



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

AUG 22 1973

1733rd

MEETING: 20 JULY 1973

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1733)	1
Statement by the President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution	
331 (1973) (S/10929)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THIRD MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 20 July 1973, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, China, France, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1733)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);
 - (b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929).

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT: Before inviting the attention of the Council to our agenda, I should like to make a brief personal statement.

2. Although I am gray-headed and stricken in years and have been around the Council for some time—and indeed I was President on two previous occasions—this is the first time that I have actually had the honour of presiding over a formal meeting and the opportunity of actually wielding the gavel. I hope therefore that members will treat me with the indulgence that they traditionally grant to a newcomer. And I feel particularly vulnerable when I compare my lack of experience with the vast experience of my predecessor in June, Ambassador Malik. My Deputy, Mr. Jamieson, in the course of the meetings of the Council earlier this week, paid my delegation's tribute to him for the skilful manner in which he had conducted the affairs of the Council last month. I am glad to be able to add my own expression of the respect that I have developed for him over the last three years.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929)

3. The PRESIDENT: In the course of the Council's consideration last month of the question on our agenda

[1717th-1726th meetings], it was agreed to extend invitations to participate in the discussion without the right to vote to the representatives of the following 19 Member States, which I shall list in the order in which their requests were received: Egypt, Israel, Jordan, United Republic of Tanzania, Chad, Syrian Arab Republic, Nigeria, Algeria, Morocco, United Arab Emirates, Somalia, Guyana, Mauritania, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Iran and Bahrain. We are now resuming consideration of the question after a suspension of the debate and these invitations remain valid.

4. In view of the limited number of places available at the Council table, my predecessor followed a procedure which I would propose to copy, that is, he invited the representatives of Egypt, Israel and Jordan to take places at the Council table and invited the remaining representatives to take the places reserved for them at the sides of the Council Chamber on the understanding that they would be invited to be seated at the Council table when it was their turn to address the Council.

5. If I hear no objection, I shall proceed to extend the appropriate invitations in the manner I have just outlined.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Zayyat (Egypt), Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) and Mr. A. H. Sharaf (Jordan) took places at the Security Council table; and Mr. H. G. Ouangmoting (Chad), Mr. H. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. E. O. Ogbu (Nigeria), Mr. H. Nur Elmi (Somalia), and Mr. Y. Mahmassani (Lebanon) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT: It will be recalled that at the 1726th meeting of the Security Council on 14 June, the President of the Council read a statement indicating that some tentative suggestions had been made to him concerning the desirability of suspending for a reasonably short period the formal Security Council meetings dealing with the examination of the situation in the Middle East and that a common view had emerged that such a suspension would be useful in affording time for further pondering on the results of the discussion as well as for further unofficial consultations among the members of the Security Council as to the Council's next steps. In accordance with the general understanding that the Council would resume its examination of the situation in the Middle East around the middle of July, I have convoked this meeting today following continued consultations among members of the Council and with representatives of the parties particularly concerned.

7. In the first part of the debate, last month, the parties, all the members of the Council and the other participants expressed their views on the important matter before us. I think the views of all of us are now well known. I hope therefore that we can now concentrate on what the outcome of the debate should be.

8. The first name inscribed on the list of speakers for this resumed discussion of the matter before the Council is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, on whom I call.

9. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): Mr. President, we take it as a sign of the great importance that your Government and you yourself attach to this resumed debate that you are with us today, having disturbed your much-deserved rest to come back to preside over this Council's deliberations. It is also fitting, I think, that when you leave the United Nations after such distinguished service you will do so after having been President of its highest organ at a moment of real historical significance.

10. I would be remiss if I did not convey to Mr. Jamieson, through you, Mr. President, our appreciation of the work he did in your absence in the first part of this debate and during the time in which he was charged, together with the President for the month of June and the Secretary-General, with preparing for these resumed meetings. He has gained the appreciation and thanks of my delegation, and of other delegations, I am sure.

11. It is also appropriate for me to convey through you, to Ambassador Malik, who was President for the month of June, our thanks and congratulations for the remarkable manner indeed in which he conducted the affairs of the Council during that month.

12. I am also sorry to see that the Secretary-General has had to alter his plans for visits which I know he was eager to make and Members were eager for him to make. I am sure that all concerned know that his presence in this debate, as well as that of his Special Representative, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, is really indispensable.

13. I should also like to thank the 14 members of the Council who saw to it that this debate should take place today, and to express regret and great sorrow that the United States of America thought this debate should not be resumed; indeed it was the only member which took that position.

14. It would perhaps be an understatement if I said that the situation which faces us all in this room is serious. Its gravity lies in the challenge facing the United Nations and its principles. The collective responsibility of Members of the community of nations for the preservation of peace and the suppression of acts of violence and aggression represents the greatest achievement of the Charter of the United Nations, the weakening of which shall surely undermine the very foundation of the contemporary international order.

15. In prohibiting the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of States the Charter crowned mankind's struggle to establish an international order of peace and justice. The primary purpose of the United Nations is

to maintain international peace and security and, to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of violence. Member States have a collective responsibility in this endeavour, for aggression against one State is aggression against the international order, and repelling the aggressor and bringing him back within the realm of international authority is the common concern and the collective responsibility of all the Members of the international community.

16. Members of the United Nations have assumed, under Article 25 of the Charter, the obligation to carry out the decisions of the Security Council. In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members conferred on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with Article 24. They agreed that "in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf."

17. The Charter empowers the Security Council with the authority to take the measures necessary for the implementation of its resolutions. They include the suspension of membership, expulsion, diplomatic and economic sanctions and coercive military action against the aggressor or law-breaker.

18. Six years have elapsed since this Council discussed the Israeli attack on Egypt, Jordan and Syria—and Israel is still in occupation of the territories of those three Member States. The Israeli military has meanwhile been applying a policy of colonization of the occupied territories through the establishment of settlements populated by new immigrants, with the avowed aim of creating new facts in the area, without an effective deterrent. Israel has undermined all the efforts of the international community and those of the United Nations, including the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

19. Israel has in fact officially declared its determination to expand beyond the lines and borders existing prior to its attack of 5 June 1967.

20. It is now up to this Council to try to put an end to the flagrant violation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of those three Member States. If the Security Council fails to act or is indeed prevented from acting in this most serious situation, the responsible members of the Council will in fact be abetting Israel in its policy of territorial expansion through the use of force.

21. The discussion which took place in the Council last month revealed general agreement on a number of key points, such as the following.

22. First, the Council has the primary responsibility of taking action in the present situation in order to achieve the just peace it seeks in our area.

23. Second, in performing its duties to achieve peace in the Middle East the Security Council is bound, naturally, by the basic principles of the United Nations Charter.

24. Third, the acquisition of territory by force is totally inadmissible under the United Nations Charter, regardless of the size of the territory. The representative of France gave expression to this important principle when he referred to the continued Israeli occupation of territory belonging to the three Arab States as:

"... obviously [constituting] a standing violation of the principles recognized by the community of nations, and in particular the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force." [1724th meeting, para. 52.]

25. Fourth, respect for the legitimate rights of all peoples, including the Palestinian people, constitutes in this case an indispensable element in the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the area.

26. Those are basic elements which emerged from the debate last month. They were further corroborated by the President of the Security Council in his answers to the questions I had put to him on 11 June [1721st meeting]. Ambassador Malik stated [1725th meeting] that under the Charter the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations consider the principle of the non-acquisition of territory by force and the principle of the territorial integrity of States to be commonly acknowledged norms of international law, violations of which are inadmissible in any circumstances whatsoever, and which are applicable in all cases, including this case of the situation in the Middle East.

27. Ambassador Malik further stated that, according to the Charter of the United Nations and decisions of United Nations organs, every people without exception has the right to self-determination. Such a right is confirmed in concrete form in decisions of the United Nations, *inter alia* with regard to the Arab people of Palestine.

28. The outcome of the Security Council's June debate fully supports the position which Egypt has consistently maintained. There was no support whatsoever and there could not have been any support for the expansionist policy advocated by Israel in the Council. Israel stated the following in the Council on 8 June: "No principle and no rule can prejudice the right to self-preservation and defence" [1719th meeting, para. 39].

29. Arguments similar to those advanced by Israel have been used in the past by aggressors to justify their wars of conquests and aggrandizement. Under the Charter, no State has the right to use security and defence pretexts or considerations to try to justify the acquisition of territories of others or the dispersal of another people. Israel has no special rights or privileges which make it above any law.

30. Such policies have led in the past to two world wars and to the collapse of the League of Nations system. Quoting his Prime Minister, the representative of Australia stated the following on 14 June before the Council:

"There is no more certain way to ensure the continued ineffectiveness of the United Nations than that the smaller nations . . . should despair absolutely of that one

world body of which they form a majority. The greatest victims of the breakdown through despair of the League of Nations were the Jewish people. No nation would have more to lose than Israel by a breakdown of the United Nations." [1725th meeting, para. 48.]

31. It is inconceivable that the representative of Israel, a State Member of the United Nations, should come to this table to advocate a doctrine which the Charter of the United Nations has indeed abolished.

32. What we are witnessing in fact is an attempt to practise an outmoded and outdated colonial policy relying on sheer force in challenge to the present international legal order. By conquering territories, by establishing settlements and outposts, by refusing to recognize the sanctity of international borders and by constantly pushing further into these territories, Israel is indeed pursuing a colonial design in the Middle East patterned on the adventures of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Israel in fact still believes in the right of conquest. Israel in fact still believes that a State's security can be achieved only by its soldiers' brandishing the most modern of arms and stationed on the heights of the conquered lands of their enemies.

33. Only this week the Chief of the Israeli military was urging the creation of more and more Israeli colonies in the Arab territories under its occupation. His ideas are not novel. They indeed reflected sadly those of the fifteenth century. Machiavelli had this to say in *The Prince*:

"The other and better course is to send colonies to one or two places, which may be as keys to that State for it is necessary either to do this or else to keep there a great number of cavalry and infantry. A Prince does not spend much on colonies, for with little or no expense he can send them out and keep them there, and he offends a minority only of the citizens from whom he takes lands and houses to give them to the new inhabitants; and those whom he offends, remaining poor and scattered, are never able to injure him."

34. In an era which has seen the decline of colonialism and the birth of new, advanced thoughts and political thinking, Israel is trying indeed to erect itself as the colonial Power of the twentieth century.

35. The brutality and immorality of the pre-Charter world threatens to gain the upper hand again in our world through the opportunism of the few and the inertia of the rest. We expect the Council today to resolve that the principles of the Charter shall be preserved.

36. Our main obligation now is to seek to and indeed to put an end to the illegal occupation that has lasted for over six years. Without the dislodging of this military occupation, there is and there will be no peace in the Middle East.

37. Israel seeks clearly to close all avenues available to us except one: that of surrender, labelled negotiations under occupation. By insisting on negotiations with the Arab countries while their territories are under occupation Israel is seeking to coerce them into conceding to it parts of their homelands. By undermining all peace initiatives, including

those of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, Israel is determined to reach this objective. It seeks to maintain the occupation of the Arab territories as a means to impose on us the surrender and acceptance of Israeli expansionism, either by forced and imposed so-called agreement or by allowing the present unbearable situation to continue indefinitely.

38. Israel frustrates the peaceful settlement adopted by the Security Council because it is based on the principles of the Charter and not on the weight of conquest and occupation. The fact that the Security Council has been unable to take any measures to enforce its resolutions has encouraged and enabled Israel to reject all the international efforts exerted to achieve justice and peace.

39. After six years of frustrated efforts the Council met on 6 June last to examine the Middle East situation fully. And as you said, Mr. President, a thorough debate took place. In that debate Africa fully participated through a mission of several Ministers for Foreign Affairs. The non-aligned countries equally expressed themselves through the representative of Guyana. The Council had before it the report of the Secretary-General [S/10929] and his Special Representative, and also had before it the resolution of the African States transmitted by the representatives of Africa [see S/10943] and the resolution of the non-aligned world transmitted by its representative [see S/10944]. The Council adjourned to provide time for its members to study these documents and to ponder on the course of action to be taken. We now meet again to face our inescapable responsibilities.

40. In our view there are now three options before the Council.

41. First, the Council could take the necessary measures under the relevant Articles of the Charter to force Israel to withdraw from the territories it has occupied and to comply with the Council's decisions. This, in our view, is the proper course of action. This is what we believe to be the duty of the Council in accordance with the Charter. But we know—alas—that at least one permanent member of the Council would use its veto power to prevent the Council from taking this course.

42. Second, the Council may allow itself to succumb to inaction, leaving Israel to pursue its policy of violence, war and lawlessness in the area. Such a course would certainly undermine the entire United Nations system.

43. The third option—the only one open to the Council now—is for the Council to pronounce itself on the substance of the problem and support the application of the principles of the Charter, impressing as much as it can upon Israel that its expansionist policy is totally contrary to the Charter and that the Council will continue to oppose such a policy and declare it completely unacceptable. In this, the Council should make it clear that Israel's occupation of the territories of three Member States constitutes a most flagrant violation of those principles, that Israel's refusal to respect the territorial integrity of the States in the area puts Israel outside the law. The Council should also invite States to refrain from giving Israel any aid or

assistance enabling it to maintain its policy of occupation and coercion.

44. Together with the Arab people whose territories are occupied we share a common responsibility. The struggle for the liberation of these territories is not only our sacred right but equally our sacred duty. Indeed, we owe it not only to ourselves or to our respective peoples but also to all other small countries, in Asia, Africa and Latin America, to struggle so that aggression will not be a rewarding policy.

45. Our commitment to stand by the people of Palestine will not be shaken by Israel's policy of force or intimidation. We shall continue to support their national struggle to live in dignity and honour in accordance with their inalienable rights.

46. At the present juncture of international relations nations are looking again to the United Nations as the symbol of a world to be ruled by law and as a shield against the forces which seek to have it degenerate into a world ruled by force.

47. It is our hope, it is our expectation that the Council will now be enabled to reflect in its decision the principles and points that emerged from its discussions during the June meetings. Let me say again that during those meetings it was apparent that the assertion of the United Nations authority for the preservation of international and its responsibility to restore peace in the Middle East was accepted. The reaffirmation of the obligation of Member States to carry out the decisions of the Security Council was also underlined. The unshakable stand of the members of the Council regarding the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war was again stated. The total disapproval and grave concern of the members of the Council concerning the persistence of Israel in its occupation of Arab territories of the States of Egypt, Jordan and Syria and its obvious use of this occupation as a means of coercion to achieve its political colonial objectives were also apparent in the deliberations of the Council. The total disapproval and condemnation of Israeli obstruction of all efforts towards the achievement of the solution determined by the Council, including Israeli obstruction of the initiatives of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General within the mandate defined for him by the Council, were also stated. The imperative need to put an end to the changes which Israel is introducing in the occupied Arab territories in violation of international law and in utter disregard of the Council's resolutions, including those on Jerusalem, was also apparent in our deliberations, as was the obligation of Member States not to recognize such illegal acts. The need for the Council's unfailing support for the Secretary-General and his Special Representative in their endeavours to assist in the implementation of the Council's resolutions was stated. And, finally, the conviction was expressed that the respect for the rights of the Palestinian people has been and remains an indispensable element in achieving a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

48. The Israeli authorities today obviously believe that the more arrogantly they affront the international community the sooner will this community accept their policies and despair of any further opposition to them.

49. The Israeli authorities today obviously believe that by exercising more pressure on us they will get more and more concessions until, finally, they realize their imperial dream of the domination of our area.

50. We tell the Israeli authorities simply that we will not yield. We tell the international community, represented in this Council, that we will continue—as we should—to resist.

51. We now put this question, with which I shall conclude. We ask the Council, we ask its members, who represent great peoples in this Council: Will our resistance be supported by the international community and be in accordance with the principles of collective security, aided and bounded at the same time by the United Nations Charter, or do we have to resist alone? After the Council's long, thorough and patient examination of the situation in the Middle East, that is the question to which we expect an answer.

52. Every vote—every single vote—will thus be understood by us to be a vote for peace through international law and order or a vote for the victory of the policies of violence and counter-violence.

53. The PRESIDENT: The next name on my list of speakers is that of the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

54. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Mr. President, I should like to express to you my delegation's profound respect. Throughout the years of our association in the United Nations we have held you in the highest regard and I am glad to see you again. We hope that under your guidance the cause of peace in the Middle East will emerge unscathed from the confrontation initiated in the Council by Egypt.

55. Disappointment and anxiety were widespread when Egypt asked two months ago for a Security Council debate on the Middle East situation. It was clear that the cause of peace could not be served by public polemic and sterile recrimination. In all parts of the world conflicts were being settled and international differences resolved by dialogue and agreement. Confrontation was being replaced by negotiation; inveterate hostility supplanted by understanding and co-operation. There was hope, indeed expectation, that constructive diplomacy would not stop at the gates of the Middle East and that Israel and the Arab States as well would find some way to initiate a process of negotiation. Instead, Egypt chose again the course of collision.

56. In his speech of 16 July, President Sadat made it clear that Egypt did not go to the Security Council for a peaceful solution of the conflict. "There is no peaceful solution", he added, revealing Egypt's true attitude.

57. Yet Israel will remain undeterred in its search for peace. It will not abandon hope that Arab Governments will eventually realize that peace is better than continuation of the conflict, that if seriously pursued, peace is attainable, and that all the peoples of the Middle East, including the Arab nation, are yearning for it. Despite Egypt's persistent refusal to enter into a meaningful dialogue on peace, Israel

will try again and again to persuade it that such a dialogue would be beneficial and essential in bringing about a peaceful settlement.

58. Two conceptions of the Middle East situation are vying with each other in the present Security Council debate. One conception draws inspiration from the age-long saga of the Jewish people, uprooted from its homeland by foreign conquerors, struggling through the centuries to preserve its civilization, faith and national identity and to restore its freedom and sovereignty. The other originates in a refusal to recognize this saga and in a denial of the Jewish people's rights to liberty, self-determination and equality with other nations. Israel, and with it enlightened world opinion, holds that the Jewish people's rebirth in its ancient homeland and the re-establishment of the sole Jewish State has been an epos of supreme justice. The Arab Governments continue to view it as a wrong against the Arab nation, although that nation has attained its rights in 18 sovereign States, including the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan.

59. On the one hand, there is the drama of the Jewish people, beleaguered and embattled for a quarter century, its very right to independence and sovereignty under constant assault. On the other, there is the demand to penalize Israel for having withstood this relentless onslaught on its life, for having repelled the aggressor and driven back the forces which seek its destruction.

60. Egypt and other Arab States having persistently tried to bring about Israel's downfall, now wish the world would ignore the origin, nature and duration of their war against the Jewish State. They would have all disregard the chain of Egyptian acts of war in 1967 that led to the outbreak of hostilities in June of that year: the imposition of a war blockade, the expulsion of the United Nations Emergency Force, the conclusion of military pacts with other Arab States for co-ordinating the attack against Israel, the massing of huge armies along the frontiers for an all-out onslaught against Israel, the bombardment of Israeli villages, President Nasser's proclamation of the final battle to annihilate Israel. To them the only development in recent years worthy of attention is Israel's success in frustrating Arab designs on its existence, resulting in the deployment of Israeli forces on the present cease-fire lines established by the Security Council. Juxtaposed to this is the realization that such a selective and distorted view of the Middle East situation must inevitably impede the solution of the conflict. It is the realization that efforts to attain a peaceful settlement between Israel and the Arab States cannot succeed if they are based on the one-sided contention that the main problem is Israeli withdrawal, while in fact the Israeli presence on the cease-fire lines is a mere by-product of the protracted war of aggression pursued by the Arab States since 1948, a war those States have refused till this day to terminate fully and definitively.

61. Israel's position is that after all the years of violence and bloodshed there appears to be a possibility of attaining genuine peace in the region and establishing secure and recognized boundaries where only truce, armistice or cease-fire lines have existed until now. The Arab Governments demand the restoration of the old military lines, the

very lines which had been a principal cause of the insecurity, chaos and belligerency of the past.

62. Israel calls on the Arab States to start building peace together by talking peace with each other. The Egyptian, and other Arab Governments, counter with the demand that the Arab views and terms be imposed on Israel from the outside in total disregard for Israel's rights and vital interests. They have tried to achieve that objective by a variety of means, including resort to force and pressure by third Powers, individually and collectively. It seems that the Arab leaders' deliberate insensibility to the history and struggle of the Jewish people has led them to repeated mistakes in the assessment of Israel's attitude and mood. A people which has been ready and able to resist oppression and cruelty, force and inhumanity for thousands of years in order to preserve its heritage and to defend its rights, will not yield to its assailants now that it stands on the threshold of ensuring for itself, at long last, the right to live in peace and security. Such a people can be reasoned with. It can be convinced by thoughtful and understanding deliberation. It cannot, however, be pressured. When the Arab States come to accept this fundamental truth they will turn away from confrontation aiming at forcing their will upon Israel, and then there will be agreement in the Middle East.

63. In the United Nations, Egypt and other Arab States still deceive themselves, at times, that by marshalling their automatic majority to pass one-sided resolutions they could sway Israel from defending its basic rights and legitimate positions. The Arab States forget that in its millennial struggle to remain alive, the Jewish people has come to learn that the strength and merit of its heritage and the justice of its cause cannot be weakened by the fact that its opponents are numerous. The Arab States also forget that in the United Nations, even at this Security Council table, there are Governments which thought little of General Assembly resolutions, some adopted by more than a hundred votes, or of Security Council resolutions which had gained 13 or 14 votes and were vetoed, and even of resolutions adopted by the Council but judged by those Governments as inequitable and prejudicial to their national interests.

64. The only resolution that has played any significant role in the Middle East conflict since 1967 is Security Council resolution 242 (1967). This has been so because it was adopted unanimously following consultation and understanding with the parties. One thing is self-evident: resolutions not based on the parties' consent cannot contribute to the attainment of agreement between them. This is sometimes recognized in Egypt as well. Thus a detailed analysis of the first stage of the present debate published in *Al Ahram* on 13 June 1973 referred to such United Nations resolutions as "rusty medals". *Al Ahram* cited Egypt's Foreign Minister as having said:

"Can you imagine the representative of Egypt to the United Nations walking through the *couloirs*, his chest covered with these rusty medals? He will make people laugh."

65. The partisan political views expressed in such resolutions which do not serve the cause of peace in the Middle

East cannot affect Israel's position founded on the precepts of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. It is not surprising, that in these circumstances, Egypt should seek to mask the real meaning of its demands by invoking principles of international law and of the United Nations Charter. It is surprising, however, that Egypt should assume that the misinterpretation and distortion of these principles would go undiscerned even when the Egyptian Foreign Minister calls to his aid the statements of the Soviet representative who misused his office of President to put forward one-sided and warped interpretations without prior consultation with members of the Security Council.

66. Thus the Egyptian Minister for Foreign Affairs has singled out the concept of non-admissibility of acquisition of territory by war which appears in the preamble of resolution 242 (1967). That entire resolution is a series of principles on the application of which the parties are to reach agreement. It is, of course, up to the parties, not up to others, to agree between themselves how those principles should be applied in practice.

67. The most important of the principles appear, as usual, in the operative part of the resolution and not in its preamble. In any event, whatever their relative significance, and even if all the principles in the preamble and in the operative part alike were to be considered of equal importance, it is clear that they cannot be tampered with by selectively singling out one or another for special emphasis. To do that would destroy resolution 242 (1967) and its carefully constructed balance. Yet, that is precisely what Egypt demands: to single out one of the many points in the resolution, thus consciously undermining the resolution as a whole. Egypt goes even beyond that, and when citing the concept of inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by war, deliberately omits the second part of that concept. Indeed, the second preambular paragraph of resolution 242 (1967) states:

"*Emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in security,*"

68. To have any meaning whatever in the Middle East context, the first part of this provision can only be read and must be interpreted in conjunction with its second part that calls for peace, the central element of which would have to be security. This is further elaborated in paragraph 1 of the resolution, envisaging the establishment of secure and recognized boundaries between Israel and the Arab States.

69. A similar distortion and misinterpretation is resorted to by Egypt when it invokes the concept of territorial integrity. This is also one of the points in resolution 242 (1967). However, as already indicated, it must be considered together with the others. To separate it from the other principles would subvert and destroy resolution 242 (1967).

70. Moreover, the full text of paragraph 1 (ii), the resolution's provision which refers to territorial integrity, calls for the application of the following principle:

“Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;”.

71. It is clear from this text that the establishment of secure and recognized boundaries is a prerequisite for the acknowledgement of territorial integrity. The idea of territorial integrity does not stand in exclusive solitude. It is part of a broader principle. In the Middle East context it is a purely theoretical idea unless and until secure and recognized boundaries between Israel and the Arab States are, for the first time, determined by agreement between the parties. In examining the Middle East question we are dealing with a concrete situation and with the need, specifically enunciated by the Security Council, to agree on the application of a number of principles to that situation through a peace agreement. Such agreement will not be reached by maiming and amputating those principles or by singling out some while relegating others to secondary positions.

72. It is to be observed that even in General Assembly resolutions unrelated to any specific problem or situation and enumerating general principles in the abstract, the notions which Egypt seeks to single out are only a part of elaborate, complex and balanced formulations.

73. Egypt's demands are contrary not merely to resolution 242 (1967) but also to the provisions of the Charter. Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter stipulates:

“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, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.”

74. For 25 years Egypt and other Arab States have resorted to threats and to the use of force against Israel and its independence. For 25 years they have remained in a state of war with Israel in defiance of the United Nations Charter. Egypt cannot invoke against Israel the provision that Egypt itself has consistently violated and continues to violate in relation to the Jewish State. Nothing in the Charter deprives a Member State of the right to defend itself. Nothing prevents Israel from responding to the Arab war by a war of self-defence and succeeding in its response.

75. Article 51 of the Charter declares unequivocally: “Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs . . .”. Israel's recourse to arms in self-defence has been in accordance with the Charter and not in contravention of it. Furthermore, no principle or provision of the Charter precludes border changes, especially following the use of force in self-defence and especially where no secure and recognized international boundaries had existed between the victim of aggression and the States that have been waging war against it for two and a half decades in violation of the Charter.

76. The argument that the 1967 line between Israel and Egypt should be considered a State boundary, despite the specific provision to the contrary contained in the Israel-Egyptian Armistice Agreement, is groundless. The Egyptian claim that the 1967 line was not final on the Israeli side but was a definitive boundary on its Egyptian side is a concept devoid of any foundation and even of logic. A line has no width; it has the same meaning and validity for both parties which it separates. If the 1967 line established for Egypt in relation to Israel, as stressed by the Foreign Minister of Egypt, is a mere separation of military forces, it could only be a military, temporary line of identical nature for Israel in relation to Egypt. Thus the Egyptian thesis regarding the 1967 line as transmitted to Israel, *inter alia*, in the Jarring aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 [S/10403, annex I] is a travesty of international law. To give it support is to demolish resolution 242 (1967), which deliberately left the question of secure and recognized boundaries to be determined by agreement between the parties.

77. It is immaterial by what semantic stratagem Egypt tries in 1973 to impose its *diktat* that the old vulnerable and provisional lines be restored and that Israel withdraw to those lines, a *diktat* repeatedly rejected by the General Assembly and the Security Council in 1967. Whether Egypt formulates this demand in specific terms or by reference to the Jarring aide-mémoire which suggested that Israel should accept the Egyptian position or by reference to resolutions supporting it, or whether it does that by professing to invoke general principles, the effect would be the same. The central problem on which the parties are to reach agreement—the question of secure and recognized boundaries—would be excluded from the process of agreement. The essence of the peace-making efforts—attainment of agreement between the parties—would be shattered and replaced by the notion of imposition from the outside. Resolution 242 (1967), the only generally acceptable basis for United Nations action, would be wrecked. To the complexity of the Middle East conflict would be added a jurisprudential void and complete chaos. If there is a flicker of hope that the parties could be brought to reason together and to try to accommodate each other, it must not be stamped out by shortsighted partisanship. A situation in which there is still some opening, no matter how modest and even disappointing, is, after all, preferable to a stark wall with all the openings hermetically closed. It would be unfortunate indeed if the Security Council itself became instrumental in creating such a situation.

78. Another attempt endangering resolution 242 (1967) is Egypt's demand regarding the alleged issue of the rights of Palestinians. Egypt would replace the resolution's call for a just settlement of the refugee problem by a provision on Palestinian rights. In view of the opposition to such a change that would inevitably sound the death-knell of resolution 242 (1967), Egypt has on occasion spoken of the possibility of using phraseology that would not mention those rights specifically and would conceal Egypt's true objectives by invoking the general principle of self-determination.

79. To satisfy the Egyptian demand regarding the principle of self-determination would mean introducing a new element into the framework of resolution 242 (1967) in the

full knowledge that this would completely upset it. This particular Egyptian claim has, however, two additional ominous implications. The Security Council is not a technical drafting committee dealing with abstract formulations. In a debate on the Middle East situation the principle of self-determination or inalienable rights must be viewed in the light of the realities of that situation. The earlier part of the debate established that behind Egypt's references to self-determination and to Palestinian rights lurks a design to dismember Jordan.

80. This has been confirmed in the meantime, both by the governmental Egyptian media of information and by the Arab terrorist organizations. Approval of the Egyptian demand would therefore, in the present political realities of the region, constitute, in fact, approval of the dismemberment of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan. This is doubtless the interpretation that has been given and would be given again in the region to such a step by the Security Council.

81. Moreover, the Foreign Minister of Egypt has made it clear that the new additional Palestinian entity should be created by recognizing the 1947 partition lines as Israel's boundaries. Support of the Egyptian demand regarding self-determination would thus be tantamount, in the Middle East context, to an invitation to Egypt to carry out its notorious two-stage plan: first, to bring about Israel's withdrawal to the 1967 lines, and then to pursue the struggle for Israel's truncation and ultimate liquidation.

82. It is to be recalled that the Palestinian terror groups which claim to speak on behalf of Palestinian rights, and which are actively supported by Egypt, openly proclaim the destruction of Israel as their objective. This is being reiterated daily with the full knowledge and consent of the Egyptian Government on Radio Cairo.

83. It has been clear from the very beginning of the Middle East debate that, as President Sadat declared last Monday, Egypt did not initiate the Security Council deliberations to advance a political solution. The first part of the debate already made it evident that Egypt was thinking in terms of continued confrontation with Israel, rather than agreement with it. Egypt was merely seeking the Security Council's support in this confrontation. Thus it called for approval of views and demands rejected by the Council in 1967 because they would have made agreement between the parties impossible.

84. The discussion, adjourned on 14 June, revealed the Egyptian designs and the baselessness of Egypt's argumentation. It showed how, in the last six years, Egypt rejected one suggestion after another made by Israel and by the Secretary-General's Special Representative to advance the peace-making efforts. The discussion brought out that the Security Council in its resolution 242 (1967) had purposely left the secure and recognized boundaries undefined so that the parties could agree on them between themselves.

85. The discussion further clarified that all, including the Arab delegations, as acknowledged by the Minister of State of the United Arab Emirates, and their supporters, as confirmed by the Indian representative on the Council in

1967, understood that resolution 242 (1967) envisaged changes in the 1967 lines and that no distinction was made in this respect between the line separating Israel from Egypt and the lines between Israel and the other Arab States. It was clear from the discussion that Egypt's demands, if granted, would undermine resolution 242 (1967) and that some of them, such as the claim regarding the so-called Palestinian rights or that Israel's recognized borders should be the partition lines of 1947, would play havoc with the situation in the Middle East.

86. It is regrettable, therefore, that Egypt has not modified its attitude and that it pursues the same course in the resumed debate. The grave implications of this course were highlighted by Egypt's Foreign Minister when, according to the governmental Egyptian Middle East News Agency, he declared in Paris on 17 July, just before his departure for the United Nations, that a Security Council resolution in support of Egypt's demands would give Egypt "a declaration enabling us to resort to any means in order to end the occupation". The significance of that statement is obvious. Egypt's aim in the Security Council is a resolution that could be used to justify Egypt's continued confrontation with Israel, including renewed resort to force. This was confirmed today by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt.

87. This is not a course which could lead to agreement and peace; this is not a position which could create conditions propitious for any constructive effort within the United Nations framework. This is not an attitude that could pave the way for a visit to the region by the Secretary-General. In fact, it brings the United Nations close to a point at which it might find itself unable to play any role in the search for peace in the Middle East.

88. The first stage of the present debate and developments since its adjournment have actually pointed the way for effective peace making. As the discussion in the Security Council progressed, it became increasingly apparent that the one method that could bring about agreement between the parties was that of negotiation. The truth of this conclusion was so obvious that the Arab Governments could no longer ignore or reject it unceremoniously, as in the past. The Egyptian Foreign Minister himself found it necessary to declare that his Government accepted the idea of talks with Israel. He accompanied that statement with the allegation that Israel prevented the initiation of such negotiations by insisting on prior conditions. That allegation, however, is no more credible today than when it was first made, in the light of the known fact that Israel is calling for negotiations without any pre-conditions, and in view of the assurances reiterated in statements before the Council that Israel does not ask Egypt to accept in advance any of the Israeli positions. In the meantime, the President of Tunisia and other international personalities have spoken publicly of the need for Arab negotiations with Israel.

89. In these circumstances, no pretext, no argument or allegation can justify Egypt's refusal to enter into a genuine dialogue with Israel. If there is now general recognition that negotiations between the parties to the conflict are essential and inevitable, there can be no reason whatever for delaying them.

90. The first round in the Middle East debate was suspended on the eve of an historic event that underlined the importance of contact and talks between nations. The American-Soviet summit meeting in Washington has dramatically demonstrated the effectiveness of the process of negotiations. None of the summit's significant results could have been envisaged and achieved without the serious exchanges of view which had taken place between the two Powers. Could anyone imagine the understandings reached and the agreements concluded in Washington resulting from a public debate in the Security Council? Would anyone suggest that the Viet-Nam agreement, the epoch-making improvement of relations between the United States and China, the progress on the German problem, would have been possible if not for the patient, constructive "quiet diplomacy" that had been put into motion? There can be no excuse for not applying this proven method also in the Middle East.

91. The 25-year Arab war against Israel is a story of fundamental errors of judgement and missed opportunities by Arab leaders. The time has come to free the situation from the entrapment in futile slogans and sterile prejudices. The sufferers in this situation are the peoples of the Middle East. For them there can be no plausible explanation why, with Israel's continuously expressed readiness to negotiate peace, the Egyptian Government has remained adamant in its refusal. The peoples of the Middle East, including the people of Egypt, are not interested in the nuances of the Security Council debate and its resolutions. They know one thing: in all parts of the world, representatives of hostile Governments meet face-to-face and try to settle their differences. Only in the Middle East do they remain immersed in the mire of fruitless rhetoric, semantic quibbling and doctrinaire postures in vain attempts to justify the absence of a constructive effort to reach understanding and harmony. How can one explain to the people the tortuous arguments and endless polemics in the Council chamber? How can one explain to them the refusal to meet with Israel and discuss seriously and fruitfully any matter with a view to making progress towards peace? How can insistence on prior conditions and prior commitments outweigh the need to test at least the possibility of making such progress?

92. Few are the capitals of the world that Egypt's leaders have not visited in the last six years to discuss the Middle East situation. They have tried various ways and means and travelled everywhere except to the one obvious destination—peace talks with Israel. The time has come to take this road. The peoples of the Middle East are sure to give their blessing to such a step.

93. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Jordan, on whom I now call.

94. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan): Mr. President, may I express to you my delegation's highest esteem and regard on the occasion of your assumption of your high office. May I add to the expression of our high esteem that of our great affection. Allow me also to convey to your predecessor, Ambassador Malik, who during last month handled the

affairs of the Council with wisdom and fairness, our greetings and compliments.

95. The Council enters a new and crucial phase in its consideration of the Middle East question. It is now expected to act. The Council has heard the parties to the conflict state their views and cases. They have not been equally positive or equally constructive. The Council is now formulating its verdict and charting the road to a resolution. My delegation has presented to you, in the course of the debate, our analysis of the problem and our basic position. We submitted that the issue is Israel's occupation for over six years now of the national soil of three States Members of the United Nations. It has neither been persuaded to evacuate these territories nor to accept the principle of evacuating those territories in the context of a peaceful and guaranteed settlement. The Arab side had not created the Arab-Israeli conflict. That conflict and the suffering that it entailed had been imposed on it. The Arab parties which came to the Security Council in 1967, while deeply realizing this fact, sought a realistic solution in a peaceful settlement which would guarantee future peace and security for all sides in the area resulting from and complementary to Israel's withdrawal from all the territories it occupied in the hostilities of 1967. That was the essence of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

96. When Jordan accepted resolution 242 (1967) its understanding of its content and intent was clear. The resolution was aimed at ending the occupation and establishing the conditions of a just and stable peace. It was an agonizing experience for Jordan to accept resolution 242 (1967) which contained some concepts and provisions that were less than fair or adequate for the Arabs in terms of absolute justice. But we accepted the resolution, and with it the will of the Security Council, in the interest of peace in the Middle East and the peaceful liberation of our occupied lands and people. There was no doubt in Jordan's mind then, nor is there any now, as to what the provisions of the resolution meant. Certainly there was and is no doubt in our mind as to what the provision for withdrawal meant. As a resolution based on balance between withdrawal and territorial integrity on the one hand and guarantees for peace on the other, it could have meant nothing less than total withdrawal. Incomplete withdrawal is neither entertained in the resolution nor acceptable to the aggrieved half-occupied countries. To us, and to any objective and fair-minded observer, the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territories occupied means a withdrawal based on the lines which existed prior to the outbreak of hostilities on 5 June 1967. The Charter of the United Nations confirms this understanding by stipulating, as its very essence, respect for the territorial integrity of States and the undertaking by Members not to use force against the territorial integrity and political independence of States. The same understanding is confirmed by the fact that resolution 242 (1967) states in its very outset the principle of the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by war. Even Israel, which now appears as the only source of a different interpretation of the resolution, sided with the logical and natural interpretation when it did not vote during the summer of 1967 against a Latin American draft

resolution in the General Assembly which contained the following operative paragraph:

"Urgently requests:

*"(a) Israel to withdraw all its forces from all the territories occupied as a result of the recent conflict."*¹

97. So there is no place for an interpretation of the Security Council resolution which could compromise its categorical call for complete withdrawal. This is Jordan's understanding of it and the basis on which Jordan accepts the other obligations derived from the other provisions of the resolution.

98. In this context the provision for "secure borders" cannot be construed in any way incompatible with this basic understanding of the resolution. There is no room for an interpretation which identifies secure borders as "expanded" borders. As I said in an earlier statement during this debate:

"... security is not a one-sided concept. Security among nations is by definition mutual. It certainly can have no other meaning in a resolution on peace in the Middle East.

"If 'secure borders' were to mean expanded borders, why should it not mean borders expanded at the expense of Israel, rather than at the expense of the Arab States neighbouring Israel? In fact, it would be more logical, in view of the situation on the ground, to argue for expanded—meaning secure—borders for the Arab countries now under Israeli occupation after the withdrawal of Israeli forces, if this notion were to be accepted.

"But secure borders are not borders based on forcible expansion. Secure borders are made so by other elements: a major element is the absence of mutual grievance; a major element is the solution of the explosive outstanding problems between the countries sharing the borders."
[1725th meeting, paras. 66-68.]

I added then that borders cannot be made more secure by the acquisition of one State of a hill or a river belonging to the neighbouring State—less still by the planting of military settlements in the heart of the neighbouring country.

99. Jordan's position remains the same. What caused the war of 1967 was not the faulty demarcation of armistice lines. What caused it was the existence of an explosive political situation. The explosiveness had its roots in Arab grievance against Israeli violence and intransigence. Israel's continued occupation of Arab territories will not make the situation less explosive, to put it euphemistically. Nor would the situation be made less explosive by an Israeli partial withdrawal, which means by Israel's acquisition of "some", not "all", of the national territories of its neighbours. There is no security for Israel in establishing its borders on the grievance of its Arab neighbours. Nor can peace and its objective and subjective conditions be ensured on such a basis.

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes, agenda item 5, document A/L.523/Rev.1.

100. In this connexion my delegation has another essential point to make. The issue of withdrawal and non-aggression is not only juridical and legal. It is an issue which goes to the heart of international order and human existence. No national entity—but more importantly—no people must be subjected to uprooting or military and political subjugation by any other foreign people or country. The people living in and around Palestine, before and after the establishment of Israel, have been subjected for several decades to successive phases of suffering, dispersal or loss of national independence. Be their name Palestinian, Jordanian, Egyptian or Syrian, they have all been partners in these sufferings, trials and tribulations. They all belong to the same nation, culture, heritage, history and future, and they have all lived for centuries in the same expanse of territory. The sufferings of all these people are derived from the same source and the solution to their problems is indivisible. The moral key is that no national entity should be allowed to displace or subjugate by force another national entity. The political key lies in the principles of territorial integrity, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of national territory by force, self-determination and national independence. Regardless of their technical nationalities, the Arab people who are now under occupation or are victims of the preceding phases of the conflict must be granted their full moral rights. These Arab people can then in the future readjust and restructure their relationships in the way they see fit. This is an inter-Arab affair. For its part the Jordan Government has made it clear that it intends to review the structure of relationships between the two flanks of the Kingdom once the physical obstacle of occupation is ended. It has also made it clear that the wishes and desires of its citizens now under occupation would be democratically and constitutionally ascertained after their liberation with a view to restructuring the framework of relationships in accordance with the needs and aspirations of its people.

101. In the meantime, and while the occupation lasts, the Jordan Government will never abandon or let down its people under occupation. But the primary and basic task is the termination of the occupation. It is the only road to any positive and imaginative construction of the future of the inhabitants of the area.

102. As I said at the outset, the Council has now reached the crucial phase of its deliberations. It is now formulating its resolution. What we hope for is that the Council should take into account the facts and the principles which my delegation has been trying to emphasize. In this framework Jordan welcomes the effective resumption of the efforts undertaken by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, the honourable and capable Ambassador Jarring, in order to put into effect resolution 242 (1967) and help establish a just and lasting peace. Jordan welcomes the interest shown by the Secretary-General in the efforts at peace making in the Middle East both personally and by virtue of his office.

103. We are ready to undertake the responsibilities involved in the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the area. In doing so Jordan takes pride in being a faithful and enthusiastic member of the Arab family, genuinely concerned for the security and future welfare of its fellow Arab States and deeply inspired by its intimate association with

the tragedy, the sufferings, the struggle and the hopes of the Palestinian people. We maintain our faith in the United Nations. We believe the United Nations to be the only arena for a fair and balanced process of peace making. We do not acquiesce in a settlement imposed on our people and our sovereignty by military and political pressure. We believe peace to be a free undertaking based on the realization of the objective conditions of justice and the moral satisfaction that justice has been ensured.

104. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, first of all I should like to thank you for the kind words you addressed to me and for your assessment of the manner in which I presided over the Security Council last month. May I, in turn, congratulate you on your assumption of this responsible post and wish you success in carrying out the tasks facing the Council, which are so serious and so important to the cause of peace, and particularly those relating to a Middle East settlement. We should like to think that your return to New York to preside over the Security Council in its discussion of such an important international problem can be regarded as an encouraging indication that the United Kingdom delegation in the Council, which sponsored resolution 242 (1967), intends to join with the other members of the Council, in an effort to bring about the adoption by the Council of a new, strong resolution and effective measures to implement resolution 242 (1967) in all its parts and provisions, with particular reference, of course, to a solution of the main issue on which a settlement depends—that is, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories.

105. I should also like to express my gratitude to Mr. El-Zayyat, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt, for the friendly words he addressed to me today; I, in turn, wish to welcome him to the United Nations and to this meeting of the Security Council.

106. I also wish to express my gratitude to the Ambassador of Jordan for the kind words that he addressed to me.

107. The Security Council has met to resume its consideration of the Middle East situation. We have all listened with great attention to the brilliant and convincing statement by Mr. El-Zayyat, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt, in which he took stock of the first round of the Council's discussion of the Middle East situation, undertaken on the initiative of Egypt.

108. In the Council's discussion of the Middle East situation in June, over 30 States Members of the United Nations took part. Nine of them were represented by Ministers for Foreign Affairs or Ministers of State, including six ministers who, speaking on behalf of the whole of Africa on instructions from the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, vigorously condemned Israel as an aggressor and supported the Arab countries.

109. I followed all those statements with attention since the occupant of the chair is under an obligation to listen with particular care to all speakers at meetings of the Security Council.

110. All the members of the Security Council, as well as a number of Arab, African and other non-aligned countries, took a most active part in the general discussion of the Middle East question in the Council. The basis of the discussion was a detailed report—prepared by the Secretary-General with the active participation of his Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring—on United Nations efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

111. The discussion of the Middle East situation in the Security Council was the focus of world-wide attention. It can be stated without exaggeration that, in view of the favourable changes which have been brought about in the international situation and the general relaxation of tensions taking place on our planet, world opinion expects the Security Council to take constructive steps towards a settlement of the Middle East conflict, which continues to be explosive and poses a threat to international peace and security.

112. The abnormality of the situation in the Middle East was stressed by all the participants in the discussion. An overwhelming majority of the members of the Council and of the non-member participants advocated a peaceful political settlement of the conflict in the Middle East and the establishment of a just and lasting peace in that area on the basis of the well-known decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

113. Special stress should be placed on the fact that all the members of the Council and all the countries participating in the discussion of the Middle East problem with, of course, the single exception of Israel—that is, 31 of the 32 participants in the discussion—supported the principle of the non-acquisition of territory by means of war or the use of force. All of them called for observance of the principle of the territorial integrity of States in the Middle East.

114. Mr. Tekoah attempted to present this as a “mechanical majority”, as he put it. No, Mr. Tekoah, this is a principle of international law; this is respect for the principles of the Charter, which are endorsed by all Members of the United Nations and by every State that applies for membership in the United Nations. This applies equally to Israel. When it became a Member of the United Nations, Israel made a solemn undertaking to respect those principles.

115. In condemning Israel's aggression and demanding the return of the territories seized by Israel and the withdrawal of its troops, all these countries called for strict observance of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations, which was approved by the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session [*resolution 2936 (XXVII)*]. This is another rule of international law which has been endorsed by the General Assembly.

116. In this connexion, it is appropriate to recall that the Security Council has so far not complied with the recommendation of the General Assembly that the Council, in accordance with the General Assembly resolution on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, should for its part adopt an equivalent resolution and take appropriate

steps to ensure the non-use of force in relations between States and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. It is quite clear that those who oppose this bring grist to the mill of the aggressor and hamper the effort to uphold and defend the just cause of the victim of aggression.

117. All those from the third world who participated in the discussion—particularly the representatives of Arab and African States—urged strict observance of the principle of the non-acquisition of territory by force. They linked this principle with the need for the speedy withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories. The African countries called upon the Security Council, in formulating a decision on the question under discussion, to take into account the extremely important resolution on the Middle East adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the countries of the Organization of African Unity at its tenth anniversary session at Addis Ababa in May of this year. The non-aligned countries appealed to the Security Council to consider the resolution on the Middle East adopted at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries held at Georgetown in August of last year. The representatives of the countries of Latin America in the Security Council drew the attention of the members of the Council to the draft resolution on the Middle East submitted by the Latin American countries to the General Assembly at its fifth emergency special session. The basic provisions of all those resolutions are the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, respect for the territorial integrity and political independence of States and the full and unconditional withdrawal of all Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories. That is not a “mechanical majority”—it is the voice of the entire world.

118. All those who participated in the discussion—with the exception, of course, of the representative of Israel—also stated bluntly that it was impossible to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East without ensuring respect for the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

119. What were the other extremely important results of the first round of discussions of the Middle East question in the Security Council?

120. Of the 15 members of the Security Council 14 supported Council resolution 242 (1967) as the only agreed basis for a Middle East settlement. They all called for implementation of all the provisions of that resolution, and an overwhelming majority of them also called for activating the Jarring mission. An overwhelming majority of the non-member participants in the discussion strongly stressed the need for compliance with resolution 242 (1967) in all its parts and provisions. Egypt, Jordan and Israel—the latter with certain reservations which are, of course, characteristic of the aggressor—also confirmed their acceptance of resolution 242 (1967) as the basis for a settlement.

121. Furthermore, a majority of the members of the Council, as well as the overwhelming majority of the Arab, African and other non-aligned States taking part in the discussion, actively supported Ambassador Jarring's widely publicized aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 as an impor-

tant document which can assist in bringing about a Middle East settlement in strict conformity with resolution 242 (1967).

122. As we are all aware, during the time when regular consultations on the Middle East were being held among the permanent members of the Security Council, all four participants in those consultations, including the United States, officially supported that initiative on the part of Ambassador Jarring—his aide-mémoire and all of its provisions. All the participants, including the United States, pointed out that Ambassador Jarring's initiative was fully in accord with his mandate under resolution 242 (1967). We hope that they will all, as before, firmly adhere to that position in support of the aide-mémoire.

123. Consequently, the discussion held in the Security Council and the documents that I have mentioned—representing as they do the will of an overwhelming majority of the members of the Council and of States Members of the United Nations as a whole—have brought out clearly the following principles and concepts on the basis of which we can and must establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East: the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by means of war, the non-use of force in relations between States, respect for the territorial integrity and political independence of the States of that area, the complete and unconditional withdrawal of all Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories as a primary condition of a Middle East settlement, respect for the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine, the need for compliance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in all its parts and provisions, approval of the Jarring aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 as an important initiative aimed at achieving a political settlement in the Middle East in full conformity with resolution 242 (1967), and the need to activate the Jarring mission. No new measures should undermine or supplant what has been recognized and accepted by the United Nations as the basis for a Middle East settlement.

124. It is the conviction of the Soviet delegation that these principles and concepts should be made the basis for a Security Council resolution on the Middle East as a result of this discussion in the Council.

125. In this connexion, it is important to note that an overwhelming majority of those who took part in the discussion, and particularly the members of the Security Council, pointed out that the United Nations, and above all the Security Council, bore a special responsibility and was called upon to play a primary role in achieving a Middle East settlement.

126. The wish was expressed that the permanent members of the Security Council should once again actively assist Ambassador Jarring in fulfilling his noble mission, that is to say, that they should first of all resume their consultations on the Middle East. This also means that those two members of the Security Council which in words express support for peace in the Middle East but in practice are unwilling to lift a finger to promote a Middle East settlement by consultations or other means should cease to obstruct a resumption of consultations on the Middle East

by the five permanent members of the Security Council and, together with the other three permanent members, actively participate in the work of helping Ambassador Jarring to fulfil his important international mission. Thus, the duty of the Security Council and the obligation of its permanent members are quite clear.

127. As for the position of the Soviet Union on the Middle East problem, it remains unchanged. The Soviet Government has always viewed and continues to view the situation in the Middle East as one of the most acute and important international problems. The USSR has favoured and continues to favour a peaceful political settlement of the Middle East conflict and a just and lasting peace in that area. In striving for a just settlement of the Middle East problem, the Soviet Union has always sought to exploit all available possibilities. The Soviet Union takes the view that the problem of a Middle East settlement should be decided on an over-all basis and that its separate aspects, parts or stages should be inseparably linked with a general settlement and should form parts of a whole. The key issue of a Middle East settlement has always been and continues to be the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967. A solution of this basic problem would also make it possible to achieve agreement on other aspects of a settlement on the basis of respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity and the safeguarding of the lawful rights and interests of all States and peoples in the area, including the Arab people of Palestine.

128. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation feels that, guided by the generally recognized principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by means of war, we must seek a settlement on the basis of unswerving compliance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in all its parts and provisions and also in accordance with the aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 of Ambassador Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Middle East—an aide-mémoire which is fully in keeping with the letter and spirit of the resolution.

129. In a recent decision of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Council of Ministers of the USSR on the "Results of the visit of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to the United States of America", it is stressed that the Soviet Union, in conformity with the programme for peace approved at the Twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, "attaches fundamental importance"—and I particularly stress the words "fundamental importance"—"to the elimination of the hotbed of war in the Middle East on the basis of respect for the lawful rights of the States and peoples that have been victims of aggression. The basis for a just solution of the Middle East problem is the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories".

130. In the speech which he delivered on 11 July of this year in Moscow upon being awarded the Lenin Prize for the Strengthening of Peace between Peoples, Comrade Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, said the following:

"One of the most important tasks of the present day is, we are convinced, that of eliminating the hotbed of aggression in the Middle East. We must no longer permit the aggressors and adventurers to continue to keep the whole of this vast region in an explosive condition. The rights of the Arab peoples, who have been victims of aggression, must be fully safeguarded. The Israeli troops must be withdrawn from all occupied Arab territories. The peace, security and State frontiers of all the countries of the Middle East must be guaranteed. We, for our part, shall remain steadfast in pursuing precisely that course."

131. Guided by the Soviet Union's position of principle with regard to the Middle East, as I have just described it, the Soviet delegation is prepared to co-operate constructively with other delegations to enable the Security Council to formulate and adopt an effective resolution and measures that will contribute to the speedy attainment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

132. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Foreign Minister of Egypt in exercise of the right of reply.

133. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): Having spoken for the Jews of the world—which means for citizens *inter alia* of Panama, Austria, the United States of America, the United Kingdom—and having spoken for Jordan, the representative of Israel chose also to speak, first, for the people of Egypt and then was kind enough to speak for me. I wish the representative of that imperial Power would at least refrain from speaking for us. I do not think he knows Egyptians. If he wants me to offer him some insight into the thinking of one Egyptian, I can tell him that passing through Belgrade, Vienna and Paris, the following questions came to my mind: Where are the occupation armies that once occupied Belgrade? Where are the occupation armies that once occupied Vienna? Where are the occupation armies that once occupied Paris? Indeed, where are the occupation armies of the past? They do not exist; and the occupation armies of today will not exist in the future. That would perhaps help him to know the thinking of Egyptians.

134. As for me, there are two statements that I would like to appear correctly in the records. The first is a reference to talks with Israel. The talks which I have been ready—perhaps until Mr. Tekoah's speech today—to undertake were talks under the auspices of the United Nations with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, to whom I have given to the best of my ability my full co-operation during the time when he needed it and was able to make use of it, on the basis of United Nations documents that have been explained and contained in the Secretary-General's report and explained also in the first part of the meeting of this Council.

135. The second concerns the declarations Mr. Tekoah said I made in Paris. People think that their short memory can get us to say whatever they want. I do not think that the memory of the members of the Council is so short. With the Council's permission, I shall restate what I said only about one hour ago: We tell the international community represented in this Council that we will continue, as we should, to resist occupation and aggression. We now ask the Council: Will this resistance be supported

by the international community and be in accordance with the principles of collective security, aided and bound at the same time by the United Nations Charter, or do we have to resist alone? That is what I said earlier today.

136. This is what I said in Paris: The failure of this Council to reach anything that would support us in our international struggle will, of course, leave us with no recourse except to use all methods and possibilities in our ability to resist aggression. I repeat that again, and I wish the record to show it correctly.

137. Mr. Tekoah also chose to refer to a declaration made on 16 July—I believe him, although I was not in Cairo on 16 July—in which he alleged that the President said “no peaceful solution is possible”. May I be allowed to say, without any discourtesy, that if that statement was made—and perhaps it was—it was because the President knew in advance the kind of speech Mr. Tekoah would make, or remake, today; it was because he knew in advance Israel’s position and the support it gets from the United States which blocks the road to peace; because peace, in our view, cannot and will not be built except on a base of justice—and Mr. Tekoah’s speech denies us that justice.

138. The difference between Israel and Egypt, as we all know, is a real difference between our faith in the United Nations and their total disdain for the United Nations. It has been pointed out in some books that the real tragedy of the United Nations is that its Members are divided into those who believe in it and those who do not believe in it and act accordingly. Those who believe in it come to this Council; those who do not believe in it say “nothing in this Council will give results except and until you come to us and know the only place to go”.

139. Mr. Tekoah said that we had journeyed to many places but not to the one obvious destination. Tel Aviv? I ask. Perhaps. And that is not novel, because after the 1967 war Israel’s Minister of War said that he was going to rest by the side of his telephone and wait for a call from Cairo. *The Guardian*, a London newspaper, under the title “I Never Forget” mentioned declarations attributed to a high authority; without identifying him, to the effect that “they will come crawling on their bellies”. The telephone did not ring, nor did we go crawling on our bellies, nor are we going to the only one and obvious destination under pressure and coercion of the occupation—no matter how many Phantoms, no matter how many vetoes.

140. Before concluding, I should like to say that when the Foreign Minister of Israel in 1967, after the Council had adopted resolution 242 (1967), went to Israel and met with representatives of the Hebrew press, they began criticizing his acceptance of resolution 242 (1967). The man was impatient and said—and I quote again from memory, but I am sure this quotation is right—“Wait until you look with nostalgia at resolution 242 (1967), when the Security Council meets again and adopts a resolution of unconditional and immediate withdrawal from all the lands we occupy.”

141. If subsequent developments have prevented the Council from meeting before now to adopt the only

resolution open to it under international law and the Charter—to order the immediate vacation of an occupation which has continued too long—then it is time now for the Council to do so.

142. The PRESIDENT: I call next on the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

143. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): The Foreign Minister of Egypt spoke of Egypt’s faith in the United Nations. Only a week ago, last Friday, on 13 July 1973, a close confidant and adviser of the President of Egypt, Mr. Muhammad Hassanin Heykal, wrote in *Al-Ahram* as follows, after referring to the United Nations:

“It is a mere stage of free deliberations, without any difference between what is going on there and what the visitors can see in the corners of Hyde Park in London.”

Apparently there is one Egyptian truth for the people of Egypt and another and different one, for obvious tactical reasons, for the benefit of the Security Council.

144. Minister El-Zayyat told us about his travels through capitals of Europe on the way to the United Nations, and his thought about “Where are the Nazi occupation armies?”. Well, those occupation armies were destroyed by the forces of States which had been attacked by the Nazis and which were finally successful in stamping out the Nazi scourge. In the same manner, the Egyptian forces, which for 25 years have been waging war against Israel by all means at their disposal, whether by over-all military confrontation or by barbaric, murderous terrorist attacks against innocent civilians, were finally in 1967 repulsed and pushed back, resulting in the creation, for the first time in two and a half decades, of a prospect for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, if Egypt finally agrees to talk peace and to work for peace.

145. The Foreign Minister of Egypt tried to explain away his statement the connotation of which was that he has come before this Council in order to ask for support for Egypt’s continued confrontation with Israel, and not for the search for peace with Israel by Egypt. He spoke of resistance to occupation in order to cover up the obvious interpretation that must have been given by all those who listened to his remarks. But no one is suggesting or asking that Egypt should accept any kind of occupation. All that is being suggested to Egypt is to join hands with Israel in a serious, genuine, responsible effort to reach agreement on peace. What Egypt is in fact resisting is not occupation; what Egypt is resisting is negotiations with Israel, agreement with Israel, peace with Israel. Perhaps the most striking aspect of Egyptian policy, reflected again today in Minister El-Zayyat’s speech, is Egypt’s refusal to free itself from the mistakes of the past and to remove the obstacles which have for long barred the way to peace.

146. This reminds one of the Arabic story of the Sultan Mahmoud, who one day was in the streets of Ghazna, his capital, when he saw a poor porter struggling under the weight of a heavy stone he was carrying on his back. Moved by pity for his condition, and unable to restrain his compassion, Mahmoud called out to him in royal com-

mand: "Drop that stone, porter." Immediately he was obeyed; the stone lay there, an obstacle to all who tried to pass, for years on end. Ultimately, a number of citizens interceded with the King, asking him to give a command for the stone to be finally taken away. But Mahmoud, reflecting in administrative wisdom, felt himself bound to reply: "That which has been done by command cannot be rescinded by an equal command, lest the people think that imperial orders are motivated by whims. Let the stone remain where it is." And the stone remained, therefore, for the rest of Mahmoud's lifetime; and even when he was dead, out of respect for royal commands, it was not moved.

147. Thus it is with Egypt: the heavy stones, such as one-sided resolutions, the February 1971 aide-mémoire and the rejection of negotiations, are still blocking the road. There is no reason whatever why they should be allowed to bar movement towards peace. Yet Egypt insists on keeping them where they are, trying to justify the unjustifiable, and even increasing and adding to the obstacles that have accumulated over the years. If there is an objective which requires immediate attention, it is the removal of these obstacles on the road to peace.

148. How distant public polemics in the Security Council frequently are from the realities of the Middle East situation has been demonstrated today by the statement of the representative of Jordan. The real situation between Israel and Jordan is characterized by conditions which contain significant and indisputable elements of peaceful relations. First of all, there is tranquillity on the border, and quiet and security on the East and West Banks of the Jordan. There is freedom of movement, practically without restriction, of people and goods across the river.

149. In an interview on 24 June 1973 the Prime Minister of Jordan, Zeid Al-Rifai, stated:

"The volume of traffic between Jordan and the Israeli-occupied West Bank is growing, and the organic links that naturally existed between the two halves of the Hashemite Kingdom are being restored."

Hundreds of thousands of persons from Jordan and other Arab countries travelling via Jordan come annually to the West Bank and visit Israel. These Arab visitors see for themselves that in addition to freedom of movement the Arab inhabitants enjoy freedom of thought and expression and freedom to obtain full employment on the West Bank, in Gaza or in Israel. The result has been the elimination of unemployment, which for years has plagued the Arab population, and in particular the refugees in its midst, and a dramatic rise in the standard of living. Agricultural production has reached unprecedented levels; industry is developing for the first time; cultural life, including Arab literature and press publications, is flourishing.

150. Israel has never suggested that this development disposes of the need for a political solution. However, those who are not ready to acknowledge the importance of the freedom of movement, the freedom of thought and expression, the freedom from want and the freedom from fear as fundamental rights of men, of cardinal significance to every human being, do not begin to understand the

meaning of the peoples' rights. Of such attitudes are born totalitarian régimes which invoke abstract political slogans while trampling to dust the rights and needs of their citizens.

151. As for the political settlement, the Jordanian Government knows well that when it will be ready to enter with Israel into serious peace negotiations agreement will be reached. Indeed Jordan's gravest problems are not with Israel. King Hussein expressed this in an interview published in the Greek daily *Elfteros Cosmos* on 1 March 1972 in the following terms:

"From the internal point of view we have no problems. However, the greatest danger of all threatening Jordan, especially since 1967, is on the State's northern border with Syria and this is why the main part of Jordan's army is deployed along the State's northern frontier."

152. In the meantime, since that statement, an even greater threat to Jordan has arisen. Jordan's very right to exist as an independent State is being questioned. The Government responsible for the creation of this threat is Egypt. The implications of the Egyptian Foreign Minister's statements regarding Palestinian rights made in the first round of the present debate were clear. Egypt was proposing Jordan's dismemberment. The following are some of the headlines on the matter in the Egyptian press. On 7 June in *Al-Ahram*:

"El-Zayyat demands international recognition of the Palestinian State."

A headline in *Al-Ahram* on 9 June:

"Jordan raises a problem regarding El-Zayyat's proposal that the United Nations recognize a Palestinian State. The representative of Jordan requests clarification from El-Zayyat regarding the proposal."

On 10 June a headline:

"The establishment of a Palestinian State within secure and recognized boundaries, a step called for in the Egyptian Foreign Minister's statement before the Security Council."

153. Jordan's reaction, as we all know, was swift. Radio Amman announced on 14 June:

"The Prime Minister of Jordan reported to the Jordanian Cabinet on 14 June regarding the memorandum that he sent to Arab Foreign Ministers concerning the meaning of the Egyptian Foreign Minister's call in the Security Council to create a Palestinian State in the occupied West Bank and concerning the dangers inherent in this call with regard to the Palestinian cause."

Since then the threat to Jordan created by Minister El-Zayyat's bombshell has grown dramatically. In an interview published on 6 July in the pro-Egyptian Beirut newspaper *Al Nahar*, President Bourguiba of Tunisia called the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan "an artificial entity" which historically should be Palestine. He also suggested

that King Hussein should step down and make room for a Palestinian Republic. When these views were confirmed by President Bourguiba to the Jordanian Ambassador in Tunis, Jordan broke relations with Tunisia on 17 July.

154. Yesterday the Government of Libya in a statement by its Minister of Information expressed its support for the view that Jordan is an artificial entity. These are Jordan's real problems. Israel does not regard the Hashemite Kingdom as an artificial entity. Israel is ready to reach agreement with Jordan and to live in peace with it within secure and recognized boundaries. In these circumstances the appearance of the Jordanian representative in this debate side by side with Egypt's Foreign Minister is certainly one of the oddest spectacles witnessed in this Council. Jordan has suffered time and again when it has been drawn into the web of Egyptian machinations and designs against Israel. This is what happened to Jordan in particular and most tragically in 1967. As King Hussein declared in an interview with the *Washington Post* on 17 April 1972:

"I will never be drawn into anything unless one and one make two. Any move that Jordan makes in the future so long as I am in a position of responsibility, whether political or military or in any other sphere, will only be taken after deep study and after we are sure it is the right course. In 1967 we knew we were walking into disaster."

155. The present debate was initiated by Egypt for reasons which the Egyptian Government, though not everyone in the Egyptian Government, regarded as warranting the convocation of the Security Council. To use King Hussein's words: For Jordan to become Egypt's tool in this debate is not the right course. For Jordan to do Egypt's bidding while Egypt calls for its dismemberment is a course of disaster. It would be regrettable if Jordan were to suffer again because of Egypt's folly instead of ensuring its own rights and securing its future in peace with Israel.

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

157. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan): The contrast between the statement which I presented before this Council in a spirit of moderation and positive approach to the solution of problems and the polemical statement just made by the Israeli representative to this Council speaks for itself. The irrelevancies, misquotations, quotations out of context and falsifications do not add substance or any spirit of constructive contribution to the statement by the Israeli representative. However, the Israeli representative might as well speak of the troubles of Jordan because, as the chronicle shows very clearly, it refers to the troubles of the neighbours of Jordan as well as the troubles of the area. The troubles of Jordan are part of those troubles of the area, troubles which were created not by natural history, not by the natural flow of history and development, but by the insistence of Israel since it came violently into the area on pursuing its policy of expansion, of violence, of pressuring its neighbours, of compounding the problems of the successive human barriers that stood in its way. It started with the Palestinians, who were dispersed and turned into uprooted refugees in the Arab world, and then

proceeded gradually and systematically, phase after phase, through violent military incursions into the territory of Jordan and its neighbours, whether they were in the north or in the south.

158. If we have troubles in the Arab world, these are natural. In the last analysis, most of these troubles in inter-Arab relations focus on the difficulties the Arabs have in working out a plan for containing the danger.

159. However, the reference by Israel to the peace and tranquillity in the occupied territories is not new. That reference is made in a spirit and a tone that have been rejected in the various chambers of this great Organization, the United Nations. That same concept and argument advanced repeatedly by the spokesmen of the colonial presence has been rejected by the Charter and by the bodies of the United Nations stemming from it. The vast membership of this Organization has come into existence as a reaction to, and a revolution against colonialism. The argument of the alleged economic and other benefits for the people under occupation has been rejected. It has become not only futile and invalid but also shameful. No nation, no State can in any way justify the occupation of the territories of other nations, the subjugation of peoples, under the pretext—false as it is in the case of the territories occupied by Israel—of an alleged benefit to these peoples. That argument has been rejected in this Council and it need not be repeated.

160. The fact of the matter in the occupied territories—particularly in the West Bank of Jordan, about which I know more—is that there is a systematic attempt at absorption. The economic measures of Israel in the occupied territories cannot be isolated from the implanting of Israeli-Jewish settlements in the heart of the occupied territories, the confiscation of lands and property over vast areas, the process of gradual de-Arabization of the occupied territories. How can one isolate this thrust, this strategy, from the figures or statistics—false as they may be—of economic indices.

161. The relationship between Jordan and Egypt has been drawn into the debate in this Council. That, again, is irrelevant. Inter-Arab relations are not being discussed in this Organization. The concepts and the formulas advanced by various Arab spokesmen and Governments with regard to the structuring of relations between the various parts of the Arab world or the various Arab peoples are not brought before this Council. The point on which Egypt and Jordan agree, the point on which the vast majority of this Organization agrees, is the fact that Israel has no right to occupy the territories of its neighbours and then to proceed to absorb them and advance as a pretext and a rationale a misinterpretation of a clear-cut resolution adopted by this Organization providing for its withdrawal in the context of a peaceful settlement. The Arab parties—in this case Jordan and Egypt—have accepted that resolution.

162. We have insisted that our approach is a positive one: we want the elimination of occupation; we want a peaceful solution; we want peace and justice to prevail in the area. We have not been an impediment to that. Neither our statements, nor the tone of our declarations, nor the substantive contributions we have made in this regard—and

I am now speaking on behalf of Jordan—have in any way been an obstacle to peace. It is the statements made before the Council by the Israeli representative and the policy and strategy pursued on the ground by his Government that have been the main block and obstacle to peace. The dismemberment of Jordan is threatened more by the armies

of occupation in its midst than by any verbal formulas. This is an obvious fact that cannot go unnoticed in this august and intelligent chamber. I need not make any additional references to it.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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