

ARTICLE 25

Table of Contents

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
Text of Article 25	
Introductory Note	1 - 2
I. General Survey	3 - 6
II. Analytical Summary of Practice	7 - 31
A. The question of the scope of the obligation under Article 25 . .	7 - 31
1. Decision of 24 January 1957 in connexion with the India-Pakistan question	7 - 13
2. Decision of 21 February 1957 in connexion with the India-Pakistan question	14 - 21
3. Decision of 2 December 1957 in connexion with the India-Pakistan question	22 - 28
4. Decision of 22 January 1958 in connexion with the Palestine question	29 - 31
** B. The question of the applicability of Article 25 to States not Members of the United Nations	

TEXT OF ARTICLE 25

The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

1. As indicated in the previous Repertory studies of Article 25, the text of this Article contains no precise delimitation of the range of questions to which it relates. On no occasion did the Security Council define the scope of the obligation incurred by Members of the United Nations under Article 25, nor did it expressly indicate on any occasion that a particular decision should or should not be considered as falling within the meaning of the Article. The present study continues the broader treatment of the Article initiated in Supplement No. 1. 1/

2. As in Supplement No. 1, the case histories included in the present study involve discussion or decisions marked by emphasis on one or more of the following elements:

- (a) the compatibility or the incompatibility of the action complained of with Article 25 of the Charter or with an earlier decision of the Security Council;
- (b) determinations by the Council that an action complained of constituted a violation of a Security Council decision or was inconsistent with the obligations under an agreement arrived at under United Nations auspices and under the Charter; and
- (c) concern with the question of enforcement of, and compliance with, the resolutions

1/ See Repertory, Supplement No. 1, vol. I, under Article 25, para. 1.

of the Security Council. All the case histories in the Analytical Summary of Practice relate to the scope of the obligations of Members of the United Nations to carry out the decisions of the Security Council.

I. GENERAL SURVEY

3. On several occasions during the period under review, the Security Council considered complaints of failure to comply with earlier decisions taken by it in connexion with the India-Pakistan and the Palestine questions. Discussion in the Council on these occasions concerned the force and effect of resolutions of the Council, and the nature and scope of the obligation resting on the parties involved to carry them out.

4. No reference was made to Article 25 in communications invoking the jurisdiction of the Council.

5. In connexion with the India-Pakistan question, the Council during this time adopted three decisions which recalled to the parties concerned the provisions of its earlier resolutions. The resolution of the Security Council of 24 January 1957, adopted at its 765th meeting, reminded the Governments and authorities concerned of the principle embodied in its earlier resolutions and declared that certain action would not be consonant with that principle. The Council resolution of 21 February 1957, adopted at its 774th meeting, referred specifically to the resolution of 24 January 1957 and, in general terms, to its previous resolutions and the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan. The resolution requested the President of the Security Council to examine with the two Governments any proposals likely to contribute to the settlement of the dispute, "having regard to the previous resolutions of the Security Council and of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan". A preambular paragraph of the resolution of 2 December 1957, adopted at the 808th meeting of the Council, observed that the Governments of India and Pakistan had recognized and accepted the provisions of the Security Council resolution of 17 January 1948 and of the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949. Another preambular paragraph recalled the Council's previous resolutions and the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan. The operative paragraphs called upon the parties to refrain from statements or acts which might aggravate the situation, and envisaged action by them with a view to making progress towards the implementation of the resolutions of the Council.

6. In connexion with the Palestine question, the Council, acting upon cross-complaints by Jordan and Israel concerning activities between the armistice demarcation lines in the Jerusalem sector, called upon them to observe article 3 of the Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement.

II. ANALYTICAL SUMMARY OF PRACTICE

A. The question of the scope of the obligation under Article 25

1. *Decision of 24 January 1957 in connexion with the India-Pakistan question*

7. At the 761st to 765th meetings, inclusive, held between 16 and 24 January 1957, the Security Council again considered the India-Pakistan question, with particular reference to a letter 2/ dated 2 January 1957 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan to

2/ S C, 12th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar., p. 1, S/3767.

the President of the Security Council. In the letter the Minister declared that continuance of direct negotiations between the Governments of Pakistan and India held no prospect of a settlement of their dispute concerning Jammu and Kashmir. The Government of India had refused to honour the international commitments which it had accepted under the two resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949; statements made by the Prime Minister of India and steps taken by the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir in collusion with the Government of India in regard to the future disposition of Kashmir were in direct contravention of the Security Council's resolution of 30 March 1951. 3/

8. At the 761st meeting of the Security Council, on 16 January 1957, the representative of Pakistan asserted that the Government of India was taking steps to integrate the State of Jammu and Kashmir into the Indian Union, reportedly on 26 January 1957, in defiance of the Security Council's clear directives and of its own freely accepted international obligation that the question of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan should be decided by the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite to be conducted by the United Nations. Accordingly, the Government of Pakistan requested the Security Council:

- (a) To call upon India to refrain from accepting the change envisaged by the new Constitution adopted by the so-called Constituent Assembly, and
- (b) To spell out, under Article 37 (2) of the Charter, the obligations of the parties under the terms of the international agreement for a plebiscite, as embodied in United Nations resolutions.

9. In the course of his reply to the Pakistan complaint, the representative of India made the following points. The question to be resolved was the status of a Security Council resolution containing recommendations made under Chapter VI of the Charter. In the view of his Government such a resolution could have value only if the two parties agreed. Accordingly, it became necessary to determine what had been agreed to and what had not. India was bound in regard to Kashmir only by the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949, with all the conditions attached to them. In the context of the United Nations Charter, those resolutions were not Security Council resolutions except for the fact that they had been endorsed by the Security Council. They constituted recommendations which could be implemented only through the co-operation and agreement of the two sides. There had been no international agreement for a plebiscite but only for a plan that was subject to certain pre-conditions which had not been met.

10. The view was expressed by several representatives that action contrary to the Security Council's resolution would lack legal force. Unlike General Assembly recommendations, the resolutions of the Security Council were binding decisions when adopted by an affirmative vote of seven members, including the concurring votes of the five permanent members. The Council's resolution of 30 March 1951 was thus valid and binding until modified by the Council itself.

3/ S C, 6th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar., p. 23, S/2017/Rev.1. The resolution stated that any action that the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir might attempt to take to determine the future shape and affiliation of the entire State or any part thereof would not constitute a disposition of the State in accordance with the principle accepted by the parties to the dispute and embodied in earlier Security Council resolutions, as well as the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, that the final disposition of the State of Jammu and Kashmir would be made in accordance with the will of the people expressed through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the United Nations.

11. At the 764th meeting a draft resolution was introduced by the representatives of Australia, Colombia, Cuba, the United Kingdom and the United States ^{4/} to reaffirm the declaration in the Council resolution of 13 March 1951 that any action by the Constituent Assembly to determine the future shape and affiliation of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, or action by the parties in support thereof, would not constitute a disposition of the State in accordance with the principle that such disposition should be made in accordance with the will of the people expressed through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the United Nations.

12. The draft resolution was supported on the following grounds. Nothing done in Kashmir should prejudice a settlement of the entire issue in accordance with the principle that had been the basis of the Council's consideration of the matter since 1948. Any formal action by the Government of India to accept such changes as were purported to be made through the Constitution drawn up by the Constituent Assembly would be in conflict with the past resolutions of the Council. The Council should therefore draw the attention of all concerned to its earlier decisions. The draft resolution was a reaffirmation of the Council's position, and of clear and binding provisions of the Charter. It was a provisional measure which reaffirmed decisions of the Council previously accepted by India and Pakistan. It was observed that it had always been one of the first concerns of the Council that nothing should be done which might aggravate the situation. The Constitution approved by the Constituent Assembly dealt, among other things, with the affiliation of the State; this represented an important new element in the situation, of which the Security Council, in view of its previous stand, was bound to take note. A primary requirement for the solution of the problem was that both parties should refrain from unilateral measures which would alter the status quo. This implied that they should desist from taking internal legislative measures by which the State would be considered definitely incorporated in the territory of one of them, and the Security Council's continued deliberations on the matter would be prejudiced. The parties should respect the standing resolutions of the Council, which had not been repealed or modified and were therefore as valid as when they had been adopted many years before.

13. Doubts concerning the draft resolution were expressed on the ground that, like the one which it reaffirmed, it was unacceptable to one of the parties and could not, therefore, serve as a basis for the settlement of the question at issue between them, which required peaceful negotiations between the two Governments without outside interference. The Security Council should urge such bilateral negotiations on the parties. The representative of India, in indicating that his Government would not accept the draft resolution, declared that there were only two ways in which a settlement could be reached. One was by imposing it, something which the United Nations had no power under the Charter to do; the other was by agreement of the parties, to which the draft resolution made no contribution. ^{5/}

^{4/} S C, 12th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar., p. 4, S/3779.

^{5/} For texts of relevant statements see S C, 12th yr., 761st mtg.: China, para. 143; Colombia, para. 140; Cuba, para. 137; Iraq, para. 145; Pakistan, paras. 5-7, 107-109; United Kingdom, para. 134; 762nd mtg.: India, para. 152; 763rd mtg.: India, paras. 174-176; 765th mtg.: Australia, paras. 34 and 35; Cuba, paras. 39, 41 and 42; India, para. 140; Philippines, para. 114; Sweden, para. 79; USSR, para. 79; United Kingdom, para. 10; United States, paras. 47 and 50.

Decision

At the 765th meeting of the Security Council, the draft resolution was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention. 6/

*2. Decision of 21 February 1957 in connexion
with the India-Pakistan question*

14. In the course of the Security Council's further consideration of the India-Pakistan question, following its decision of 24 January 1957, there was continued discussion concerning the effect of the resolutions adopted by the Council in the earlier stages of its examination of the question.

15. At the 768th meeting, on 15 February 1957, a joint draft resolution 7/ was submitted by the representatives of Australia, Cuba, the United Kingdom and the United States. The preamble would refer to the resolution of 24 January 1957, the previous resolutions of the Council and the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan; to the importance which the Council had attached to the demilitarization of Jammu and Kashmir; and to the proposal of the representative of Pakistan for the use of a temporary United Nations force in connexion with demilitarization. It would express the belief that the use of such a force deserved consideration as a possible contribution to the achievement of demilitarization. The operative part would have the President of the Security Council examine with the two Governments any proposals likely in his opinion to contribute to the achievement of demilitarization or to the establishment of other conditions for progress towards a settlement of the dispute. In so doing, the President was to have regard to the previous resolutions of the Security Council and of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, and was to bear in mind the statements of the representatives of the two Governments and the proposal for the use of a United Nations force.

16. One of the sponsors of the draft resolution considered that the substantial area of agreement manifested in the statements of the parties gave reason to hope that progress towards a settlement of the dispute could be made in accordance with United Nations resolutions. One of the most important bases of agreement was the continued recognition by the parties of their international obligations under the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949.

17. The representative of India criticized the draft resolution on many grounds. He questioned the value of the references in the draft resolutions to the Council's previous decisions. Resolutions passed under Chapter VI of the Charter had no binding effect upon Member States unless they consented to be bound by them; consequently, the Government of India considered itself engaged only by such resolutions under Chapter VI as it had accepted. Even Article 37, which empowered the Council to recommend terms of settlement, did not empower it to compel the parties to accept them; the Council could take binding decisions only under Chapter VII of the Charter. The Government of India had accepted only the Council's resolution of 17 January 1948 and the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949, the latter on the basis of assurances from the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan that the obligations contained in the second resolution were dependent on the prior fulfilment of the provisions of the first resolution. India had not accepted later decisions of the Council relating to

6/ 765th mtg., para. 150.

7/ S C, 12th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar., p. 7, S/3787.

demilitarization, arbitration and the alleged agreement of the parties to parts of proposals made by the representative of the United Nations for India and Pakistan. On this last point, the representative of India declared that his Government would not agree that the exploratory efforts it had made in seeking a settlement should be used against it as if it had made binding engagements.

18. Amendments 8/ to the joint draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the 770th meeting of the Security Council on 18 February 1957, would delete all reference to earlier decisions on the ground that the President of the Security Council should not be hampered in his task by the inclusion of proposals which had been objected to by one party or the other.

19. Amendments 9/ submitted by the representative of Colombia would replace the preamble by referring simply to the Council's "previous resolutions" and to a letter 10/ addressed to the President of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan on 20 August 1948 by the Prime Minister of India, since that letter alone entitled the Council to insist upon a plebiscite. The President of the Security Council would be requested, while examining proposals likely to contribute to the achievement of the provisions of the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, to bear in mind the statements of the representatives of the Governments of India and Pakistan, the proposals for the use of a temporary United Nations force if accepted by the parties and the possibility of referring the problem to the International Court of Justice.

20. The representative of Colombia held that without these amendments the draft resolution would introduce, without the agreement of the parties, new elements that might imply solutions different from what was agreed upon in 1948 and would make the task of the President of the Security Council more difficult. The Council would accomplish nothing by drawing up an instrument if the parties did not sign it, for the Security Council was not a court of law. If a judicial decision to settle the ownership of Kashmir were wanted, application should be made to the International Court of Justice. If a fair settlement, an act of conciliation, was wanted, the Council could send the President to confer with the parties, but he would need the signatures of both, since the Council was dealing with the matter under Chapter VI of the Charter and could do nothing without their signatures.

Decisions

Both groups of amendments were rejected at the 773rd meeting, on 20 February 1957. The joint draft resolution also failed of adoption. 11/ At the 774th meeting of the Council, on 21 February 1957, a new joint draft resolution 12/ submitted by the representatives of Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States was adopted 13/ by the Council.

21. This resolution referred specifically to the resolution of 24 January 1957 and, in general terms, to the other resolutions adopted by the Council and the Commission for India and Pakistan. It requested the President of the Security Council to examine with the parties any proposals likely in his opinion to contribute to a settlement, having

8/ S C, 12th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar., p. 8, S/3739.

9/ S C, 12th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar., p. 8, S/3791/Rev.1.

10/ S C, 3rd yr., Suppl. for Nov., S/1100, para. 78.

11/ S C, 12th yr., 773rd mtg., paras. 124-126.

12/ S C, 12th yr., 773rd mtg., para. 150; Suppl. for Jan.-Mar., p. 9, S/3793.

13/ S C, 12th yr., 774th mtg., para. 79.

regard to previous resolutions on the matter. This resolution was characterized as superior to the four-Power draft which had failed of adoption at the preceding meeting, in that the President of the Security Council would not be hampered in the exercise of his task by provisions which had proved unacceptable to one of the parties and would doom the mission to failure; it was stated, however, that the reference to previous Council resolutions would continue to make negotiations with the parties difficult. The problem before the Council was the pacific settlement of the Kashmir question in keeping with Chapter VI of the Charter, which excluded any measures of compulsion and any attempt to impose unacceptable solutions on one of the parties.

*3. Decision of 2 December 1957 in connexion
with the India-Pakistan question*

22. Following submission of a report 14/ by the representative of Sweden on his efforts to carry out the Security Council resolution of 21 February 1957, the Security Council again took up the India-Pakistan question at the request of the representative of Pakistan.

23. Explaining his Government's request for renewed consideration of the question, the representative of Pakistan declared that India's persistent failure to carry out the commitments and obligations which it had assumed under the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan clearly involved a threat to the peace and fell under the provisions of Articles 39 and 41 of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The Government of Pakistan had fully and faithfully implemented part I of the resolution and was prepared to carry out the remaining parts. The Security Council should proceed to secure the demilitarization of the state of Jammu and Kashmir and a free and impartial plebiscite under the auspices of the United Nations.

24. In reply, the representative of India contended that his Government's engagement by the resolutions referred to commenced only upon the fulfilment of certain conditions by Pakistan. Part III of the resolution was contingent on part II, which was itself contingent on part I; the whole of the resolution of 13 August 1948 was contingent on all the conditions to which both countries had given adherence at the time of its adoption, and which Pakistan had violated at the time and continued to violate. The Government of India could hardly be expected to proceed to the implementation of parts II and III of the resolution without a prior fulfilment by Pakistan of the necessary conditions in part I. With reference to a suggestion by the representative of Sweden, in his report to the Council, that certain aspects of the question of implementation might be submitted to arbitration, the representative of India pointed out that the Security Council had not been asked to decide who had title to Kashmir, a matter which in any case it was not competent to decide. The sovereignty, honour, integrity and vital interests of India were involved, and there was no instance in history where a matter so wide and so intimately connected with a country's integrity had been subjected to arbitration. The Government of India had come to the Council under Chapter VI of the Charter, seeking by methods of conciliation to have the aggression committed by Pakistan vacated. It followed that Pakistan did not occupy a place of parity with India in respect of the determination of the future of Kashmir.

25. At the 803rd meeting, on 18 November 1957, a joint draft resolution 15/ was submitted by Australia, Colombia, Philippines, United Kingdom and United States, under which the Security Council, after observing that the two Governments recognized and

14/ S C, 12th yr., Suppl. for Apr.-June, p. 12, S/3821.

15/ S C, 12th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., p. 10, S/3911.

accepted the commitments undertaken by them in the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, was to request the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan to make any recommendations for further action which he considered desirable in connexion with part I of the resolution of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan dated 13 August 1948 and to enter into negotiations with the two Governments in order to implement part II of that resolution; and, in particular, to reach agreement on a reduction of forces on each side of the cease-fire line to a specified number determined on the basis of the relevant Security Council resolutions.

26. Explaining the draft resolution, one of the sponsors declared that it reflected the view that no settlement of the Kashmir problem could be reached except on an amicable basis acceptable to both parties; it was quite impossible for the Council to push a sovereign nation into an action which it refused to take. Another sponsor asserted that in proceeding under Chapter VI of the Charter, the Security Council must attempt to find a basis for progress towards a settlement acceptable to both sides. In doing this, the Council should proceed from the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan. The Security Council was not attempting to impose a decision on this point; the draft resolution merely reflected publicly announced decisions of the parties themselves.

27. At the 805th meeting, on 21 November 1957, the representative of India stated that his Government was totally opposed to the joint draft resolution. It omitted reference to the resolution of 17 January 1948; without this, the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan to which it referred were of no effect. He also objected to the use of the word "commitments" instead of "engagements" in reference to the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan. India was engaged by the resolutions in the sense that when one commitment had been performed another would arise. The latter was an entirely voluntary obligation assumed by India, which it was prepared to carry out, although only on condition of the fulfilment of the first part of the resolution of 13 August 1948.

28. At the 807th meeting, on 28 November 1957, the representative of Sweden submitted amendments 16/ to delete the reference to commitments undertaken by the parties; to insert a reference to the provisions of the Council resolution of 17 January 1948; and to replace the second operative paragraph by a request that the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan should make recommendations to the parties for further appropriate action, with a view to making progress towards the implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949, and towards a peaceful settlement. 17/

Decision

At the 808th meeting on 2 December 1957, the Security Council adopted 18/ the amendments by Sweden and the joint draft resolution as amended; the relevant paragraphs follow.

16/ S C, 12th yr., 807th mtg., para. 3, S/3920.

17/ For texts of relevant statements see: S C, 12th yr., 791st mtg.: Pakistan, paras. 74-80; 795th mtg.: India, paras. 15, 23, 41-64, 155; 797th mtg.: United Kingdom, paras. 20 and 21; United States, paras. 38 and 39; 798th mtg.: Australia, paras. 6-9; 799th mtg.: India, paras. 58, 66, 84, 158, 159, 165; 803rd mtg.: United Kingdom, paras. 62 and 63; 805th mtg.: India, paras. 38 and 42; 807th mtg.: Sweden, para. 3; 808th mtg.: India, paras. 37 and 43; United States, paras. 21 and 26.

18/ S C, 12th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., p. 21, S/3922.

"Observing further that the Governments of India and Pakistan recognize and accept the provisions of its resolution dated 17 January 1948 and of the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan dated 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949, which envisage in accordance with their terms the determination of the future status of the State of Jammu and Kashmir in accordance with the will of the people through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite, and that Mr. Jarring felt it appropriate to explore what was impeding their full implementation,

"Concerned over the lack of progress towards a settlement of the dispute which his report manifests,

"Considering the importance which it has attached to the demilitarization of the State of Jammu and Kashmir as one of the steps towards a settlement,

"Recalling its previous resolutions and the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan on the India-Pakistan question,

".....

"2. Requests the United Nations representative for India and Pakistan to make any recommendations to the parties for further appropriate action with a view to making progress toward the implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949 and toward a peaceful settlement;"

4. *Decision of 22 January 1958 in connexion
with the Palestine question*

29. At the 787th meeting of the Security Council, on 6 September 1957, it considered a complaint by Jordan ^{19/} against Israel of a violation by the latter of the General Armistice Agreement ^{20/} by the latter in the armistice demarcation zone at Jerusalem. Jordan maintained that Israel activities in this area constituted a violation of the General Armistice Agreement. Israel contended that in the absence of provisions in that agreement concerning the civilian status of the zone, no civilian activity in the area could be deemed a violation of the General Armistice Agreement.

30. At the 809th meeting, on 22 January 1958 a joint draft resolution ^{21/} was submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States which would note that the status of the zone was affected by the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement and that neither Israel nor Jordan enjoyed sovereignty over any part of the zone; and would direct the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) to regulate activities within the zone, subject to arrangements made pursuant to the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement and to paragraph 3 of the operative part of the draft resolution itself, which provided that the parties should discuss civilian activities in the zone through the Mixed Armistice Commission and that activities in the zone should be suspended until provision had been made for their regulation. The parties were to be called upon to co-operate in carrying out these recommendations and to observe article 3 of the General Armistice Agreement relating to movements of their forces over the armistice demarcation lines.

^{19/} S C, 12th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept., p. 33, S/3878.

^{20/} For General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 42, I, No. 656, p. 303.

^{21/} S C, 13th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar., p. 4, S/3942.

31. In the course of discussion of the draft resolution, the view was generally expressed that the Chief of Staff should be given the necessary authority to supervise and regulate civilian activities in the area. The representative of Jordan declared that his Government would accept the draft resolution even though it was only partly responsive to the complaint. The representative of Israel stated that any changes in the General Armistice Agreement, as suggested in operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the draft resolution, could be made only by the joint consent of its signatories, through the methods provided for in the instrument. In the meantime the Government of Israel would observe the General Armistice Agreement as it stood and would abide by its obligations under international law, with the clear understanding that Jordan would be bound to do the same. 22/

Decision

At the 810th meeting, on 22 January 1958, the Security Council adopted the joint draft resolution unanimously. 23/

** B. The question of the applicability of Article 25 to States
not Members of the United Nations

22/ For texts of relevant statements see: S C, 12th yr., 787th mtg.: Jordan, paras. 42-44, 92-96; 788th mtg.: Israel, paras. 25, 26, 32-40, 46-49; S C, 13th yr., 809th mtg.: France, paras. 88 and 89; Iraq, paras. 80 and 81; Panama, paras. 52-56; United Kingdom, paras. 41 and 42; United States, paras. 33-35; 810th mtg.: Israel, para. 29; Jordan, paras. 21-23.

23/ S C, 13th yr., 810th mtg., para. 30.