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with firing incidents against Cambodian territory on 19 July and 4 and 10 August.
- Letter dated 4 September (S/8801), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese soldiers with an incursion into Cambodian territory on 4 August.
- Letter dated 10 September (S/8814), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese aircraft with attacks on, and violations of, Cambodian territory between 6 and 12 July.
- Letter dated 16 September (S/8816), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese aircraft with violations of Cambodian air space between 1 July and 19 July.
- Letter dated 27 September (S/8834), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with a violation and an attack on Cambodian territory on 27-28 August and 1/2 September.
- Letter dated 2 October (S/8840), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with attacks and violations of Cambodian territory between 7 July and 25 August.
- Letter dated 9 October (S/8849), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with attacks against Cambodian territory between 2 August and 9 September.
- Letter dated 15 October (S/8859), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with violations and attacks on Cambodian territory between 5 and 22 September.
- Letter dated 15 November (S/8899), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with incidents against Cambodian territory between 4 September and 23 October.
- Letter dated 15 November (S/8900), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese air forces with twenty-one violations of Cambodian air space between 8 September and 9 October.
- Letter dated 18 November (S/8903), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with three attacks on Cambodian territory on 8 and 16 November.
- Letter dated 27 November (S/8907), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with an attack on a Cambodian patrol on 18 November.
- Letter dated 16 December (S/8940), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with attacks on Cambodian territory between 10 and 20 November.
- Letter dated 27 December (S/8944), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with mortar attacks against Cambodian territory on 19 and 21 December.
- Letter dated 26 December (S/8957), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with violations and attacks on Cambodian territory between 1 and 29 November.
- Letter dated 16 January 1969 (S/8969), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with attacks against Cambodian territory between 1 and 20 December 1968.
- Letter dated 21 January (S/8975), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with firing incidents against Cambodian territory between 18 December 1968 and 2 January 1969.
- Letter dated 24 and 28 January (S/8980 and Add.1), transmitting photographs relating to attacks by United States-South Viet-Nameese forces against Cambodian territory on 6, 15 and 16 November 1968.
- Letter dated 28 January (S/8985), transmitting a message of 25 December 1968 from the Chief of State of Cambodia to the Secretary-General charging the United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with an attack against a lorry proceeding along the Khsim-Sen Monorom (Mondulkiri) road on 17 December.
- Letter dated 28 January (S/8986), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with violations of Cambodian territory on 1 December 1968 and 1 and 13 January 1969.
- Letter dated 4 February (S/8992), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with violations and attacks against Cambodian territory between 29 December 1968 and 13 January 1969.
- Letter dated 12 February (S/9007), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with a violation of Cambodian territory on 19 January and the arrest of Cambodian nationals.
- Letter dated 26 February (S/9043), charging violation of Cambodian air space on 12 February by United States-South Viet-Nameese aircraft, one of which crashed in Cambodian territory.
- Letter dated 5 March (S/9044), concerning the capture of three United States servicemen from the crew of the aircraft shot down on 12 February in Cambodian territory (S/9043),
- Letter dated 5 March (S/9045), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese aircraft with violations of Cambodian air space on 10, 18 and 20 January.
- Letter dated 12 March (S/9074), charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with armed incidents and violations of Cambodian territory from 11 January to 25 February.
- Letter dated 14 March (S/9087), concerning violations of Cambodia's air space and territory and attacks against Khmer inhabitants from 22 February to 2 March by United States-South Viet-Nameese forces.
- Letter dated 14 March (S/9088), transmitting the text of a 7 March statement from the Cambodian Government concerning an attack by United States-South Viet-Nameese air forces against Cambodian territory on 27 February.
- Letter dated 26 March (S/9117) concerning alleged violations of Cambodian territory by United States-South Viet-Nameese forces from 21 February to 7 March.
- Letter dated 1 April (S/9126) concerning violations of Cambodian territory and shooting at Khmer inhabitants by United States-South Viet-Nameese forces from 27 February to 9 March.
- Letter dated 1 April (S/9128) concerning attack by United States-South Viet-Nameese aircraft on Cambodian territory on 12 March.
- Letter dated 4 April (S/9133) transmitting a Government statement concerning the alleged attack by United States-South Viet-Nameese aircraft on the village of Skatum on 11 March (reported in S/9127).
- Letter dated 11 April (S/9153) concerning an attack by United States-South Viet-Nameese aircraft on the night of 23/24 March against the village of Chea Theach.
- Letter dated 17 April (S/9160) concerning an article by a United States correspondent on the alleged clandestine presence of special United States military

teams in Cambodia for the purpose of gathering intelligence data on troop and supply movements.

Letter dated 17 April (S/9161) charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with violations and attacks against Cambodian territory from 16 to 25 March.

Letter dated 29 April (S/9182) charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with attacks against Cambodian territory from 6 to 26 March.

Letter dated 29 April (S/9183) charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with attacks against Cambodian territory on 5 and 6 April.

Letter dated 5 May (S/9193) charging a violation of Cambodian air space by United States-South Viet-Nameese forces on 28 April.

Letter dated 26 May (S/9224) charging United States-South Viet-Nameese aircraft with scattering defoliants over an area 20 kilometres from the frontier, from 18 April to 2 May.

Letter dated 27 May (S/9226) charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with artillery attacks against Cambodian territory from 23 to 25 April.

Letter dated 3 June (S/9236) charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with landing commandos, arresting Cambodian nationals and firing against provincial guards inside the Cambodian frontier, on 20 and 22 April.

Letter dated 10 June (S/9249) charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with violations

and attacks against Cambodian territory from 25 March to 15 April.

Letter dated 10 June (S/9250) charging United States-South Viet-Nameese aircraft with a machine-gun attack against Cambodian villages on 23 May.

Letter dated 12 June (S/9251) charging a commando group transported by United States-South Viet-Nameese helicopters with attacking a Cambodian village in the province of Mondulhiri on 25 May.

Letter dated 17 June (S/9265) charging an attack by United States-South Viet-Nameese forces against the Cambodian villages of O-Pot, O-Ret and Bu Raing on 23 May.

Letter dated 17 June (S/9266) charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with violations of Cambodian territory and the shooting of civilians from 19 April to 30 May.

Letter dated 24 June (S/9282) charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with shooting at and violations of Cambodian territory from 11 April to 3 May.

Letter dated 1 July (S/9301) charging an attack by a United States-South Viet-Nameese helicopter against the village of Pop Lom on 16 June.

Letter dated 2 July (S/9308) charging violations of Cambodian territorial waters by South Viet-Nameese vessels between 19 April and 26 May.

Letter dated 3 July (S/9309) charging United States-South Viet-Nameese forces with shooting at Cambodian territory on 31 May and violating of Cambodian air space on 1 June.

## *Chapter 14*

### **COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING RELATIONS BETWEEN CAMBODIA AND THAILAND**

780. During the period under review Cambodia addressed twenty-five letters to the Security Council charging violations of its territory, territorial waters and air space by Thailand. During the same period Thailand addressed four letters to the Council containing similar charges against Cambodia.

781. Cambodian charges included incursions by armed Thai elements into Cambodian territory and attacks on military posts, border patrols and villages, resulting in frequent armed clashes and numerous casualties. In five instances the Thai intruders were alleged to have numbered 100 or more. Other Cambodian complaints referred to exploding mines and booby traps laid by Thai elements, causing death and injury to military personnel and civilians and destruction of carts and cattle. There were also charges of abduction of villagers, illegal fishing by Thai fishing junks and vessels and violations of Cambodian air space by Thai aircraft.

782. In a letter dated 14 October 1968 (S/8858), the representative of Cambodia presented charges concerning several incidents which had taken place during September, including one in which armed units from Thailand had fired mortar shells on a Cambodian Provincial Guard Post, mortally wounding two Cambodian soldiers.

783. In a letter dated 15 October (S/8860), the representative of Cambodia gave further details of an

incident of 27 June and claimed that subsequently Thailand had fabricated evidence of an attack on one of its own villages for use as proof of alleged aggression against Thai territory by Cambodian forces.

784. In a letter dated 16 December (S/8938), the representative of Cambodia complained of several incidents of illegal Thai fishing in Cambodian waters during November and charged that on 18/19 November ten armed Thai junks engaged in clandestine fishing in Cambodian waters had attacked a Cambodian patrol, resulting in the death of one soldier.

785. In a letter dated 31 December (S/8958) the representative of Cambodia charged that an armed band of about sixty men coming from Thailand on 29 November had entered Cambodian territory and opened fire on a Cambodian patrol, killing two soldiers and wounding two others.

786. In two letters dated 20 May and 10 June 1969 (S/9216, S/9247), the representative of Cambodia stated that on 16 May Cambodian soldiers had captured four Thai soldiers and seventy-two Thai civilians who had entered Cambodian territory with three bulldozers and fifteen trucks to install a rebel government of the "Khmer Serai" movement, which was being supported by the Thai régime.

787. In its complaints against Cambodia, Thailand charged Cambodian soldiers with firing at Thai military personnel and villagers across the frontier or after



intruding into Thai territory, robbing Thai villagers of domestic animals and other belongings, planting mines and booby traps and attacking Thai fishing boats well within Thai territorial waters. Occasional casualties were reported.

788. In a letter dated 20 September 1968 (S/8832), the representative of Thailand charged that on 12, 27 and 30 June, 4 and 9 July and 1 August Cambodian soldiers had fired into Thai villages, resulting in the death of one villager and damage to homes and a temple.

789. In a letter dated 20 February 1969 (S/9022), the representative of Thailand complained of twelve incidents between August and December in which he charged that Cambodian armed elements had intruded into Thai territory and had robbed Thai villagers of twenty-six buffaloes and other belongings. The letter also complained of illegal fishing in Thai waters and charged that a mine laid by Cambodian soldiers in a Thai village had caused the death of one of the inhabitants.

790. In a letter dated 10 February 1969 (S/9003) the representative of Thailand charged that on 4 February a Thai naval ship intercepted a P.C. boat of the Cambodian Navy which was in the process of seizing a Thai fishing-boat on the high seas. After an exchange of fire initiated by the Cambodian vessel, the latter withdrew into Cambodian waters, abandoning the Thai fishing-boat. On boarding the fishing-boat Thai authorities found only the body of a sixteen-year-old boy who had been shot in the back.

791. In a letter dated 17 February (S/9013) Cambodia replied to the Thai charges, stating that on 4 February a group of armed Thai junks engaged in clandestine fishing in Cambodian waters had been challenged by a vessel of the Cambodian Navy. In answer to the challenge the Thai junks had replied with automatic weapons fire. The Cambodian vessel, obliged to return fire, had succeeded in hitting a Thai junk, which was then abandoned by its crew. The junk was captured and was being taken in tow by the Cambodian vessel to a Cambodian naval base when the vessel was surprised by a Thai warship in Cambodian waters. After a forty-minute exchange of fire, initiated by the Thai warship, the latter withdrew into Thai territorial waters. The captured Thai junk was sunk during the encounter.

792. In a letter dated 10 December 1968 (S/8927), Cambodia denied Thai charges of crimes by Cambodian armed forces against Thai civilians between October 1967 and March 1968 and counter-charged Thailand with reversing the roles of aggressor and victim by falsely charging the under-equipped Cambodian armed forces with imaginary crimes and acts of provocation. The letter stated that the incidents had been initiated entirely by the Thai armed forces.

793. Listed below are letters other than those already mentioned addressed by the representatives of Cambodia and Thailand to the President of the Security Council for the information of the Council.

Letter dated 17 July 1968 (S/8684) from the representative of Cambodia charging Thai soldiers with attacks and violations of Cambodian territory on 9, 13 and 27 June.

Letter dated 22 July (S/8688) from the representative of Thailand charging Cambodian soldiers with attacks

against Thai authorities and civilians in the border areas from 10 March to 24 May.

Letter dated 25 July (S/8694) from the representative of Cambodia charging Thai soldiers with violation of Cambodian territory on 18 June.

Letter dated 21 August (S/8764) from the representative of Cambodia charging Thai soldiers with violations of Cambodian territory from 10 to 16 July.

Letter dated 27 August (S/8783) from the representative of Cambodia charging violation of Cambodian territory on 1 August by a group of Thai soldiers.

Letter dated 4 October (S/8841) from the representative of Cambodia concerning incidents by Thai armed forces against Cambodian territory on 15 and 16 September.

Letter dated 9 October (S/8850) from the representative of Cambodia concerning incidents by Thai soldiers against Cambodian territory from 20 to 26 August.

Letter dated 23 October (S/8866) from the representative of Cambodia charging Thai forces with violations of Cambodian territory on 12 and 16 September.

Letter dated 6 November (S/8889) from the representative of Cambodia charging mining incidents and violations of Cambodian territorial waters by Thai nationals from 12 to 28 September.

Letter dated 15 November (S/8901) from the representative of Cambodia concerning incidents by Thai soldiers against Cambodian territory from 23 September to 16 October.

Letter dated 16 December (S/8937) from the representative of Cambodia concerning incidents by Thai soldiers against Cambodian territory from 8 to 16 November.

Letter dated 16 January 1969 (S/8970) from the representative of Cambodia charging violation of Cambodian waters by Thai fishing junks on 15-16 December.

Letter dated 17 February (S/9014) from the representative of Cambodia charging violation of Cambodian territory by Thai soldiers on 5 February.

Letter dated 29 April (S/9184) from the representative of Cambodia charging Thai nationals with violations of Cambodian territory from 7 to 21 March.

Letter dated 3 June (S/9234) from the representative of Cambodia transmitting the text of a Government statement of 20 May, charging Thailand with interference in the internal affairs of Cambodia.

Letter dated 3 June (S/9235) from the representative of Cambodia charging Thai forces with a mine explosion on Cambodian territory on 9 April.

Letter dated 10 June (S/9248) from the representative of Cambodia charging Thai soldiers and nationals with a mine incident and violations of Cambodian territory on 8, 11 and 23 April.

Letter dated 17 June (S/9264) from the representative of Cambodia charging violations of Cambodian territorial waters by Thais engaged in clandestine fishing from 18 to 21 May.

Letter dated 24 June (S/9280) from the representative of Cambodia transmitting the text of a statement by the Government of Cambodia denying statements of the Thai Ministry of the Interior concerning the

capture by Cambodian authorities of four Thai soldiers and seventy-two civilians in the Phnom Melai region of Cambodia mentioned in S/9216 and S/9247).

Letter dated 24 June (S/9281) from the representative of Cambodia charging Thai nationals with repeated violations of Cambodian territorial waters and territory on 12 March, 30 April and 5 May.

## **Chapter 15**

### **COMMUNICATION CONCERNING VIET-NAM**

794. By a letter dated 27 September 1968 (S/8833) the Permanent Representative of the Philippines transmitted a letter dated 4 September addressed to the Secretary-General by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Viet-Nam and requested that it be circulated as a Security Council document. In his letter the Minister of Foreign Affairs stated that since 1954 the people and Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam had been the victims of a campaign of subversion and aggression, directed by the Hanoi régime, with the assistance of countries of the Communist bloc, in order to impose communism by force. In 1962, the Republic of Viet-Nam had requested the assistance of its allies to help defend its freedom, in legitimate right of self-defence. A call to world aid had been reiterated in 1964, and forty-three countries had responded with different types of assistance to help rebuild the country. The Honolulu Joint Communiqué of 20 July had made clear the Republic's views on the essential conditions of peace, which were in accord with the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962, as follows: (a) re-establishment of the 17th Parallel as the demarcation line between North and South Viet-Nam, pending deter-

mination by the free choice of all Viet-Nameese on reunification; (b) respect for the Republic's territorial integrity; (c) complete cessation of hostilities and subversion, and withdrawal from South Viet-Nam of Communist military and subversive forces to the North; (d) compliance with the principle of non-interference between North and South, and (e) effective international supervision and guarantees. Concerning allied forces in the South, the Republic would request their removal as North Viet-Nam withdrew its forces to the north, ceased infiltrations and the level of violence thus subsided. When peace was restored, the Republic was ready to discuss with the North Viet-Nam authorities all avenues which might lead to reunification by peaceful means. However, it rejected such a solution as a "coalition Government" or any overt or disguised territorial concession. The people and Government of the Republic sought a genuine, lasting peace and rejected the principles of retaliation and revenge in favour of national reconciliation and was offering full participation to all individuals and members of groups who accepted to renounce force and abide by the Constitution and laws of Viet-Nam.

## **Chapter 16**

### **REPORTS ON THE STRATEGIC TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS**

795. On 2 August 1968 the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council the report (S/8713) of the Trusteeship Council on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands covering the period from 1 July 1967 to 19 June 1968.

796. On 27 May 1969 the Secretary-General transmitted to the members of the Council the report (S/9223) of the United States Government on the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for the period from 1 July 1967 to 30 June 1968.

## **Chapter 17**

### **COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE KOREAN QUESTION**

797. By a letter dated 3 October 1968 (S/8839) the representative of the United States transmitted to the Security Council a report of the United Nations Command complaining of the continuation of serious North Korean violations of the Armistice Agreement of 27 July 1953, in the form of efforts to infiltrate, terrorize and subvert the Republic of Korea. The report charged that intensification of North Korean efforts to subvert the Republic of Korea had reached such a dangerous level, especially since January 1968, that the situation was causing serious concern on all sides, and had rendered necessary the issuance of a further report

to the Security Council. The report said that the violations, which had occurred without provocation, constituted clear evidence of North Korea's unwillingness to keep faith with the Armistice Agreement and to cooperate with its machinery and left the United Nations Command with no alternative but to take measures to defend the territorial integrity of the Republic of Korea and to assure the safety of its own personnel. The United Nations Command was, however, ready to seek the co-operation of North Korean representatives on the Military Armistice Commission for undertaking more effective measures for the reduction of violations

of the Armistice Agreement and for conducting joint investigations of incidents in order to establish a more peaceful atmosphere throughout Korea.

798. By letter dated 18 April 1969 (S/9163), the representative of the United States transmitted to the Council the statement by General Knapp, senior member for the United Nations Command, at a meeting of the Military Armistice Commission at Panmunjon on that date, charging that North Korean military aircraft had shot down an unarmed United States reconnaissance aircraft. In his statement General Knapp said that on 15 April a United States EC-121 aircraft was shot down, with no survivors from the thirty-one men on board the aircraft. He further said that the United States aircraft was flying a routine reconnaissance track similar to those of a large number of missions which had flown over international waters in that area regularly since 1950, and that the aircraft Commander was under orders to maintain a distance of fifty nautical miles from the coast of North Korea. All evidence was said to confirm that the plane had remained far outside the territorial air space claimed by North Korea and that when shot down was at a point approximately ninety miles from North Korea. General Knapp, after reiterating that the United States aircraft was engaged in completely legitimate reconnaissance operations outside North Korean territorial limits, said that the shooting down of that single unarmed aircraft was by no means an act of self-defence but rather a calculated act

of aggression, completely unjustified under international law, and urged North Korea to take appropriate measures to prevent similar incidents in the future.

799. By a letter dated 8 May 1969 (S/9198), the representative of the United States transmitted a further report of the United Nations Command charging North Korean violations of the 1953 Armistice Agreement during calendar year 1968. According to the report, North Korean violations of the Armistice Agreement, including acts of infiltration, terrorism and subversion, during the first eight months of 1968, as reported by the United Nations Command in its submission of 3 October 1968, had been exceeded, both in frequency and magnitude, during the final four months of the year and were of such seriousness as to warrant a further report to the United Nations. The report added that the year 1968 had witnessed 761 serious incidents in the United Nations Command half of the Demilitarized Zone and throughout the Republic of Korea as a result of North Korean infiltrations, making it the most violent year since the 1953 Armistice Agreement. Furthermore, according to the report, during the first four months of 1969, following the period covered by the report, the North Koreans had committed additional violations, the most serious of which was an unprovoked attack upon a United Nations Command work party within the Demilitarized Zone on 15 March, resulting in the death of one United Nations Command soldier and the wounding of three more.

## Chapter 18

### COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE INDIA-PAKISTAN QUESTION

800. In a letter dated 25 July 1968 (S/8692) the representative of Pakistan drew the attention of the Security Council to Government-sponsored legislation adopted by the Indian Legislature on 20 March and 9 May 1968 which, he stated, sought to confer jurisdiction on the Supreme Court of India to hear appeals against decisions of the Jammu and Kashmir High Court in respect of election petitions and to authorize the extension of a number of laws of the Indian Union to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. After stating that Pakistan had consistently brought to the attention of the Security Council the measures that India had taken over the years to consolidate its hold over the occupied area of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, the letter declared that the above legislation formed another link in the chain of attempts by India to obliterate the special status of that State and gradually to bring about a *fait accompli* diametrically opposed to the agreement contained in the UNCIP resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949.

801. In a letter dated 11 April 1969 (S/9151), the representative of Pakistan drew the attention of the Security Council to certain measures being taken by India directly or through its agents in the State of Jammu and Kashmir which, according to the letter, were causing strong resentment among the people of the Jammu and Kashmir State and in Pakistan. The measures referred to included a bill in the Indian Parliament, which Pakistan believed was designed to extend the "Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act of 1967" to the area in Jammu and Kashmir under India's control. The letter recalled that when that Act had been passed by the Indian Parliament in 1967, the

Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations, by his letter dated 28 December 1967 (S/8315), had drawn the attention of the Security Council to it and had stated that the measure was bound to lead to serious consequences.

802. By another legislative measure, Pakistan's letter stated, India wished to confer proprietary rights to non-Muslims over property left by Muslim citizens of the State of Jammu and Kashmir who had been forced to migrate from the State. Pakistan concluded its letter by stating that the proposed Indian legislative measures, besides constituting violations of India's obligations under United Nations resolutions and the Charter, would also prevent the creation of an atmosphere favourable to the promotion of negotiations for a peaceful settlement of the dispute concerning the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

803. In a letter dated 2 June 1969 (S/9231), the representative of India, after referring to Pakistan's letters of 2 July 1968 (S/8670), 25 July 1968 (S/8692) and 11 April 1969 (S/9151), stated that the subject-matter of the last two letters had also been raised by Pakistan in its notes to India on 20 July 1968 and 2 April 1969. Copies of India's replies to those notes were annexed to the letter of 2 June. In its replies India had stated that since the State of Jammu and Kashmir had acceded to India and was Indian territory, any changes, undertaken or contemplated, either within the State or in relations between the State and the Central Government were matters entirely for the Government of India and the Government of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to decide.

Pakistan's notes in that respect amounted to an unwarranted interference in the domestic affairs of India. So far as Pakistan's letter of 2 July 1968 was concerned, the fact that India was prepared to discuss all

differences with Pakistan was in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Tashkent Declaration and did not mean that India could not take measures necessary for proper government in Kashmir.

## **Chapter 19**

### **LETTER DATED 18 JUNE 1969 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF HAITI**

804. In a letter dated 18 June 1969 (S/9273) addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Haiti stated that on 4 June 1969 a Super Constellation aircraft flew over the capital of Haiti and dropped incendiary bombs on the National Palace, the Foreign Ministry and other official and public buildings. The aircraft, which had managed to escape anti-aircraft fire, had left in a northerly direction, flying over Cap-Haitien.

805. The letter added that Haiti considered the dropping of incendiary bombs over its capital, resulting in loss of life and damage to property, to be a flagrant violation of all international conventions and of peaceful coexistence among nations. It also considered the incident to be related to its complaint submitted to the Security Council in May 1968 (S/8592 and S/8593).

## **Chapter 20**

### **COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE IRAQ-IRANIAN BOUNDARY TREATY OF 1937**

806. In a letter dated 29 April 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9185 and Corr.1), the representative of Iraq stated that on 19 April the Iranian Government had announced its unilateral abrogation of the Iraq-Iran Boundary Treaty of 1937 in clear violation of the rules of international law. The letter charged that Iran's renunciation of the Treaty was accompanied by a massive disposition of troops, naval and air force units along the Iraqi borders, constituting a serious threat to the security and territorial integrity of Iraq. Some of these troops, the letter continued, had violated Iraqi sovereignty and had engaged in acts which constituted a serious intervention in Iraq's administration of the Shatt-al-Arab, besides constituting a clear violation of the Boundary Treaty and the basic principles of international law and of the United Nations Charter. The letter concluded by stating that Iraq refused to cede any part of its national territory or territorial waters and would never be intimidated by threats or military dispositions.

807. In a letter dated 1 May addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9190), the representative of Iran, after referring to the above Iraqi letter, stated that for more than thirty years Iraq had refused to carry out its obligations under the 1937 Treaty. Article 5 of that Treaty had called upon the two parties to conclude a convention to oversee navigation in the Shatt-al-Arab within one year after its entry into force. The letter charged that despite Iran's continuous efforts, Iraq had purposely failed to conclude the required convention. It also listed several other Iraqi violations of the 1937 Treaty and declared that faced with such continuous violations Iran had no alternative but to abrogate the Treaty. The letter concluded by stating that Iran was always ready to settle the matter by friendly negotiation based on general practice of international law with regard to frontier rivers.

808. In a further letter dated 9 May (S/9200), the representative of Iran stated that on 15 April 1969, Iraq had demanded that Iranian ships should lower their flags while sailing the Shatt-al-Arab and that Iran should withdraw its naval personnel on board such boats. Iraq also had threatened that failing compliance, it would forcibly eject such personnel and lower the Iranian flag. The letter also charged Iraq with harassment and mass expulsions of Iranian nationals and pilgrims in Iraq. Iran then declared that it would not allow the waters of the Shatt-al-Arab, more than half of which originate from sources in Iran, to fall within the exclusive dominion of Iraq and would not permit a situation imposed by colonialism to continue to deprive it of its sovereign rights. The 1937 Iraq-Iran Boundary Treaty, the letter stated, was an instrument designed to perpetuate the control of the British Admiralty of the waters of the Persian Gulf including the Shatt-al-Arab; none the less, the Treaty and the annexed Protocol had recognized and made provisions for Iran's right to free and unhindered use of the waterway. Iraq's intransigence had prevented the adoption of measures required to implement those provisions. Iran, however, was prepared to conclude a new treaty with Iraq under which the sovereign rights of both nations would be safeguarded in the Shatt-al-Arab in accordance with established rules of international law and justice.

809. Annexed to the above letter were two statements of the Iranian Ministry of Foreign Affairs dated 27 April and 3 May 1969 (S/9200/Add.1).

810. In a letter dated 13 May (S/9205) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Iraq, after stating that Iran, in its two communications to the Security Council, had distorted historical facts and recent events, reiterated his Government's stand that Iran's abrogation of the 1937 Treaty was an illegal act violating all rules of international law. He said the Treaty was not a time-

expiring treaty and had been concluded to determine once and for all the boundary status between the two countries. Accordingly, the theory of *rebus sic stantibus* could not be invoked with regard to the 1937 Treaty, inasmuch as that would basically negate the principle of *pacta sunt servanda*. He said that despite numerous concessions made by Iraq to induce Iran to conclude an agreement to regulate navigation in the Shatt-al-Arab, as provided for by article II of the Protocol attached to the 1937 Boundary Treaty, Iran had consistently frustrated those attempts so that it could put forward non-implementation of article II of the Protocol as a pretext for the Treaty's abrogation. There was also no basis for Iran's claim that half of the waters of the Shatt-al-Arab originated from its territory. Iraq had never denied Iran the right to navigation in the Shatt-al-Arab; however, it could not accept that navigational rights could be equated with sovereign rights in the river as claimed by Iran. The letter then said that Iran's offer to conclude a new treaty could not be taken in good faith in view of its unilateral abrogation of the already binding Treaty. Iraq, however, was always willing to abide by the rules of international law, the principles of the United Nations Charter and the provisions of the 1937 Boundary

Treaty with Iran. Iraq believed that a similar attitude on the part of Iran and a restoration of the *status quo ante* all along the border between the two countries would help eliminate tension in the area.

811. In a letter dated 11 July (S/9323) the representative of Iraq stated that there had been no favourable development in the situation created by Iran's unilateral attempt to abrogate the Iraq-Iran Boundary Treaty of 1937. Iran still persisted in its intransigence and continued its demonstrations of force in the Shatt-al-Arab, thereby violating Iraq's sovereignty and threatening its security, as well as endangering navigation in the river. If Iran felt justified in its claims that Iraq had failed to live up to its commitments under the 1937 Boundary Treaty, it should have resorted to a neutral judicial body, such as the International Court of Justice, in order to obtain a compulsory judicial decision. For its part, Iraq was willing to refer all disputes concerning the application of the Boundary Treaty to the International Court of Justice and to abide by the Court's decision thereon.

812. Attached to the letter was a study detailing the historical background of the Iraq-Iran boundary issue and the origins of the current dispute.

## Chapter 21

### COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING RELATIONS BETWEEN EL SALVADOR AND HONDURAS

813. In a letter dated 27 June 1969 (S/9291), the representative of El Salvador stated that his Government had been obliged to sever diplomatic relations with the Government of Honduras because of extremely grave incidents against thousands of Salvadorian nationals in Honduras. He reported that according to official migration records, more than 9,000 Salvadorians had already fled Honduras as a consequence of indiscriminate mass persecution. By the same letter he also transmitted the text of the cable by which the Government of El Salvador had notified the Government of Honduras of its decision to sever diplomatic relations.

814. By a letter dated 2 July (S/9315), the representative of El Salvador transmitted to the Secretary-General the text of a letter dated 1 July from his Foreign Minister to the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States in which, after denying the charges made against his country by Honduras, the Foreign Minister stated that all El Salvador had done was to denounce publicly the outrages committed against thousands of Salvadorians living in Honduras. The letter added that El Salvador had asked the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to verify, *in situ*, the charges of violations of human rights of Salvadorians residing in Honduras.

815. By a letter dated 3 July (S/9314), the representative of El Salvador transmitted the text of a message from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of his country which stated that on that day armed Honduran aircraft had violated El Salvador's air space and had machine-gunned Salvadorian guard posts. It added that for twenty minutes Honduran soldiers on the neighbouring heights had fired on the Salvadorian frontier guards, who had returned their fire. El Salvador had taken defensive action in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and Article 7 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

816. In a letter dated 4 July (S/9318), the representative of Honduras stated that his country and El Salvador were the only two States of Central America which had not yet fixed their common frontier. For more than 100 years, Honduras had made every possible effort, the latest having been made on 18 December 1967, to remedy that situation. From time immemorial thousands of Salvadorians had entered Honduras in an irregular manner and had remained there without changing their legal residence. In recent years, a series of unfortunate incidents, which had not been provoked by Honduras, had disturbed the relations between the two countries. The situation had further deteriorated during a sporting event held in El Salvador. After that incident, both Governments had asked the Organization of American States for the assistance of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. The letter added that the Government of El Salvador, without awaiting regional and international agreement, had severed its relations with Honduras, obliging it to take corresponding action. Furthermore, El Salvador had mobilized its armed forces and had deployed its troops along the frontier in a show of military force on 3 July, when a clearly marked Honduran commercial airplane was subjected to artillery fire by the Salvadorian army. Attack was also made on Honduran customs installations, and the Honduran Air Force had intercepted a Salvadorian military aircraft flying inside Honduran territory.

817. By a telegram dated 4 July (S/9317), the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States transmitted to the Secretary-General the text of a resolution adopted on that date by the Council of the OAS. By that resolution the Council of the OAS resolved, among other things, to recommend to the Governments of El Salvador and Honduras to take appropriate measures in order to avoid any act that might aggravate the situation, and to express its wish

that mediation by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica, Guatemala and Nicaragua would be successful in the search for a solution satisfactory to the parties.

818. By a telegram dated 14 July (S/9328), the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States transmitted the text of a resolution which had been approved on the same date by the Council of the OAS. By that resolution, the Council of the OAS, at the request of the Governments of Honduras and El Salvador, resolved to convoke the Organ of Consultation, which would meet to constitute itself and act provisionally, in accordance with article 12 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and to inform the United Nations Security Council of the text of the resolution.

819. In a letter dated 15 July (S/9329), the representative of Honduras stated that for some years the Government of El Salvador had been constructing military installations in localities close to the Honduran frontier and had been acquiring military equipment over and above the normal needs of its armed forces. The letter added that while Honduras was placing its confidence in the mediation efforts of Guatemala, Nicaragua and Costa Rica, the Government of El Salvador was making preparations for the attack which it carried out on 14 July in the form of air raids on the airport of Tegucigalpa and on towns located in various parts of the country, some of them many kilometres from El Salvador territory and not containing any military installations. It charged that casualties amounted to five civilians dead and several wounded and that schools, hospital centres and family dwellings had been destroyed or damaged. In addition, Salvadorian infantry units had attacked some frontier posts. All this occurred while Honduras was preparing to place the matter before the OAS, in view of the failure of the mediation efforts by the Central American Foreign Ministers, most of whose proposals had been rejected by El Salvador. Early on 15 July, the letter went on, Salvadorian aircraft had made another raid over the Tegucigalpa airport but had been intercepted by Honduran fighter aircraft and driven back to Salvadorian territory. As an act of legitimate self-defence, the Honduran armed forces ordered an attack on military installations and harbour facilities in different places throughout Salvadorian territory.

820. In a letter dated 15 July (S/9330 and Corr.1), the representative of El Salvador stated that his country was obliged, in view of the repeated aggression by Honduras, to take measures of legitimate self-defence to secure the defensive position of El Salvador and to

protect its vital interests while steps were taken by the competent organs of the Inter-American system and, possibly, of the United Nations, to put an end to the Honduran aggression. Honduran troops, the letter added, encouraged and led by agents of the public authorities had, since 15 June 1969, been persecuting Salvadorian residents merely on the grounds of their nationality. Sixteen thousand Salvadorians had been expelled from Honduran territory. El Salvador, the letter further stated, had presented evidence of those facts to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and was offering that evidence to the Security Council as well. The allegations by Honduras that it had been the victim of a surprise attack by El Salvador while negotiations were in progress in Washington was ridiculous. When the OAS had met in Washington on 14 July, the aggressive intentions of Honduras were already clear from the many incidents of the preceding days. Moreover, Honduras had been keeping large concentrations of troops in border areas and had been taking other military measures with which it was proposing to attack and occupy La Unión, the main port of eastern El Salvador. Those plans had been frustrated by the defensive measures taken by El Salvador.

821. By a cable dated 15 July (S/9334), the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States transmitted the text of a resolution adopted on the same date by the Council of the OAS, acting provisionally as the Organ of Consultation, by which it resolved to call upon the Governments of El Salvador and Honduras to suspend hostilities, to restore matters to the *status quo ante bellum* and to take the necessary measures to re-establish and maintain inter-American peace and security and for the solution of the conflict by peaceful means.

822. On 15 July, the Secretary-General addressed identical cables to the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of El Salvador (S/9332) and Honduras (S/9333) in which he stated that he had followed with deep concern the deterioration of the relations between those two countries, hoping that the situation would improve and negotiations would be undertaken for a peaceful settlement of their dispute. However, the situation appeared to be growing worse and the use of force threatened peace. In the circumstances, he added, it was his duty to appeal to both Governments to desist at once from the use of force and direct their efforts towards the use of peaceful means for settling their differences. Both Governments had not only responsibility to their peoples and to the peoples of other States Members of the United Nations to prevent a breach of the peace but a duty to prevent damage to the promising structure of the Central American Common Market.

## Chapter 22

### REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS AND THE EFFECTS OF THEIR POSSIBLE USE

823. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2454 A (XXIII) of 20 December 1968, the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council on 1 July 1969 (S/9292) a report on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons and the effects of their possible use, which had been prepared with the assistance of qualified consultant experts. The Secretary-General stated that the group of fourteen consultant experts whom he had appointed had submitted a unanimous report, which he had decided to accept in its entirety. In the hope that further action would be taken to deal with the threat posed by the existence of such

weapons, the Secretary-General stated that he felt it incumbent upon him to urge that the Members of the United Nations undertake the following measures in the interests of enhancing the security of the peoples of the world: (1) to renew the appeal to all States to accede to the Geneva Protocol of 1925; (2) to make a clear affirmation that the prohibition contained in the Geneva Protocol applies to the use in war of all chemical, bacteriological and biological agents (including tear gas and other harassing agents), which now exist or which may be developed in the future; and (3) to call upon all countries to reach agreement to halt the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical and bacteriological (biological) agents for purposes of war and to achieve their effective elimination from the arsenal of weapons.

### *Chapter 23*

#### **ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA**

824. A special meeting of the Security Council was convened on 16 June 1969 for the purpose of hearing a statement by His Excellency Dr. Carlos Lleras Restrepo, President of the Republic of Colombia, concerning the views of his Government on certain aspects of the problem of the maintenance of international peace and security. The proceedings of the special meeting were circulated as an official document of the Security Council (S/9259 and Corr.1 and 2).





## APPENDICES

### I. Representatives and deputy, alternate and acting representatives accredited to the Security Council

The following representatives and deputy, alternate and acting representatives were accredited to the Security Council during the period covered by the present report:

#### *Algeria*

Mr. Tewfik Bouattoura  
Mr. Abdellatif Rahal  
Mr. Hadj Benabdelkader Azzout

#### *Brazil<sup>a</sup>*

Mr. João Augusto de Araújo Castro  
Mr. Geraldo de Carvalho Silos  
Mr. Celso Antonio de Souza e Silva  
Mr. Nelson Freire Lavenère Wanderley  
Mr. João Clemente Baena Soares

#### *Canada<sup>a</sup>*

Mr. George Ignatieff  
Mr. Paul André Beaulieu  
Mr. Gordon E. Cox  
Mr. Sydney Allan Freifeld

#### *China*

Mr. Liu Chieh  
Dr. Chun-Ming Chang

#### *Colombia<sup>b</sup>*

Dr. Julio César Turbay Ayala  
Dr. José María Morales-Suárez

#### *Denmark<sup>a</sup>*

Mr. Otto R. Borch  
Mr. Skjold G. Mellbin  
Mr. Torben Dithmer

#### *Ethiopia<sup>a</sup>*

Lij Endalkachew Makonnen  
Mr. Kifle Wodajo

#### *Finland<sup>b</sup>*

Mr. Max Jakobson  
Mr. Ilkka Pastinen  
Mr. Matti Cawen

#### *France*

Mr. Armand Béard  
Mr. Claude Chayet  
Mr. Fernand Rouillon  
Mr. Marcel Bouquin

#### *Hungary*

Mr. Károly Csatorday  
Mr. József Tardos  
Mr. Endre Zádor

#### *India<sup>a</sup>*

Mr. Gopaldaswami Parthasarathi  
Mr. B. C. Mishra

#### *Nepal<sup>b</sup>*

Mr. Padma Bahadur Khatri  
Mr. Uddhav Deo Bhatt

#### *Pakistan*

Mr. Agha Shahi  
Mr. S. A. Pasha  
Mr. Mohammad Yunus  
Mr. Jamil U. Hasan

#### *Paraguay*

Mr. Miguel Solano López  
Dr. Víctor Manuel Jara Recalde  
Dr. Manuel Avila

#### *Senegal*

Mr. Ibrahima Boye  
Mr. Abdou Salam M'Bengue

#### *Spain<sup>b</sup>*

Mr. Jaime de Piniés  
Mr. Gabriel Cañadas

#### *Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

Mr. Yakov Aleksandrovich Malik  
Mr. Lev Isaakovich Mendelevich  
Mr. Aleksei Vasilyevich Zakharov  
Dr. Viktor Levonovich Issraelyan  
Mr. Nikolai Konstantinovich Tarassov  
Mr. Vikenti Pavlovich Sobolev

#### *United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*

Lord Caradon  
Sir Leslie Glass  
Mr. David H. T. Hildyard  
Mr. Edward Youde  
Mr. Henry Darwin  
Mr. A. D. Parsons

#### *United States of America*

Mr. George W. Ball  
Mr. James Russell Wiggins  
Mr. Charles W. Yost  
Mr. William B. Buffum  
Mr. Richard F. Pedersen  
Mr. Christopher H. Phillips

#### *Zambia<sup>b</sup>*

Mr. Vernon Johnson Mwaanga  
Mr. Wamunyima Mubita  
Mr. Lishomwa Sheba Muuka  
Mr. Isaac Raphael B. Manda

<sup>a</sup> Term of office ended on 31 December 1968.

<sup>b</sup> Term of office began on 1 January 1969.

## II. Presidents of the Security Council

The following representatives held office of President of the Security Council during the period covered by the present report:

### Algeria

Mr. Tewfik Bouatjoura (16 to 31 July 1968)

### Brazil

Mr. João Augusto de Araújo Castro (1 to 31 August 1968)

### Canada

Mr. George Ignatieff (1 to 30 September 1968)

### China

Mr. Liu Chieh (1 to 31 October 1968)

### Denmark

Mr. Otto R. Borch (1 to 30 November 1968)

### Ethiopia

Lij Endalkachew Makonnen (1 to 31 December 1968)

### Finland

Mr. Max Jakobson (1 to 31 January 1969)

### France

Mr. Armand Bérard (1 to 28 February 1969)

### Hungary

Mr. Károly Csatorday (1 to 31 March 1969)

### Nepal

Mr. Padma Bahadur Khatri (1 to 30 April 1969)

### Pakistan

Mr. Agha Shahi (1 to 31 May 1969)

### Paraguay

Mr. Miguel Solano López (1 to 30 June 1969)

### Senegal

Mr. Ibrahima Boye (1 to 15 July 1969)

## III. Meetings of the Security Council during the period from 16 July 1968 to 15 July 1969

Meeting	Subject	Date	Meeting	Subject	Date
1434th	The situation in the Middle East:			States addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8758)	21 August 1968
	(a) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8616)	5 August 1968	1442nd	Ditto	22 August 1968
	(b) Letter dated 5 June 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8617)		1443rd	Ditto	22 August 1968
	(c) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8721)		1444th	Ditto	23 August 1968
	(d) Letter dated 5 August 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8724)		1445th	Ditto	24 August 1968
1435th	Ditto	6 August 1968	1446th	The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 2 September 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8794)	4 September 1968
1436th	Ditto	7 August 1968	1447th	Ditto	5 September 1968
1437th	Ditto	9 August 1968	1448th	The situation in the Middle East: (a) Letter dated 2 September 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8794)	8 September 1968
1438th	Ditto	12 August 1968		(b) Letter dated 8 September 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8805)	
1439th	Ditto	15 August 1968		(c) Letter dated 8 September 1968 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8806)	
1440th	Ditto	16 August 1968			
1441st	Letter dated 21 August 1968 from the representatives of Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, the United Kingdom and the United				

Meeting	Subject	Date
1449th	Ditto	10 September 1968
1450th	Admission of new Members: Letter dated 6 September 1968 from the Prime Minister of Swaziland addressed to the Secretary-General (S/8808)	11 September 1968
1451st	The situation in the Middle East: (a) Letter dated 2 September 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8794) (b) Letter dated 8 September 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8805) (c) Letter dated 8 September 1968 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8806)	11 September 1968
1452nd	Ditto	18 September 1968
1453rd	The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 17 September 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Pakistan and Senegal (S/8819)	20 September 1968
1454th	Ditto	27 September 1968
1455th (private)	Consideration of the report of the Security Council to the General Assembly	30 September 1968
1456th	The situation in the Middle East: (a) Letter dated 1 November 1968 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8878) (b) Letter dated 1 November 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8879)	1 November 1968
1457th	Ditto	4 November 1968
1458th	Admission of new Members: Letter dated 25 October 1968 from the President of the Republic	6 November 1968

Meeting	Subject	Date
	lic of Equatorial Guinea addressed to the Secretary-General (S/8883)	
1459th	Letter dated 26 December 1963 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/5488) Report by the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (S/8914)	10 December 1968
1460th	1. The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8945) 2. The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8946)	29 December 1968
1461st	Ditto	30 December 1968
1462nd	Ditto	31 December 1968
1463rd	Letter dated 9 January 1969 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council transmitting the text of General Assembly resolution 2479 (XXIII) of 21 December 1968 (S/8962) <i>Note verbale</i> dated 16 January 1969 from the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8967) and <i>note verbale</i> dated 16 January 1969 from the Permanent Mission of Spain to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8968)	24 January 1969
1464th	The situation in Namibia: Letter dated 14 March 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic	20 March 1969

Meeting	Subject	Date
	of), Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia (S/9090 and Add.1 and 2)	
1465th	Ditto	20 March 1969
1466th	1. The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 26 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9113)	27 March 1969
	2. The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 27 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9114)	
1467th	Ditto	27 March 1969
1468th	Ditto	28 March 1969
1469th	Ditto	28 March 1969
1470th	Ditto	29 March 1969
1471st	Ditto	29 March 1969
1472nd	Ditto	1 April 1969
1473rd	Ditto	1 April 1969
1474th	Letter dated 26 December 1963 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/5488) Report by the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (S/9233)	10 June 1969
1475th	Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:	13 June 1969

Meeting	Subject	Date
	Letter dated 6 June 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia (S/9237 and Add.1 and 2)	
	Reports of the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) (S/8954 and S/9252)	
1476th	Ditto	13 June 1969
1477th	Ditto	17 June 1969
1478th	Ditto	18 June 1969
1479th	Ditto	19 June 1969
1480th	Ditto	23 June 1969
1481st	Ditto	24 June 1969
1482nd	The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 26 June 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9284)	30 June 1969
1483rd	Ditto	1 July 1969
1484th	Ditto	2 July 1969
1485th	Ditto	3 July 1969

#### IV. Representatives, chairmen and principal secretaries of the Military Staff Committee

##### A. REPRESENTATIVES OF EACH SERVICE IN RESPECT OF EACH DELEGATION

16 July 1968 to 15 July 1969

Period of service from 16 July 1967

##### Chinese delegation

General Wang Shu-ming, Chinese Air Force	16 July 1968 to present time
Rear Admiral Hsiung Teh-shu, Chinese Navy	16 July 1968 to present time
Colonel Hwang Hsiung-sheng, Chinese Air Force and Acting Army Representative	16 July 1968 to present time

*French delegation*

Brigadier General G. Arnous-Riviere, French Army	16 July 1968 to 29 August 1968
Brigadier General R. J. Pessey, French Army	29 August 1968 to present time
Commander J. P. Murgue, French Navy	16 July 1968 to present time
Colonel R. Charles, French Air Force	16 July 1968 to 12 September 1968
Colonel J. Faberes, French Air Force	12 September 1968 to present time

*USSR delegation*

Major General M. I. Stolnik, Soviet Army	16 July 1968 to present time
Captain 1st Rank V. N. Vashchenko, USSR Navy	16 July 1968 to present time
Colonel V. S. Afanasiev, USSR Air Force	16 July 1968 to 20 December 1968
Colonel V. N. Galich, USSR Air Force	20 December 1968 to 7 April 1969
Colonel V. I. Pereverzev, USSR Air Force	7 April 1969 to present time

*United Kingdom delegation*

Lieutenant General Sir George Lea, British Army	16 July 1968 to present time
Rear Admiral L. E. S. H. Le Bailly, Royal Navy	16 July 1968 to present time
Air Vice Marshal D. Crowley-Milling, Royal Air Force	16 July 1968 to present time

*United States delegation*

Lieutenant General F. H. Chesarek, US Army	16 July 1968 to 10 March 1969
Lieutenant General H. J. Lemley, Jr., US Army	10 March 1969 to present time
Vice Admiral A. McB. Jackson, Jr., US Navy	16 July 1968 to 1 April 1969
Vice Admiral J. M. Lee, US Navy	1 April 1969 to present time
Lieutenant General J. R. Holzapple, US Air Force	16 July 1968 to 1 February 1969
Lieutenant General J. W. Carpenter, III, US Air Force	1 February 1969 to present time

B. CHAIRMEN AT MEETINGS

16 July 1968 to 15 July 1969

<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Chairman</i>	<i>Delegation</i>
604th	18 July 1968	Colonel V. S. Afanasiev, USSR Air Force	USSR
605th	1 Aug. 1968	Lieutenant General Sir George Lea, British Army	UK
606th	15 Aug. 1968	Rear Admiral L. E. S. H. Le Bailly, Royal Navy	UK
607th	29 Aug. 1968	Air Vice Marshal D. Crowley-Milling, Royal Air Force	UK
608th	12 Sep. 1968	Vice Admiral A. McB. Jackson, Jr., US Navy	US
609th	26 Sep. 1968	Colonel J. M. Boyd, US Air Force	US
610th	10 Oct. 1968	General Wang Shu-ming, Chinese Air Force	China
611th	24 Oct. 1968	General Wang Shu-ming, Chinese Air Force	China
612th	7 Nov. 1968	Brigadier General R. J. Pessey, French Army	France
613th	21 Nov. 1968	Brigadier General R. J. Pessey, French Army	France
614th	5 Dec. 1968	Captain 1st Rank V. N. Vashchenko, USSR Navy	USSR
615th	19 Dec. 1968	Colonel V. S. Afanasiev, USSR Air Force	USSR
616th	2 Jan. 1969	Rear Admiral L. E. S. H. Le Bailly, Royal Navy	UK
617th	16 Jan. 1969	Air Vice Marshal D. Crowley-Milling, Royal Air Force	UK
618th	30 Jan. 1969	Lieutenant General Sir George Lea, British Army	UK
619th	13 Feb. 1969	Vice Admiral A. McB. Jackson, Jr., US Navy	US
620th	27 Feb. 1969	Vice Admiral A. McB. Jackson, Jr., US Navy	US
621st	13 Mar. 1969	General Wang Shu-ming, Chinese Air Force	China
622nd	27 Mar. 1969	Rear Admiral Hsiung Teh-shu, Chinese Navy	China
623rd	10 Apr. 1969	Brigadier General R. J. Pessey, French Army	France
624th	24 Apr. 1969	Colonel J. Faberes, French Air Force	France
625th	8 May 1969	Colonel V. I. Pereverzev, USSR Air Force	USSR
626th	22 May 1969	Major General M. I. Stolnik, Soviet Army	USSR
627th	5 June 1969	Rear Admiral L. E. S. H. Le Bailly, Royal Navy	UK
628th	19 June 1969	Brigadier General D. J. St. M. Tabor, British Army	UK
629th	3 July 1969	Vice Admiral J. M. Lee, US Navy	US

C. PRINCIPAL SECRETARIES AT MEETINGS

16 July 1968 to 15 July 1969

<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Principal Secretary</i>	<i>Delegation</i>
604th	18 July 1968	Captain 1st Rank I. P. Sakulkin, USSR Navy	USSR
605th	1 Aug. 1968	Colonel F. H. Bristowe, Royal Marines	UK
606th	15 Aug. 1968	Colonel F. H. Bristowe, Royal Marines	UK
607th	29 Aug. 1968	Colonel F. H. Bristowe, Royal Marines	UK
608th	12 Sep. 1968	Colonel E. P. Lasche, US Army	US
609th	26 Sep. 1968	Captain A. R. Gordon, US Navy	US
610th	10 Oct. 1968	Colonel Hwang Hsiung-sheng, Chinese Air Force	China
611th	24 Oct. 1968	Colonel Hwang Hsiung-sheng, Chinese Air Force	China
612th	7 Nov. 1968	Colonel J. Faberes, French Air Force	France
613th	21 Nov. 1968	Lieutenant Colonel J. F. Podeur, French Army	France
614th	5 Dec. 1968	Lieutenant Colonel Y. P. Vetrov, Soviet Army	USSR

<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Principal Secretary</i>	<i>Delegation</i>
615th	19 Dec. 1968	Lieutenant Colonel Y. P. Vetrov, Soviet Army	USSR
616th	2 Jan. 1969	Colonel F. H. Bristowe, Royal Marines	UK
617th	16 Jan. 1969	Wing Commander B. R. Clarke, Royal Air Force	UK
618th	30 Jan. 1969	Colonel F. H. Bristowe, Royal Marines	UK
619th	13 Feb. 1969	Captain A. R. Gordon, US Navy	US
620th	27 Feb. 1969	Colonel E. P. Lasche, US Army	US
621st	13 Mar. 1969	Captain Wang Jan-chih, Chinese Navy	China
622nd	27 Mar. 1969	Colonel Hwang Hsiung-sheng, Chinese Air Force	China
623rd	10 Apr. 1969	Colonel J. Faberes, French Air Force	France
624th	24 Apr. 1969	Lieutenant Colonel J. F. Podeur, French Army	France
625th	8 May 1969	Lieutenant Colonel Y. P. Vetrov, Soviet Army	USSR
626th	22 May 1969	Lieutenant Colonel Y. P. Vetrov, Soviet Army	USSR
627th	5 June 1969	Colonel F. H. Bristowe, Royal Marines	UK
628th	19 June 1969	Colonel C. H. M. Toye, British Army	UK
629th	3 July 1969	Colonel E. P. Lasche, US Army	US