UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL

Distr.
GENERAL

S/4098
22 September 1958

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUMMARY STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON MATTERS OF WHICH THE SECURITY COUNCIL IS SEIZED AND ON THE STAGE REACHED IN THEIR CONSIDERATION*

Table of contents

* Note: This consolidated summary statement is being issued for the convenience of the members of the Security Council, so that a brief account of the proceedings of the Council on matters of which it is seized may be found in one document.

Table of Contents (cont'd)

/...

Table of Contents (cont'd) Page

/...

Table of Contents (cont'd) Page

Pursuant to rule 11 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the Secretary-General submits the following statement on matters of which the Security Council is seized and on the stage reached in their consideration on 20 September 1958.

1. THE IRANIAN QUESTION

By a letter dated 19 January 1946 (Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, First Series, Supplement No. 1, page 16) addressed to the Executive Secretary, the Head of the Iranian delegation stated that, owing to the interference of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, through the medium of its officials and armed forces, in the internal affairs of Iran, a situation had arisen which might lead to international friction. He requested the Executive Secretary, in accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Charter, to bring the matter to the attention of the Security Council, so that the Council might investigate the situation and recommend appropriate terms of settlement.

By a letter dated 24 January (Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, First Series, Supplement No. 1, page 17), the Head of the USSR delegation stated that the allegation made by the Iranian delegation was devoid of any foundation.

At its second meeting (25 January), the Security Council included the item in its agenda.

At the fifth meeting (30 January), the Security Council adopted a resolution which after considering that both parties had affirmed their readiness to seek a solution of the matter at issue by negotiation, and that such negotiations would be resumed in the near future, requested the parties to inform the Council of any results achieved in such negotiations.

By a letter dated 18 March (S/15), the Iranian Ambassador to the United States of America, in accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Charter, brought to the attention of the Security Council a dispute between Iran and the Soviet Union, the continuance of which was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. He stated that the Soviet Union had continued to maintain its troops in Iranian territory after 2 March 1946, contrary to the

express provisions of article V of the Tripartite Treaty of Alliance of 29 January 1942, and that the Soviet Union was continuing to interfere in the internal affairs of Iran through the medium of Soviet agents, officials and armed forces.

By a letter dated 19 March (S/16), the representative of the USSR informed the Secretary-General that negotiations were being conducted between the Government of Iran and the Government of the Soviet Union, and suggested that the meeting of the Security Council be postponed from 25 March to 10 April.

The above letters dated 18 and 19 March, together with other communications relating to the Iranian question, were included in the Council's agenda at its twenty-sixth meeting (26 March).

After taking various procedural decisions, the Security Council, at its thirtieth meeting (4 April), adopted a draft resolution submitted by the representative of the United States, providing, inter alia, that further proceedings be deferred until 6 May, at which time the USSR Government and the Iranian Government were requested to report to the Council whether the withdrawal of all Soviet Union troops from the whole of Iran had been completed, and at which time the Council should consider what, if any, further proceedings on the Iranian appeal were required.

By a letter dated 6 April (S/30), the representative of the Soviet Union proposed that the Iranian question be removed from the agenda of the Council, on the ground that, under the understanding between the Government of Iran and the Government of the Soviet Union, full evacuation of the USSR troops from Iran had been started on 24 March and would be concluded in five or six weeks. As was known from the joint USSR-Iranian communiqué published on 4 April, an understanding on all points had been reached between the two Governments.

In a letter dated 9 April (S/33), the Iranian Ambassador stated that it was his Government's desire that the question should remain on the agenda of the Security Council. In a letter dated 15 April (S/37), the Iranian Ambassador communicated the text of a telegram from his Government withdrawing its complaint from the Council.

Pursuant to a suggestion made in the Council at its thirty-second meeting (15 April), the Secretary-General on 16 April submitted a memorandum (S/39)

concerning the legal aspects of the question of the retention of the Iranian question on the agenda. The Council referred the memorandum to the Committee of Experts, which submitted its report (S/42) on 18 April.

At the thirty-sixth meeting (23 April), the Security Council rejected a draft resolution submitted by the representative of France, which would have noted the agreement reached between the Parties and requested the Secretary-General to collect the necessary information in order to complete the Council's report to the Assembly under Article 24, on the manner in which it had dealt with the case placed on its agenda on 26 March at the request, subsequently withdrawn, of the Government of Iran. Accordingly, the Council remained seized of the Iranian question. The representative of the Soviet Union stated that the decision to retain the Iranian question on the agenda was contrary to the Charter and that, accordingly, his delegation did not consider it possible to take any further part in the discussion of the question by the Council.

By a letter dated 6 May (S/53), the Iranian Ambassador reported on the withdrawal of USSR troops from certain Iranian provinces and promised a further report promptly when the state of affairs in the province of Azerbaijan had been ascertained by his Government.

At the fortieth meeting (8 May), the Security Council adopted a draft resolution submitted by the representative of the United States, providing, inter alia, that the Council should (a) defer further proceedings in order that the Government of Iran might have time in which to ascertain through its official representatives whether all USSR troops had been withdrawn from the whole of Iran; and (b) request the Iranian Government to submit a complete report immediately upon the receipt of the information which would enable it to do so.

By letters dated 20 and 21 May (S/66 and S/68), the Iranian Ambassador submitted additional information with respect to the matters brought to the Security Council's attention by his Government. With the letter dated 21 May, the Iranian Ambassador communicated the text of a telegram from the Iranian Prime Minister stating that reports had been received to the effect that USSR troops had evacuated Azerbaijan on 6 May.

At the forty-third meeting (22 May), the Security Council adopted a draft resolution submitted by the representative of the Netherlands, providing that the discussion of the Iranian question should be adjourned, the Council to be called together at the request of any of its members.

By a letter dated 5 December 1946 (S/204), the Iranian Ambassador forwarded a report concerning the existing state of affairs in Azerbaijan.

Since the forty-third meeting, the Security Council has not discussed this agenda item.

2. SPECIAL AGREEMENTS UNDER ARTICLE 43 AND THE ORGANIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES MADE AVAILABLE TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Article 47 of the Charter provides for the establishment of a Military Staff Committee, consisting of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives, "to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament."

At the twenty-third meeting (16 February 1946), the Council directed the Military Staff Committee, as its first task, to examine from the military point of view, the provisions of Article 43 of the Charter and submit the results of the study and any recommendations to the Council in due course.

At the one hundred and fifth meeting (13 February 1947), the Council, in its resolution (S/268/Rev.1/Corr.1) concerning the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 41 (I) and 42 (I), requested the Military Staff Committee to submit its recommendations in pursuance of Article 43 as soon as possible, and, as a first step, to submit not later than 30 April 1947, its recommendations with regard to the basic principles which should govern the organization of armed forces to be made available to the Security Council.

By letter dated 30 April (S/336), the Military Staff Committee submitted its report on "General Principles governing the organization of the armed forces to be available to the Security Council by Member nations of the United Nations".

General discussion of the report began at the one hundred thirty-eighth meeting (4 June). Replies to several questions raised during the discussion on the articles of the report were received from the Military Staff Committee (S/380, S/394 and S/395). At the one hundred forty-sixth meeting, the Council requested the Committee to submit an estimate of the over-all strength of the armed forces to be made available to the Security Council, indicating the strength and composition of the separate components and the proportions that should be provided by the five permanent members. At the one hundred forty-ninth meeting, the Council considered the Committee's estimate (S/394) and decided to request the Military Staff Committee's interpretation of the initial contribution of armed forces referred to in articles 10 and 11. The answer of the Military Staff Committee was circulated as document S/408.

At the 142nd, 143rd, 145th and 149th meetings, the Council adopted provisionally in first reading, subject to subsequent adoption of the report as a whole, articles 1-6, 9, 10, 12-15, 18, 19, 22-24, 29, 30, 35-40, with amendments to some of these articles offered by the representatives of Australia and Belgium. Agreement was not reached on the remaining articles. At the one hundred fifty-seventh meeting (15 July 1947), the Council discussed article 11 of the report and proposals submitted by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Australia. No agreement was reached on the text of the article. Since then, the Council has held no further discussion of the report.

3. RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The provisional rules of procedure adopted by the Security Council at its first meeting (17 January 1946) are contained, as amended to date, in document S/96/Rev.4 published on 29 July 1952.

The Security Council has not discussed a letter dated 5 September 1947 (S/540/Corr.1) from the representative of the United Kingdom suggesting several additional rules of procedure concerning Council meetings.

4. STATUTE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE

At its second meeting (25 January 1946) the Council approved a directive to the Military Staff Committee which had been drafted for the Council by the Preparatory Commission, asking the Committee to draw up and submit to the Council proposals for its organization and procedure.

At its twenty-thrd meeting (16 February 1946), the Security Council agreed to postpone consideration of the report of the Millitary Staff Committee concerning its statute and rules of procedure (S/10 as revised in S/115). The Council instructed the Committee of Experts to examine the report. Pending approval of the report by the Council, the Military Staff Committee was authorized to carry out its business along the lines suggested in its report.

The report of the Committee of Experts was circulated on 17 July 1947 (S/421), but has not so far been placed on the Council's agenda.

5. THE GENERAL REGULATION AND REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS AND INFORMATION ON THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED NATIONS[1/]

(a) Inclusion of the items in the agenda

By a letter dated 27 December 1946 (S/229), the representative of the USSR transmitted for inclusion in the agenda of the Council a draft resolution having to do with the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41 (I) concerning the general regulation and reduction of armed forces. The proposal was placed on the agenda at the eighty-eight meeting (31 December) and consideration of it was deferred. In the agenda of the ninetieth meeting (9 January 1947), the USSR proposal and a draft resolution (S/233) presented at the eighty-eight meeting by the representative of the United States, appeared under the heading "Resolution of the General Assembly on the principles governing the general regulation and reduction of armaments (document S/231) and proposals regarding its implementation...".

At the ninetieth meeting, resolution 42 (I) of the General Assembly concerning "Information on Armed Forces of the United Nations" was placed on the agenda of the Council. At the 102nd meeting (11 February 1947) examination of the two items was combined.

1/ See also item 18: International Control of Atomic Energy.

(b) Implementation of General Assembly resolution 41 (I)

(i) Establishment of the Commission for Conventional Armaments

At the ninetieth meeting, the Council formally accepted General Assembly resolution 41 (I) and decided to proceed to consideration of its implementation. Discussion began at the ninety-second meeting (15 January 1947). Draft resolutions were introduced by the representatives of France (S/243), Australia (S/249), Colombia (S/251) and the United States (S/264). At the 105th meeting (13 February), the Security Council resolved (S/268/Rev.1/Corr.1), inter alia, to set up a Commission for Conventional Armaments composed of representatives of members of the Security Council to submit to the latter within not more than three months proposals (a) for the general regulation and reduction of armaments and armed forces; and (b) for practical and effective safeguards in connexion therewith.

(ii) Plan of work and organization of the Commission for Conventional Armaments

By a letter dated 25 June 1947 (S/387), the Chairman of the Commission transmitted a first progress report to the Council, attaching for approval of the Council a proposed plan of work (S/387, Annex A) and for the information of the Council a scheme for the organization of the Commission's work. At the 152nd meeting (8 July 1947), the Council adopted the plan of work adopted by the Commission for Conventional Armaments. The Council also took note of the Commission's scheme of organization of its work (S/387, Annex B).

(c) Consideration of General Assembly resolution 192 (III)

(i) Transmission to the Commission for Conventional Armaments

By a letter dated 14 January 1949 (S/1216), the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council General Assembly resolution 192 (III). At the 407th meeting of the Council (8 February), the representative of the USSR submitted a draft resolution (S/1246/Rev.1) dealing with the contents of the General Assembly resolution. At the 408th meeting (10 February), the representative of the United States submitted a draft resolution (S/1248) recommending that General Assembly resolution 192 (III) be transmitted to the Commission for Conventional Armaments for action according to its terms. At the

same meeting, the representative of the USSR proposed (S/1249) that his earlier draft resolution (S/1246/Rev.1) and General Assembly resolution 192 (III) be transmitted to the Commission for Conventional Armaments, and, separately to the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Council adopted the United States draft resolution (S/1248), and rejected both USSR draft resolutions (S/1246/Rev.1 and S/1249).

(ii) Working paper of Commission for Conventional Armaments for implementation of General Assembly resolution 192 (III)

By a letter dated 4 August 1949 (S/1372), the Chairman of the Commission for Conventional Armaments transmitted to the President of the Security Council a working paper adopted by the Commission at its nineteenth meeting on 1 August 1949, concerning implementation of General Assembly resolution 192 (III).

On 27 September the representative of France submitted a draft resolution (S/1399/Rev.1) calling for approval of the proposals contained in the working paper and instructing the Secretary-General to transmit it, together with the records of the Security Council's discussion, to the General Assembly.

The representative of the USSR submitted a draft resolution (S/1405) calling for the submission by States of information on both conventional armaments and atomic weapons. A revision of this draft resolution (S/1405/Rev.1) called for submission also of information on armed forces. The representative of France submitted a draft resolution (S/1408/Rev.1) as an alternative to the USSR draft resolution calling for the submission by States of full information on conventional armaments and armed forces under adequate procedures for complete verification of such information. The French draft resolution recalled that the submission of full information on atomic material and facilities, including atomic weapons, was an integral part of the United Nations plan, approved by the General Assembly on 4 November 1948, to ensure the use of atomic energy only for peaceful purposes and to ensure effective prohibition of atomic weapons.

The question was discussed at the 450th through 452nd meetings (11, 14 and 18 October 1949). The French draft resolution (S/1399/Rev.1) was not adopted, as one of the negative votes was that of a permanent member. The USSR draft

resolution (S/1405/Rev.1) was not adopted, and the alternative French draft resolution (S/1408/Rev.1) was also not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

A draft resolution (S/1410) introduced by the representative of France inviting the Secretary-General to transmit to the General Assembly the proposals contained in the working paper adopted by the Commission for Conventional Armaments, together with the records of the Council and the Commission discussions was adopted.

(d) Second progress report of the Commission for Conventional Armaments

By a letter dated 4 August 1949 (S/1371), the Chairman of the Commission for Conventional Armaments transmitted to the President of the Security Council two resolutions adopted by the Commission concerning items 1 and 2 of the Commission's plan of work and an accompanying report. On 27 September, the representative of the United States submitted a draft resolution (S/1398) calling for approval and transmission to the General Assembly of the resolutions of the Commission.

The question was discussed at the 450th meeting (11 October 1949). The United States draft resolution was not adopted, one of the negative votes being that of a permanent member. The Council adopted a draft resolution (S/1403) submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom to transmit to the General Assembly the resolutions of the Commission and its report.

(e) Consideration of General Assembly resolution 300 (IV)

By a letter dated 6 December 1949 (S/1429), the Secretary-General transmitted General Assembly resolution 300 (IV) to the President of the Security Council. A draft resolution (S/1445), submitted at the 461st meeting (13 January 1950) by the representative of France, proposing that General Assembly resolution 300 (IV) be transmitted to the Commission for Conventional Armaments for further study in accordance with its plan of work, was adopted at the 462nd meeting (17 January 1950).

By a letter dated 10 August 1950 (S/1690), the Chairman of the Commission for Conventional Armaments transmitted the third progress report of the Commission to the President of the Security Council. The report has not been placed on the agenda of the Security Council nor considered by it.

(f) Establishment of the Disarmament Commission and dissolution of the Commission for Conventional Armaments

The subject of effective regulation and reduction of conventional armaments was discussed at the fifth session of the General Assembly in connexion with the agenda item "International control of atomic energy". By resolution 496 (V) the Assembly established a Committee of Twelve to report on means whereby the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Conventional Armament Commission might be co-ordinated and their functions merged. At the sixth session, the Assembly, by resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952, took note of the recommendation of the Committee of Twelve (A/1922) and established under the Security Council a Disarmament Commission and dissolved the Atomic Energy Commission. The Commission was, with the guidance of certain specified principles and directives, to prepare proposals for "the regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments, for the elimination of all major weapons adaptable to mass destruction, and for effective international control of atomic energy to ensure the prohibition of atomic weapons and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only". In accordance with the Assembly's recommendation in that same resolution, the Security Council, at its 571st meeting (30 January 1952), dissolved the Commission for Conventional Armaments (S/2516/Corr.1).

Three reports covering the work of the Disarmament Commission during the years 1952 and 1953 (DC/11, dated 29 May 1952; DC/20, dated 13 October 1952; and DC/32, dated 20 August 1953) have been submitted to the Security Council and the General Assembly. The General Assembly, having considered them, adopted resolutions 704 (VII) of 8 April 1953 and 715 (VIII) of 28 November 1953.

(g) Establishment of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission

Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 715 (VIII), the Disarmament Commission at its thirty-fifth meeting on 19 April 1954 established a Sub-Committee composed of the representatives of Canada, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The Sub-Committee has thus far held eighty-six private meetings and has submitted three reports to the Disarmament Commission (DC/53, dated 22 June 1954; DC/71, dated 7 October 1955; and DC/83, dated 4 May 1956). The Commission, in turn, has

transmitted the first two to the General Assembly and the Security Council by means of its fourth report (DC/55, dated 3 August 1954) and a letter from the Chairman, dated 25 November 1955 (S/3463). The General Assembly, having considered them, adopted resolutions 808 (IX) of 4 November 1954 and 914 (X) of 16 December 1955, which suggested that the Disarmament Commission reconvene its Sub-Committee. The third report of the Sub-Committee (DC/83) was considered by the Disarmament Commission during its meetings in July 1956.

On 20 December 1956, the Disarmament Commission decided to take note of the third report and to transmit it to the General Assembly and the Security Council for their consideration. On 14 February 1957 the General Assembly adopted resolution 1011 (XI) which requested the Disarmament Commission to reconvene its Sub-Committee at an early date. Pursuant to that resolution, the Sub-Committee was convened on 18 March 1957 and discussions were continued for seventy-one meetings between 18 March and 6 September 1957. The Sub-Committee submitted two reports to the Disarmament Commission: Fourth Report, 1 August 1957 (DC/112), and Fifth Report, 11 September 1957 (DC/113).

On 14 November 1957, in resolution 1148 (XII), the General Assembly requested the Disarmament Commission to reconvene its Sub-Committee as soon as feasible, and on 19 December it decided (resolution 1150 (XII)) to enlarge the Commission by the addition of fourteen Member States. The Commission has held no meetings since the adoption of those resolutions.

6. APPOINTMENT OF A GOVERNOR FOR THE FREE TERRITORY OF TRIESTE[2/]

(a) Introductory note

In a letter dated 12 December 1946 (S/224/Rev.1), the Chairman of the Council of Foreign Ministers transmitted those articles and annexes of the draft peace treaty with Italy relevant to the establishment of a Free Territory of Trieste. The letter was placed on the agenda of the Security Council at the eighty-ninth meeting (7 January 1947). At its ninety-first meeting (10 January), the Council formally accepted the responsibilities devolving upon it under that text. Article 11, paragraph 1, of the Permanent Statute of the Free Territory (Annex VI of the Treaty) provides that the Governor of the Free Territory shall be appointed by the Security Council, after consultation with the Governments of Yugoslavia and Italy.

2/ See also item 15: The Question of the Free Territory of Trieste.

(b) Consideration by the Security Council (1947-1949)

By a letter dated 13 June 1947 (S/374), the representative of the United Kingdom requested that an early date be fixed for the discussion by the Council of the appointment of a Governor for the Free Territory of Trieste.

At its 143rd meeting (20 June 1947), the Council included the question in its agenda. After discussion at its 144th and 155th meetings held in private (20 June and 10 July), the Council set up a sub-committee of three members, composed of representatives of Australia, Colombia and Poland, to collect information about the candidates for the post of Governor. After examination of the Sub-Committee's report and further discussion at its 203rd and 223rd meetings (24 September and 18 December) the Council decided to request the Governments of Italy and Yugoslavia to consult with each other in an effort to reach agreement on a candidate.

The replies of the Governments of Italy (S/644 and S/647) and of Yugoslavia (S/648) indicated that no agreement had been reached.

The Council resumed the discussion at its 233rd and 265th meetings (23 January and 9 March 1948), held in private, and agreed to postpone consideration of the matter and to take up the question again at the request of any member of the Council.

On 20 March 1948, the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, issued a joint declaration in which it was stated, inter alia, that, in view of the evident impossibility of agreement on the selection of a Governor and of developments in the Yugoslav-occupied zone of the Free Territory, the three Governments had decided to recommend the return of the Free Territory to Italian sovereignty as the best solution to meet the democratic aspirations of the people and to make possible the re-establishment of peace and stability in the area. The three Governments had proposed to the Governments of the USSR and Italy that the latter join in an agreement on an additional Protocol to the Treaty of Peace with Italy which would provide for such a solution. This note was circulated among the members of the Security Council on 31 March 1948 (S/707).

By a letter dated 8 February 1949 (S/1251), the representative of the USSR requested that the question of appointment of a Governor of the Free Territory be considered by the Security Council in the near future. The Council resumed

consideration of the matter at its 411th meeting (17 February) at which the USSR representative submitted a draft resolution (S/1260) providing that the Council appoint Colonel Flückiger as Governor of the Free Territory. After further discussion at its 412th, 422nd and 424th meetings, the USSR draft resolution was rejected.

(c) Consideration by the Security Council (1953)

By a letter dated 12 October 1953 (S/3105), the representative of the USSR, referring to the declaration made on 8 October 1953 by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom on the question of Trieste, requested that a meeting of the Council be convened to discuss the question of the appointment of a Governor of the Free Territory of Trieste. A draft resolution enclosed with the letter provided that the Council decide to appoint Colonel Flückiger as Governor.

At its 625th meeting (15 October), the Council decided to include the question in the agenda. At its 628th meeting (20 October), it decided to postpone study of the matter until 2 November, on which date, at its 634th meeting, it decided to postpone the discussion for a further three weeks. At its 641st meeting (23 November), the Council decided to postpone the discussion until the week of 8-15 December, with the proviso that the date of the meeting would be set by the President.

At its 647th meeting (14 December 1953), the Council decided to postpone consideration of the question pending the outcome of current efforts to find a solution to the Trieste problem.

7. THE EGYPTIAN QUESTION

By a letter dated 8 July 1947 (S/410), the Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that British troops were being maintained in Egyptian territories against the unanimous will of the people, contrary to the letter and spirit of the Charter and to General Assembly resolution 41 (I) adopted on 14 December 1946. Moreover, the occupation of the Sudan by the British armed forces and the pursuance there of their hostile policy had given rise to a dispute between the Egyptian Government and the Government of the United Kingdom, the continuance of which was likely to endanger the

maintenance of international peace and security. Direct negotiations had been attempted in conformity with Article 33 of the Charter, but to no avail. Consequently, the Egyptian Government brought its dispute to the Security Council under Articles 35 and 37 of the Charter, requesting the Council to direct (a) the total and immediate evacuation of British troops from Egypt, including the Sudan; (b) the termination of the present administrative regime in the Sudan.

The Security Council placed the question on its agenda at the 159th meeting (17 July). Discussion started at the 175th meeting (5 August) and continued through the 176th, 179th, 182nd, 189th, 193rd, 196th, 198th, 199th, 200th and 201st meetings (10 September 1947). At the 189th meeting (20 August), the representative of Brazil submitted a draft resolution (S/507) recommending to the Governments of the United Kingdom and Egypt (a) to resume direct negotiations and, should such negotiations fail, to seek a solution of the dispute by other peaceful means of their own choice; and (b) to keep the Security Council informed of the progress of the negotiations.

At the 198th meeting (28 August), the Brazilian draft resolution as amended by China (S/507/Add.1), Belgium (S/507/Add.1) and Australia (S/516) was rejected. In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 27 of the Charter, the United Kingdom representative did not take part in the voting. At the same meeting, the representative of Colombia submitted a draft resolution (S/530), calling upon the Governments of the United Kingdom and Egypt to resume direct negotiations with a view (a) to completing at the earliest possible date the evacuation of all United Kingdom military, naval and air forces from Egyptian territory, mutual assistance being provided in order to safeguard in time of war or imminent threat of war the liberty and security of navigation of the Suez Canal; and (b) to terminating the joint administration of the Sudan with due regard to the principle of self-determination of peoples and their right to self-government; and to keep the Security Council readily informed of the progress of their negotiations.

At the 200th meeting (29 August), the Colombian draft resolution was voted upon in parts and rejected.

At the 201st meeting (10 September), the representative of China submitted a draft resolution (S/547) recommending that the parties: (a) resume negotiations,

and (b) keep the Security Council informed of the progress of these negotiations and report thereon to the Council in the first instance not later than 1 January 1948. At the same meeting, the Chinese draft resolution and the Australian amendments (S/549) thereto were rejected, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of seven members.

The President stated that the Egyptian question would remain on the agenda and that the Council would reconsider the question either at the request of any member of the Council or at the request of either of the two parties.

8. THE INDONESIAN QUESTION

(a) Inclusion of the question in the agenda

The Indonesian question was brought before the Council by two letters, dated 30 July 1947, from the Government of India and from the Government of Australia. In its letter (S/447), the Government of India, under Article 35, paragraph 1, of the Charter, drew the Council's attention to the situation in Indonesia, which in its opinion endangered the maintenance of international peace and security. The Council was requested to take the necessary measures to put an end to the situation.

The letter from the Australian Government (S/449) stated that the hostilities in progress in Java and Sumatra constituted a breach of peace under Article 39 and urged the Council to take immediate action to restore international peace and security.

The question was included in the Council's agenda at the 171st meeting (31 July 1947), when the representatives of India and the Netherlands were invited to participate in the discussion. The Security Council subsequently invited the representatives of the Philippines, the Republic of Indonesia, Australia,[3/] Belgium,[3/] Burma and Pakistan to participate in the discussion at various stages. Members of the United Nations Committee of Good Offices and of the Commission for Indonesia were also invited to participate in the discussion during later stages.

3/ Representatives of Australia and Belgium were invited to participate in the discussion of the question after these two countries ceased to be members of the Security Council at the end of 1947 and 1948 respectively.

(b) From the cease-fire resolution to the breakdown of the "Renville" Agreement (August 1947-December 1948)

On 1 August 1947 (175rd meeting), the Security Council adopted a resolution (S/459) calling upon the parties to cease hostilities forthwith, to settle their disputes by arbitration or by other peaceful means, and to keep the Security Council informed about the progress of the settlement.

By letters dated 3 and 4 August (S/466), the representative of the Netherlands informed the Council that orders had been issued to the Netherlands forces in the areas concerned to cease hostilities. By a cablegram dated 5 August (S/469), the Vice-Premier of the Republic of Indonesia informed the Council that his Government had decided to order a cessation of hostilities. He requested that the Council appoint a committee to secure effective implementation of the cessation of hostilities.

On 25 August 1947, the Security Council adopted two resolutions (S/525). The first provided for establishment of a commission composed of the consular representatives in Batavia of members of the Security Council to report on the situation in Indonesia. In the other resolution, the Security Council tendered its good offices to the parties and expressed its readiness, if the parties so requested, to assist in the settlement of the dispute through a committee of the Council consisting of three of its members, each of the parties selecting one member and the third to be chosen by the two so selected.

By letters dated 4 and 18 September 1947 (S/545 and S/564), the representatives of the Netherlands and of the Republic of Indonesia informed the Council that the Governments of Belgium and Australia had accepted their respective invitations to serve on the Council's Committee of Good Offices. By a letter dated 18 September (S/558), the representatives of Australia and Belgium informed the Council that the Government of the United States of America had agreed to be the third member.

After discussion in the course of further meetings, held during the month of October 1947, when the Council discussed the interim report (S/573) and the full report (S/586 and Addenda 1 and 2) of the Consular Commission at Batavia, the Security Council, at its 219th meeting (1 November), adopted a resolution (S/597) which provided, inter alia, that the Committee of Good Offices should assist the parties in reaching agreement on an arrangement which would ensure

the observance of the cease-fire resolution. At its 224th meeting on 19 December, the Council agreed that the Committee of Good Offices should continue with the same membership after 31 December 1947, although Australia's membership in the Security Council ended on that date.

On 17 January 1948 (229th meeting), the President of the Security Council read a cablegram (S/650) from the Chairman of the Committee of Good Offices stating that the delegations of the Republic of Indonesia and the Netherlands would sign a truce agreement on 17 January 1948 on board the USS "Renville" and that, immediately thereafter, both parties would sign an agreement on twelve political principles which were to form the agreed basis for discussion concerning the settlement of the dispute. On 19 January, six additional political principles were accepted by the parties. The above documents came to be known as the Renville Agreement.

On 28 February 1948 (259th meeting), the Security Council adopted a resolution (S/678) in which it noted with satisfaction the first interim report of the Committee of Good Offices (S/649 and Corr.1) and maintained its offer of good offices. The Council also adopted a resolution (S/689) requesting the Committee of Good Offices to pay particular attention to political developments in Western Java and Madura and to report thereon at frequent intervals.

In the course of 1948, the Security Council received various reports from the Committee of Good Offices on developments in Indonesia and on the negotiations between the parties, culminating in the special reports which it submitted on 12 and 18 December regarding the collapse of direct talks between the representatives of the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia (S/1117 and S/1129).

(c) From the resumption of military operations to the Round Table Conference at The Hague (December 1948-December 1949)

On 20 December, the Council convened in emergency session (387th meeting) at the request of the Australian and United States representatives (S/1128) to consider the Indonesian question in the light of the resumption of military operations in Indonesia on 18 December. The Committee of Good Offices submitted a number of reports (S/1129/Add.1, S/1138, S/1144, S/1146, S/1154, S/1156 and S/1166) concerning the outbreak of hostilities and later developments in Indonesia.

At the 392nd meeting (24 December) the Council adopted a resolution (S/1150) calling upon the parties to cease hostilities forthwith. The Government of the Netherlands was called upon immediately to release the President of the Republic of Indonesia and other political prisoners arrested since 18 December. The Council also instructed the Committee of Good Offices to report on events since 12 December and on the parties' compliance with the above directives. At the 395th meeting (28 December), the Council adopted a resolution (S/1165) requesting the Consular Commission in Batavia to report fully on the situation in the Republic of Indonesia, covering observance of the cease-fire orders and conditions in areas under military occupation or from which armed forces might be withdrawn. On the same date, the Council adopted a resolution (S/1164) noting that the Government of the Netherlands had not released the prisoners as requested by the resolution of 24 December, and calling upon the Netherlands Government to set them free forthwith and to report to the Council within twenty-four hours.

After further discussion in the course of the month of January, the Security Council, on 28 January 1949 (406th meeting), adopted a resolution (S/1234) in which, inter alia, it once again called upon the parties immediately to cease all military operations, called for the release of all political prisoners arrested by the Netherlands Government in the Republic of Indonesia since 17 December 1948, and recommended that the parties undertake negotiations, with the assistance of the Commission, for the establishment of a federal, independent and sovereign United States of Indonesia at the earliest possible date. The transfer of sovereignty over Indonesia by the Government of the Netherlands to the United States of Indonesia should take place at the earliest possible date and in any case no later than 1 July 1950. Various other provisions of the resolution concerned the return of the Republican Government to Jogjakarta and called for the progressive return to the administration of that Government of the other areas controlled by the Republic under the Renville Agreement. The Committee of Good Offices was to be known as the United Nations Commission for Indonesia.

On 1 March 1949, the United Nations Commission for Indonesia submitted a report (S/1270 and Corr.1) which was followed by three supplementary reports during the remainder of the month of March (S/1270/Add.1-3). The report stated

that the Netherlands Government had not released the Republican political prisoners and had refused to permit the re-establishment of the Republican Government at Jogjakarta, that there had been no negotiations under the resolution, and that there had been no actual or complete cessation of hostilities. The report also gave details of a proposal by the Netherlands Government to convene a round-table conference on the Indonesian question at The Hague, a proposal viewed by the Commission as a counter-proposal or a substitute for the 28 January resolution of the Security Council. The Commission requested indications as to what its position should be towards the invitation.

After discussion in the course of a number of meetings, the Security Council, on 23 March (421st meeting), approved a directive to the Commission stating that it was the sense of the Council that the Commission should assist the parties in reaching agreement as to the implementation of the Council's resolution of 28 January and as to the time and conditions for holding the proposed conference at The Hague. If such an agreement was reached, the holding of such a conference and participation in it by the Commission would be consistent with the purposes and objectives of the resolution of 28 January.

The Commission reported on 9 May (S/1320) that both parties had accepted its invitation to discussions pursuant to the Council's directive.

On 4 August, the Commission reported (S/1373) that a cease-fire had been ordered by the two Governments on 3 August, that the Government of the Republic had been restored to Jogjakarta, and that the time and conditions for the Round-Table Conference at The Hague had been settled.

On 8 November 1949, the Commission submitted a special report (S/1417) on the Round-Table Conference held at The Hague from 23 August to 2 November 1949. Under the agreements reached at The Hague, the Netherlands was to transfer sovereignty unconditionally to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, the transfer to be effected by 30 December 1949 at the latest. The residency of New Guinea, however, was excepted, and its status was to be determined within a year of the transfer of sovereignty.

The Commission stated that it would continue to carry out its functions in accordance with its terms of reference and that, in accordance with the agreement reached at the conference, it would observe in Indonesia the implementation of the decisions reached at The Hague.

/

The Security Council commenced discussion of the special report of the Commission at its 455th meeting (12 December), when the President of the Council (the representative of Canada) submitted a draft resolution (S/1431) congratulating the parties on the successful conclusion of the Round-Table Conference, welcoming the forthcoming establishment of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia and commending the Commission. It requested the Commission to continue to discharge its responsibilities, including in particular observing and assisting in the implementation of the agreements reached at the Round-Table Conference.

The representative of the Ukrainian SSR submitted a draft resolution (S/1433) calling for withdrawal of Netherlands forces, the release of political prisoners by the Netherlands Government and for the establishment of a United Nations Commission composed of representatives of States members of the Security Council which would inquire into the activities of the Netherlands authorities and would submit to the Council proposals for the settlement of the conflict between the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia on the basis of recognition of the independence and sovereign rights of the Indonesian people. This proposal provided also for dissolution of the Commission for Indonesia.

At the 456th meeting (13 December), the Canadian draft resolution was voted upon in parts and was not adopted. The Ukrainian SSR draft resolution was also rejected. Following the vote, the President of the Security Council stated that rejection of the Canadian draft resolution had no effect whatsoever on the previous decisions taken by the Council which remained in full force and effect.

(d) From the transfer of sovereignty to the adjournment of the Commission sine die (December 1949 - 3 April 1951)

The United Nations Commission for Indonesia submitted a number of reports in the course of 1950 (S/1449, S/1663, S/1842 and S/1875 and Corr.1). The reports dealt with the implementation of the agreements reached at The Hague, including the transfer of sovereignty which had taken place on 27 December 1949, the repatriation of Netherlands forces and the dissolution of the Royal Netherlands Indonesian Army (KNIL), as well as with events which took place in the South Moluccas, following the proclamation, on 25 April 1950, of a "South Moluccas Republic" by a group of persons who had seized authority in the islands.

On 3 April 1951, the Commission submitted a report (S/2087) on its activities since the transfer of sovereignty. Among other things, the report stated that the withdrawal of Netherlands troops was progressing satisfactorily and that observation by the Commission was no longer necessary. It summarized the developments which had led to the establishment, on 18 August 1950, of the Republic of Indonesia as a unitary State, as well as related correspondence with and between the parties in connexion with the right of self-determination.

It also dealt with a special Union Conference held at The Hague on 4 December 1950 to deal with the question of the status of New Guinea. No agreement had as yet been achieved on the status of that territory. Since the military problems were virtually solved, since no other matters had been submitted by the parties, and since no items remained on its agenda, the Commission had decided that, while holding itself at the disposal of the parties, it would adjourn sine die.

The Security Council has not so far discussed that report.

9. VOTING PROCEDURE IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL

By a letter dated 2 January 1947 (S/237), the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council the text of General Assembly resolution 40 (I) of 13 December 1946, which recommended to the Council "the early adoption of practices and procedures, consistent with the Charter, to assist in reducing the difficulties in the application of Article 27 and to ensure the prompt and effective exercise by the Security Council of its functions".

At its 197th meeting (27 August 1947), the Council decided to refer the matter to the Committee of Experts, which was instructed to submit to the Council its recommendations on the measures that the latter should adopt in view of the Assembly's recommendations.

On 2 September, the United States representative on the Committee of Experts submitted draft rules of procedure relating to voting in the Security Council (S/C.1/160). The Committee has not so far discussed this question.

On 2 December, the Secretary-General transmitted to the Council the text (S/620) of General Assembly resolution 117 (II) of 21 November 1947, under which the Interim Committee was to consult with any committee which the Council might

designate to co-operate with the Interim Committee in the study of the problem of the voting procedure in the Council.

At its 224th meeting (19 December 1947), the Security Council decided that the Secretary-General's letter conveying the Assembly's resolution should be received by the Council.

On 25 April 1949, the Secretary-General transmitted to the Council the text (S/1312) of General Assembly resolution 267 (III) of 14 April 1949, recommending to the members of the Council that a list of decisions set forth in an Annex to the resolution be deemed procedural, and to the permanent members that they seek agreement upon what possible decisions of the Council they might forbear to exercise their veto. At the 452nd meeting (18 October 1949), the President reported that agreement had not been possible as each permanent member adhered to its position, but that they had agreed on the principle and practice of consultation before important decisions were to be made.

10. REPORTS ON THE STRATEGIC TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS PURSUANT TO THE RESOLUTION OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF 7 MARCH 1949

In a letter dated 17 February 1947 (S/281) the United States representative submitted for the approval of the Security Council, in accordance with Article 83 of the Charter, the text of a draft Trusteeship Agreement for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. After discussion at the 113rd meeting (26 February) and subsequent meetings, the Council, at its 124th meeting (2 April) approved the Agreement (S/318), which came into force on 18 July 1947.

The question of formulating procedures to govern the detailed application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter to that strategic area was raised by the Secretary-General in a letter dated 7 November 1947 (S/599). After discussion of the matter by the Council, on the basis of a report of the Committee of Experts dated 12 January 1948 (S/642), meetings were held between committees appointed by the Security and Trusteeship Councils and the resulting agreement was embodied in a resolution (S/1280) adopted by the Council at its 415th meeting (7 March 1949). This agreement dealt with the respective functions of the two Councils in respect of strategic areas in general.

The United States Government and the Trusteeship Council have periodically submitted reports to the Security Council in virtue of these agreements. The United States Government has also given notice of periods when access to parts of the Trust Territory has been restricted for security reasons.

11. APPLICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

Up to its tenth session, the General Assembly, upon the recommendation of the Security Council, had approved the admission of: Afghanistan (19 November 1946), Iceland (19 November 1946), Sweden (19 November 1946), Thailand (16 December 1946), Pakistan (30 September 1947), Yemen (30 September 1947), Burma (17 March 1948), Israel (11 May 1949) and Indonesia (28 September 1950).

In the course of its tenth session, on 8 December 1955, the General Assembly adopted resolution 918 (X) by which it requested the Security Council to consider, in the light of the general opinion in favour of the widest possible membership of the United Nations, the pending applications for membership of all those eighteen countries about which no problem of unification arose. The Security Council considered this resolution, as well as a resolution adopted by the Assembly at its ninth session (resolution 817 (IX)) concerning reconsideration of all pending applications, and the application of Spain (S/3441/Rev.1), at a series of meetings in December 1955. As a result of this consideration, the Security Council on 14 December recommended admission of the following sixteen applicants: Albania, Jordan, Ireland, Portugal, Hungary, Italy, Austria, Romania, Bulgaria, Finland, Ceylon, Nepal, Libya, Cambodia, Laos and Spain. All these States were admitted to membership by the General Assembly on 14 December 1955 (resolution 995 (X)).

In the course of 1956, the Security Council recommended the admission of the Sudan, Morocco, Tunisia and Japan. These States were admitted to membership by decisions taken by the General Assembly in the course of its eleventh session, as was Ghana, whose admission was recommended by the Security Council on 7 March 1957.

On 5 September 1957, the Security Council decided to recommend to the General Assembly the admission of the Federation of Malaya. The General

/

Assembly at its twelfth session admitted the Federation of Malaya to membership in the United Nations.

The following applications have so far failed to obtain the recommendation of the Security Council: The Mongolian People's Republic, the Republic of Korea, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

12. THE PALESTINE QUESTION

(a) Inclusion of the item in the agenda

In a letter dated 2 December 1947 (S/614) the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council, General Assembly resolution 181 (II) concerning the future Government of Palestine (Plan of Partition). At its 222nd meeting (9 December), the Council took note of that resolution and decided to postpone discussion of the matter.

At its 253rd meeting (24 February 1948) the Council began its consideration of the question, and at its 263rd meeting (5 March) adopted a resolution (S/691) calling upon the permanent members to consult together regarding the situation in Palestine and appealing to all Governments to act to prevent such disorders as were occurring in Palestine. On 19 March (270th meeting), those permanent members of the Council who had consulted together recommended that the Council should make it clear to the parties concerned that the Council was determined not to permit the existence in Palestine of any threat to the peace and that it would take further action by all means available to it to bring about the immediate cessation of violence and the restoration of peace.

(b) Establishment on 23 April 1948 of the Consular Truce Commission

At its 277th meeting (1 April), the Council adopted two resolutions (S/714); the first one called for a truce in Palestine, and the second requested the Secretary-General to convoke a special session of the General Assembly to consider further the question of the future Government of Palestine.

In accordance with the terms of the first resolution, the representatives of the Jewish Agency and of the Arab Higher Committee met with the President in order to agree upon a basis for the truce. Since no agreement was reached, the Council adopted on 17 April (283rd meeting) a resolution calling for a truce and outlining

the principles and machinery therefor (S/723). Subsequently, on 23 April, the Council established a Truce Commission (S/727) to assist in the implementation by the parties of the Council's truce resolution of 17 April and to be composed of the representatives of those members of the Security Council, except Syria, who had career consular officers in Jerusalem.

(c) The Security Council truce resolution of 29 May 1948

Following the outbreak of hostilities on 14 May 1948, the Council adopted at its 302nd meeting (22 May) a resolution calling upon the parties to issue cease-fire orders within thirty-six hours of the adoption of the resolution (S/773).

The provisional Government of Israel communicated to the Council its acceptance of the truce on 24 May (S/779), whereas the Arab States informed the Council that the 17 April truce resolution should be first observed so that the cease-fire might lead to a just and lasting solution (S/792).

The Council at its 310th meeting (29 May) adopted a resolution (S/801) calling, inter alia, for a cessation of hostilities for a period of four weeks, and instructing Count Folke Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator,[4/] to supervise the cease-fire, in concert with the Truce Commission which was to be provided with military observers, and to make contact with the parties with a view to carrying out his functions as determined by the General Assembly.

The Arab States and the provisional Government of Israel advised the Council of their acceptance of the resolution (S/804, S/810).

At its 313th meeting (3 June), the Council agreed that the Mediator should be given full authority to interpret the terms of the cease-fire resolution. Only if his interpretation was challenged should the matter be submitted to the Council.

4/ In its resolution 186 (S-2) adopted on 14 May 1948, the General Assembly had empowered a United Nations Mediator to promote a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine, and relieved the Palestine Commission of further responsibility under resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947. The Mediator was directed to conform with such instructions as the General Assembly or the Security Council might issue.

(d) The Security Council truce resolution of 15 July 1948

The first truce in Palestine went into effect on 11 June 1948. Since the first truce was to expire on 9 July 1948, the Council addressed on 7 July (351st meeting) an urgent appeal to both Jews and Arabs for the prolongation of the truce (S/875). Nevertheless, fighting started again in Palestine.

At the 353rd meeting (13 July), the Mediator presented to the Council an oral report supplementing his previous written report (S/888), wherein he called upon the Council to order an immediate cease-fire. At its 358th meeting (15 July), the Council adopted a resolution (S/902), describing the situation in Palestine as a threat to the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter, ordering an indefinite cease-fire, and instructing the Mediator to supervise the truce and to establish procedures for examining alleged breaches.

Since many alleged violations of the cease-fire order were brought to the notice of the Council, especially in the Negev area, the Council took various decisions to remedy the situation. These resolutions, which were taken at the meetings of 19 October, 4 and 16 November and 29 December (S/1044, S/1070, S/1080, S/1169), were concerned chiefly with calling upon both parties to cease fire and to start negotiations for armistice agreements. On 17 September (S/1002), the Security Council was informed of the assassination in Palestine of Count Folke Bernadotte, the Mediator. The Council, at its 358th meeting (18 September), approved the cablegram sent on the previous day by the Acting Secretary-General empowering Dr. Ralph Bunche to assume full authority as Acting Mediator until further notice.

(e) Conclusion of the Armistice Agreements between February and July 1949

On 11 December 1948 (S/1122), the General Assembly established by resolution 194 (III) a Palestine Conciliation Commission (France, Turkey and the United States) which was, inter alia, to assume the function of the Acting Mediator under resolution 186 (S-2) of 14 May 1948, and to take steps to assist the Governments and authorities concerned to achieve a final settlement of all questions outstanding between them.

By letter dated 6 January 1949 (S/1187), the Acting Mediator, Dr. Bunche, informed the Security Council that the Government of Egypt and the provisional Government of Israel had unconditionally accepted a proposal providing for a cease-fire in the Negev area, to be immediately followed by direct negotiations,

under United Nations chairmanship, on the implementation of the Council's resolutions of 4 and 16 November 1948, calling for the conclusion of armistice agreements.

Between February and July 1949, Armistice Agreements were signed between Israel on the one hand, and Egypt (S/1264/Rev.1), Lebanon (S/1296/Rev.1), the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (S/1302/Rev.1) and Syria (S/1353/Rev.1) on the other. On 21 July, the Acting Mediator submitted his final report on the status of the armistice negotiations and the truce in Palestine (S/1357).5/

At the 457th meeting (11 August), the Council adopted two resolutions (S/1376), the first paying tribute to Count Folke Bernadotte and, upon the completion of their responsibilities, expressing appreciation to the Acting Mediator and the members of the staff of the Palestine Mission, and the second which, inter alia, expressed the hope that the parties, by means of negotiations conducted by the Palestine Conciliation Commission, would soon achieve agreement on a final settlement and, meanwhile, reaffirmed the cease-fire order contained in the Council's 15 July resolution (S/902); relieved the Acting Mediator of any further responsibility under Security Council resolutions; noted that the Armistice Agreements were to be supervised by Mixed Armistice Commissions under the chairmanship of the United Nations Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization; and requested the Chief of Staff to report to the Council on the observance of the cease-fire in Palestine. Since then, the Chief of Staff has periodically submitted reports on the work of that organization.

(f) The demilitarization of Jerusalem

The question of demilitarization of the Jerusalem area, with special reference to General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, was placed on the agenda of the 453rd meeting on 25 October 1949 at the request of the representative of Egypt. The Council decided to adjourn further discussion of this matter indefinitely, pending discussion of the Palestine question by the General Assembly. While the Assembly has discussed various aspects of the Palestine question at each subsequent session, the Council has not resumed discussion of this matter.

5/ Meanwhile, at its 207th meeting (11 May 1949), the General Assembly, upon the recommendation of the Security Council, had decided to admit Israel to membership in the United Nations.

(g) Charges submitted by Egypt on 9 September 1950 of alleged violation of the Egyptian-Israel Armistice Agreement

By letter dated 9 September 1950 (S/1789 and Corr.1), Egypt drew to the attention of the Security Council the expulsion by Israel of thousands of Palestinian Arabs into Egyptian territory and alleged violations by Israel of the Egyptian-Israel General Armistice Agreement.

At its 524th meeting (17 November), the Council adopted a resolution (S/1907 and Corr.1), which called upon the parties to consent to the handling of the present complaints according to the procedures established in the Armistice Agreements; requested the Israel-Egyptian Mixed Armistice Commission to give urgent attention to the Egyptian complaints of expulsion of thousands of Palestine Arabs and called upon both parties to give effect to any finding of the Israel-Egyptian Mixed Armistice Commission regarding the repatriation of any such Arabs who, in the Commission's opinion, were entitled to return; and authorized the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization to recommend to Israel and Egypt and other appropriate Arab States such steps as he considered necessary to control the movement of nomadic Arabs across international frontiers or armistice lines.

(h) Charges submitted by Syria in April 1951 of alleged violation of the Armistice Agreement regarding the Huleh Marshes

At the 541st meeting (17 April 1951), the Council considered the various items concerning alleged violations of the Syrian-Israel General Armistice Agreements which had been submitted by the representatives of Syria and Israel (see S/Agenda 541). The Council agreed to defer further consideration until such time as General Riley, Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization, should be able to come before the Council for the purpose of providing it with further information.

At the 545th meeting (8 May), the Council adopted a resolution noting that fighting was continuing in the demilitarized zone and calling upon the parties to cease fighting (S/2150).

At the 547th meeting (18 May), the Council adopted a resolution (S/2157) which, inter alia, (1) called upon the Government of Israel to comply with the request of the Chief of Staff and of the Chairman of the Israel-Syria Mixed

Armistice Commission to ensure that the Palestine Land Development Company cease all operations in the demilitarized zone until such time as an arrangement was made through the Chairman of the Israel-Syria Mixed Armistice Commission for the continuation of the drainage project; (2) found that the aerial action taken by Israel forces on 5 April and any future aggressive military action by either party in or around the demilitarized zone should be regarded as constituting a violation of the cease-fire provision of the Security Council resolution of 15 July 1948, and as inconsistent with the terms of the Armistice Agreement and the obligations assumed under the Charter; and (3) decided that Arab civilians who had been removed from the demilitarized zone by Israel should be permitted to return forthwith to their homes and that the Israel-Syria Mixed Armistice Commission should supervise their return and rehabilitation.

(i) Complaint submitted by Israel in July 1951 regarding the Suez Canal

By letter dated 11 July 1951 (S/2241), the representative of Israel requested urgent consideration of the following item: "Restrictions imposed by Egypt on the passage of ships through the Suez Canal".

The Council began consideration of this question at the 549th meeting (26 July) and invited the representatives of Israel, Egypt and Iraq to participate without vote in the discussion.

At the 558th meeting (1 September), the Council adopted a resolution (S/2322) which found, inter alia, that the practice of interfering with passage through the Suez Canal of goods destined for Israel was inconsistent with the objectives of a peaceful settlement and the establishment of permanent peace in Palestine. The resolution called upon Egypt to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound and to cease all interference with such shipping beyond that essential to the safety of shipping in the Canal itself and to the observance of the international conventions in force.

/...

(j) Compliance with and enforcement of the General Armistice Agreements, with special reference to recent acts of violence, and in particular to the incident at Qibiya on 14-15 October 1953: report by the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization

In identical letters dated 17 October 1953, the representatives of France (S/3109), the United Kingdom (S/3110) and the United States (S/3111) requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the matter of the tension between Israel and the neighbouring Arab States, with particular reference to recent acts of violence and to compliance with and enforcement of the General Armistice Agreements.

The Council discussed this matter at ten meetings between 19 October and 25 November 1953, during which time Major General Vagn Bennike, Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, presented a comprehensive report concerning the activities and decisions of the four Mixed Armistice Commissions, particularly regarding the Qibiya incident.

At the 642nd meeting (24 November), the Council adopted a resolution (S/3139/Rev.2) which, inter alia (1) found that the retaliatory action at Qibiya taken by armed forces of Israel and all such actions constituted a violation of the cease-fire provisions of the Council's resolution of 15 July 1948 and were inconsistent with the parties' obligations under the General Armistice Agreement and the Charter; (2) expressed the strongest censure of that action, calling upon Israel to take effective measures to prevent all such actions in the future; (3) took note of the fact that there was substantial evidence of crossing of the demarcation line by unauthorized persons often resulting in acts of violence and requested the Government of Jordan to continue and to strengthen the measures which they were already taking to prevent such crossings; (4) recalled to the Government of Israel and Jordan their obligations under Security Council resolutions and the General Armistice Agreement to prevent all acts of violence on either side of the demarcation line; (5) reaffirmed that it was essential in order to achieve progress by peaceful means towards a lasting settlement of the issues outstanding between them that the parties abide by their obligations under the General Armistice Agreement and the resolutions of the Security Council; and (6) requested the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization to report within three months to the Council, with such recommendations as he might consider appropriate, on compliance with and enforcement of the General Armistice

Agreements, with particular reference to the provisions of that resolution and taking into account any agreement reached in pursuance of the request by the Government of Israel for the convocation of a conference under Article XII of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan.

(k) Complaint submitted by Syria against Israel on 16 October 1953 concerning work on the west bank of the River Jordan in the Demilitarized Zone

In a letter dated 16 October 1953 (S/3108/Rev.1), the representative of Syria complained that on 2 September 1953 Israel had started works in the Demilitarized Zone to divert the Jordan River into a new channel with a view to making it flow through its own territory. He charged that that action violated the provisions of the Israel-Syrian Armistice Agreement, particularly article V thereof. He also recalled that the Chief of Staff had requested Israel on 23 September to stop all operations.

Following a report by the Chief of Staff on the question (S/3122), the Council started discussing the question at its 629th meeting (27 October). At the 631st meeting (27 October), the Council adopted a resolution (S/3128) wherein it deemed it desirable that the works started in the Demilitarized Zone should be suspended pending the urgent examination of the question by the Council, and took note with satisfaction of Israel's undertaking to suspend the works in question during the Council's examination of the dispute.

After further discussion of the question at subsequent meetings, France, the United Kingdom and the United States submitted at the 648th meeting (16 December) a joint draft resolution (S/3151), under which as subsequently revised (S/3151/Rev.2) the Council would, inter alia, (1) endorse the request by the Chief of Staff to the Government of Israel dated 23 September 1953; (2) call upon the parties to the dispute to comply with all the decisions and requests made by the Chief of Staff in the exercise of his authority under the Armistice Agreement; (3) request and authorize the Chief of Staff to explore possibilities of reconciling Israel and Syrian interests involved in the dispute over the diversion of Jordan waters at Banat Ya'qub, including full satisfaction of existing irrigation rights at all seasons, while safeguarding the rights of individuals in the Demilitarized Zone, and to take such steps in accordance with

/...

the Armistice Agreement as he might deem appropriate to effect a reconciliation; (4) request the Secretary-General to place at the disposal of the Chief of Staff a sufficient number of experts, in particular hydraulic engineers, to supply him on the technical level with the necessary data for a complete appreciation of the project in question and of its effect upon the Demilitarized Zone; and (5) direct the Chief of Staff to report to the Security Council within ninety days on the measures taken to give effect to that resolution.

At the 656th meeting (22 January 1954), the Council failed to adopt the revised joint draft resolution owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

During the discussion of the question, the representative of Lebanon submitted one draft resolution on 18 December 1953 (S/3152) and another draft resolution (S/3166) at the 655th meeting (21 January 1954). The Council has not yet acted on these resolutions.

(1) Complaints received from Israel and Egypt in January and February 1954

In a letter dated 28 January 1954 (S/3168), the representative of Israel requested that a complaint concerning restrictions placed by Egypt upon shipping proceeding to Israel through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba be placed on the Council's agenda for urgent consideration. The letter added that the acts complained of constituted violations of the Council's resolution of 1 September 1951 and of the Egypt-Israel Armistice Agreement.

In a letter dated 3 February (S/3172), the representative of Egypt requested the inclusion of the following in the same agenda for urgent consideration: "Complaint by Egypt against Israel concerning violations by Israel of the Egyptian-Israel Armistice Agreement in the Demilitarized Zone of El-Auja".

At the 657th meeting (4 February), the Council decided that the agenda should consist of those two complaints and that they should be considered consecutively. It discussed the complaint submitted by Israel at eight meetings from 4 February (657th meeting) to 29 March (664th meeting).

At the 662nd meeting (23 March), the representative of New Zealand submitted a draft resolution (S/3188/Corr.1) providing, inter alia, that the Council should (1) recall its resolution of 1 September 1951; (2) note with grave concern that Egypt had not complied with that resolution; (3) call upon Egypt, in accordance with its obligations under the Charter, to comply with it; and (4) consider that without prejudice to the provisions of the resolution of 1 September 1951, the

complaint concerning the alleged interference with shipping to Elath through the Gulf of Aqaba should in the first instance be dealt with by the Mixed Armistice Commission established under the Egypt-Israel Armistice Agreement.

At the 664th meeting (29 March), the New Zealand draft resolution was put to the vote, and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council. Since the 664th meeting, the Council has not considered those complaints.

(m) Complaints received from Lebanon and Israel in March and April 1954

In a cablegram dated 30 March 1954 (S/3192) Jordan charged that on 28 March large Israel military armed forces had attacked the Jordan village of Nahhalin, killing nine persons and wounding eighteen civilians. It was stated that on the same date the Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission had adopted a resolution condemning Israel in the strongest terms for that aggression and calling upon the Israel authorities to take the most effective measures to prevent such and other aggressions against Jordan in the future and to apprehend and punish those responsible.

In a letter dated 1 April (S/3195), the representative of Lebanon submitted for urgent consideration a complaint regarding this incident on behalf of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan.

By a letter dated 5 April (S/3196), the representative of Israel requested urgent consideration of four complaints concerning repudiation by Jordan of its obligations under the Israel-Jordan Armistice Agreement, and an armed attack on a bus near Scorpion Pass on 17 March.

At the 665th meeting (8 April), the Council had before it a provisional agenda containing the complaints received from Lebanon as sub-item (a) and the complaints received from Israel as sub-item (b). At the 665th to 670th meetings the Council considered the question of whether the two sub-items should be discussed consecutively or concurrently. At the 670th meeting (4 May), the Council decided that it should (1) adopt the provisional agenda; (2) hold a general discussion in which reference might be made to any or all of the complaints on the agenda; and (3) not commit itself, at that stage, as to the separate or joint character of its eventual resolution or resolutions. Thereafter the President invited the representatives of Israel and Jordan to take part in the discussion.

At the 671st meeting (12 May), the representative of Lebanon submitted a draft resolution providing that the Council should (1) find that the attack on Nahhalin constituted a flagrant breach by Israel of the Council's resolution of 15 July 1948, of article III, paragraph 2, of the Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement, of Israel's obligations under the Charter and of the Council's resolution of 24 November 1953; (2) express the strongest censure in condemnation of that action and call upon Israel to take effective measures to apprehend and punish the perpetrators; (3) request Israel to pay compensation for loss of life and damage to property sustained in Nahhalin as a result of the action; and (4) call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply, in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter, such measures against Isreal as they deemed necessary to prevent the repetition of such actions and the aggravation of the situation.

In the course of the 670th meeting (4 May), the representative of Israel inquired from the President whether, in inviting the representative of Jordan to the Council for the purpose of presenting a complaint against Israel, the Council had satisfied itself that the Government of Jordan had given or would give assurances, under Article 35, paragraph 2, of the Charter, of its acceptance in advance of the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the Charter.

By a letter dated 26 May (S/3219), the Ambassador of Jordan informed the President of the Security Council that he was not empowered to represent his Government before the Council or to take part in its current discussion.

Since the 671st meeting the Council has not considered those complaints.

On 19 June the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization transmitted two reports on the Scorpion Pass (S/3252) and Nahhalin incidents (S/3251).

(n) The incident of 28 September 1954 concerning the SS. Bat Galim

In a letter dated 28 September 1954 (S/3296), the representative of Israel informed the Council that, on that date, the Israel vessel SS. Bat Galim had arrived at the southern entrance of the Suez Canal without incident but that after the routine inspection by the Egyptian authorities had taken place in a friendly atmosphere, an Egyptian patrol vessel had approached the ship, and that wireless communication, which had been maintained up to then with the Company's offices in Haifa, had come to an end. The letter added that the seizure of the vessel was

but the latest example of the Egyptian Government disregard for the Security Council and its resolutions, especially that of 1 September 1951.

In a letter dated 29 September (S/3297), the representative of Egypt informed the President that, on 28 September, the SS. Bat Galim had approached the habour of Suez and, without any provocation, had opened fire with small-arms on Egyptian fishing boats within Egyptian territorial waters. The Egyptian authorities had taken the preliminary measures of arresting the crew of the ship and ordering an immediate inquiry to determine responsibility for the incident.

The Council discussed the question at seven meetings from 14 October 1954 to 13 January 1955 (682nd to 688th meetings).

In a report dated 25 November 1954 (S/3323), the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine described the proceedings of the Mixed Armistice Commission concerning the complaints by Israel and Egypt. He stated that the Commission had rejected an Egyptian draft resolution providing that the Commission should (1) find that during the night of 27-28 September 1954, the Israel vessel Bat Galim had entered Egyptian territorial waters; (2) decide that that action was a violation of article II, paragraph 2 of the General Armistice Agreement; (3) decide that that action was also a violation of the shipping agreement signed by both parties and witnessed by the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission, which was considered as complementary to the General Armistice Agreement; and (4) call upon Israel authorities to prevent such actions in the future.

Thereafter, the Commission had adopted an Israel draft resolution providing that the Commission should find that the Egyptian complaint regarding the SS. Bat Galim case was unfounded and that no provision of the General Armistice Agreement had been violated by Israel.

In a letter dated 4 December (S/3326), the representative of Egypt stated that, owing to insufficient evidence, the Egyptian judicial authorities had set aside charges of murder, attempted murder and unlawful carrying of weapons brought against the members of the crew of the SS. Bat Galim. The seamen would be released as soon as the necessary formalities had been concluded and the Egyptian Government was prepared to release the seized cargo immediately.

At the 688th meeting (13 January 1955), the President, in summing up the discussion, stated that it was evident that most representatives regarded the resolution of 1 September 1951 as having continuing validity and effect, and it was in that context and that of the 1888 Convention that they had considered the Bat Galim incident. In so far as steps had been taken by Egypt towards a settlement, such as the release of the crew on 1 January 1955 and the announced willingness to release the cargo and the ship itself, those steps had been welcomed by most of the representatives. Hope had been expressed that a continued attitude of conciliation on both sides would speedily bring about an agreement on the arrangements for the release of the ship and cargo. On that note of hope and expectation, he proposed to adjourn the meeting.

Since the 688th meeting, the Council has not considered this matter.

(o) Egyptian and Israel complaints of March 1955 concerning incidents in the Gaza area

I. In a letter dated 2 March 1955 (S/3367), the representative of Egypt requested a meeting of the Council to consider the following complaint: "Violent and premeditated aggression committed on 28 February 1955 by Israel armed forces against Egyptian armed forces inside Egyptian-controlled territory near Gaza, causing many casualties, including thirty-nine dead and thirty-two wounded and the destruction of certain military installations in violation of, inter alia, article I, paragraph 2, and article II, paragraph 2 of the Egyptian-Israel General Armistice Agreement".

In a letter dated 3 March (S/3368), the representative of Israel requested consideration of his Government's complaint against Egypt for continuous violations by Egypt of the General Armistice Agreement and of resolutions of the Security Council by means of, inter alia, attacks of regular and irregular Egyptian armed forces against Israel armed forces; assertion by Egypt of the existence of a state of war and the exercise of active belligerency against Israel, particularly the maintenance and the enforcement of blockade measures; and Egyptian refusal to seek agreement by negotiation for an effective transition from the present armistice to peace.

In a report dated 17 March (S/3373), submitted orally to the Council, the Chief of Staff stated that, on 6 March, the Egyptian-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission had decided that the attack on Gaza constituted a violation of the General Armistice Agreement. He added, however, that infiltration from Egyptian-controlled territory was one of the main causes of the prevailing tension. He suggested that, in order to decrease tension along the Demarcation Line the two parties should examine in an informal meeting the possibility of agreeing on certain measures which he had proposed.

On 28 March, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America submitted a joint draft resolution (S/3378) providing that the Council should (1) condemn the attack on Gaza as a violation of the cease-fire provisions of the Council's resolution of 15 July 1948 and as inconsistent with the obligations of the parties under the Armistice Agreement and the Charter; (2) call again upon Israel to take all necessary measures to prevent such actions; and (3) express its conviction that the maintenance of the Armistice Agreement was threatened by any deliberate violations of that agreement by one of the parties to it, and that no progress towards the return of permanent peace in Palestine could be made unless the parties complied strictly with their obligations under the Armistice Agreement and the cease-fire provisions of its resolution of 15 July 1948.

On the same date, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America submitted a second joint draft resolution (S/3379), providing that the Council, anxious that all possible steps should be taken to preserve security in the area, should, inter alia, (1) request the Chief of Staff to continue his consultations with the Governments of Egypt and Israel with a view to the introduction of practical measures to that end; (2) note that the Chief of Staff had already made certain concrete proposals to that effect; and (3) call upon the Governments of Egypt and Israel to co-operate with the Chief of Staff with regard to his proposals, bearing in mind that, in the opinion of the Chief of Staff, infiltration could be reduced to an occasional nuisance if an agreement had been effected between the parties on the lines he had proposed.

The two draft resolutions were adopted unanimously at the 695th and 696th meetings (29 and 30 March) respectively.

/...

II. In a letter dated 4 April (S/3385), the representative of Israel requested the President to place on the Council's agenda a complaint concerning repeated attacks by Egypt against Israel, with special reference to (1) the armed assault at Patish on 24 March; (2) frequent mining and firing on Israel army units patrolling the Israel-Egyptian border at the Gaza strip between 26 March and 3 April and (3) the attack on Israel army patrol and on the village of Nahal-Oz on 3 April.

In a report dated 14 April (S/3390), the Chief and Staff described the incidents between Egypt and Israel since the Gaza incident on 28 February. He believed that the most urgent step to be taken to improve the situation in the Gaza area was the institution of joint patrols along the Demarcation Line.

The Council discussed the question at the 697th and 698th meetings (6 and 19 April). At the 698th meeting, the President stated that the consensus of opinion was that there was no need for any new action by the Council at present, inasmuch as the facts brought to the Council's notice and the possible measures to avert frontier incidents in the area of the Demarcation Line between Egypt and Israel had been fully covered in the resolutions adopted by the Council during the month of March. He trusted that he was expressing the general views of the members of the Council in appealing to both sides to give full effect to the Security Council resolutions of 29 and 30 March, aimed at averting frontier incidents.

(p) Egyptian and Israel complaints of August and September 1955 concerning incidents in the Gaza area

In letters dated 30 and 31 August 1955 (S/3425, S/3426, S/3427), the representative of Israel informed the Security Council of new and grave outbreaks of violence in the Gaza strip, starting on 22 August.

In a letter dated 6 September (S/3431), the representative of Egypt informed the Security Council that since 22 August 1955 Israel armed forces had embarked upon vast military operations culminating on 31 August in an incident in the area of Khan Yunis.

In a report dated 5 September (S/3430), the Chief of Staff stressed, among other things, that a repetition of the incidents would only be avoided if the forces of the opposing sides were separated by an effective physical barrier along the Demarcation Line.

/...

The Council discussed the question at the 700th meeting (8 September 1955) and unanimously adopted a draft resolution (S/3435), by which, among other things, the Council (1) called upon both parties forthwith to take all steps necessary to bring about order and tranquillity in the area; (2) endorsed the view of the Chief of Staff that the armed forces of both parties should be clearly and effectively separated by measures such as those which he had proposed; (3) declared that freedom of movement must be afforded to the United Nations observers in the area; (4) called upon both parties to appoint representatives to meet with the Chief of Staff and to co-operate fully with him to those ends.

(q) Incidents of December 1955 on Lake Tiberias

In a letter dated 13 December 1955 (S/3505), the representative of Syria informed the Council of a large-scale attack launched on the night of 11-12 December by Israel armed forces in the area lying to the east of Lake Tiberias causing considerable loss of life and property.

The Council discussed the question at eight meetings from 16 December 1955 to 19 January 1956 (707th and 709th to 715th meetings).

In a letter dated 21 December 1955 (S/3518), the representative of Israel informed the Council that evidence found on Syrian prisoners proved that Syrian outposts off the northeastern shore of Lake Tiberias had been instructed to fire upon Israel boats within a limit of 250-400 metres of the shore.

In a report dated 15 December 1955 (S/3516) and a supplement dated 30 December (S/3516/Add.1), the Chief of Staff, after explaining the background of the incident, made certain suggestions to prevent further incidents arising from fishing activities on Lake Tiberias.

On 11 January 1956, the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States submitted a joint draft resolution (S/3530 and Corr.1), under which, among other things, the Council would (1) remind Israel that the Council had already condemned military action in breach of the General Armistice Agreements, whether or not undertaken by way of retaliation, and had called upon Israel to take effective measures to prevent such actions; (2) condemn the attack of 11 December as a flagrant violation of the cease-fire provisions of its resolution of 15 July 1948, of the terms of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria, and of Israel's obligations under the Charter; (3) express its grave

concern at the failure of Israel to comply with its obligations; (4) call upon the Government of Israel to do so in the future, in default of which the Council would have to consider what further measures were required to maintain or restore peace; (5) call upon the parties to comply with their obligations under article 5 of the General Armistice Agreement; (6) request the Chief of Staff to pursue his suggestions for improving the situation in the area; and (7) call upon both parties to co-operate with the Chief of Staff in this and all other respects.

The three-Power joint draft resolution was revised twice by its sponsors (S/3530/Rev.2 and Rev.3), to include provisions by which the Council would (1) hold that the Syrian interference with Israel activities on Lake Tiberias reported by the Chief of Staff in no way justified the Israel action; and (2) call upon the parties to arrange with the Chief of Staff for an immediate exchange of all military prisoners.

The Council also had before it two other draft resolutions. There was a Syrian draft resolution (S/3518) which was submitted on 22 December 1955 and which was amended by the representative of the USSR on 9 January 1956; and a Yugoslav draft resolution (S/3536) which was submitted on 18 January 1956.

At the 715th meeting (19 January 1956), the Council decided to grant priority in the voting to the revised three-Power draft resolution (S/3530/Rev.3). At the same meeting on 19 January, the three-Power draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

(r) Resolution of 4 April 1956 concerning the status of compliance given to the General Armistice Agreements and the resolutions of the Security Council adopted during the past year

In a letter dated 20 March 1956 (S/3561), the representative of the United States requested a meeting of the Council to consider the status of compliance given to the General Armistice Agreements and the resolutions of the Security Council adopted during the past year.

On 21 March 1956, the United States submitted a draft resolution (S/3562 and Corr.1) according to which, among other things, the Council, after recalling its resolutions of 30 March 1955, 8 September 1955 and 19 January 1956, would (1) consider that the situation prevailing between the parties concerning the enforcement of the Armistice Agreements and the compliance given to the

/...

above-mentioned resolutions of the Council was such that its continuance was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security; (2) request the Secretary-General to undertake, as a matter of urgent concern, a survey of the various aspects of enforcement of and compliance with the four General Armistice Agreements and the Council's resolution under reference; (3) request the Secretary-General to arrange with the parties for the adoption of any measures which after discussion with the parties and with the Chief of Staff he considered would reduce existing tensions along the Armistice Demarcation Lines.

The Security Council discussed the question at six meetings held between 26 March and 4 April 1956 (717th and 722nd meetings). On 3 April, the USSR submitted a number of amendments to the United States draft resolution (S/3574).

On 4 April, the Council rejected these amendments and adopted unanimously the United States draft resolution (S/3575).

Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the Security Council's resolution of 4 April 1956

In the course of his consultations in the Middle East with the countries concerned, from 10 April to 3 May 1956, the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council texts of communications relating to negotiations that passed between him and the authorities in Egypt and Israel (S/3584, S/3586 and S/3587), as well as a progress report (S/3594). On 9 May, he submitted his report (S/3596) giving a full account of his mission, the unconditional assurances he had received from the parties concerned regarding a cease-fire and agreements reached in arrangements to ensure compliance with the Armistice Agreements.

Discussion of the report of the Secretary-General

The report of the Secretary-General was discussed by the Security Council at six meetings from 29 May to 4 June 1956 (723rd to 728th meetings). On 25 May, the representative of the United Kingdom had circulated a draft resolution (S/3600) which he revised on 29 May (S/3600/Rev.1). The revised draft resolution provided, inter alia, that the Council, conscious of the need to create conditions in which a peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis of the dispute between the parties could be made, would (1) commend the Secretary-General and the parties on

the progress already achieved; (2) declare that the parties to the Armistice Agreements should speedily carry out the measures already agreed upon with the Secretary-General, and should co-operate with the Secretary-General and the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization to put into effect their further practical proposals, pursuant to the resolution of 4 April, with a view to full implementation of that resolution and full compliance with the Armistice Agreements; (3) declare that full freedom of movement of United Nations observers must be respected in all areas along the Armistice Demarcation Lines, in the Demilitarized Zones and in the Defensive Areas as defined in the Armistice Agreements, to enable them to fulfil their functions; (4) endorse the Secretary-General's view that the re-establishment of full compliance with the Armistice Agreements represented a stage which had to be passed in order to make progress possible on the main issues between the parties; (5) request the Chief of Staff to continue to carry out his observation of the cease-fire pursuant to the Security Council's resolution of 11 August 1949 and to report to the Security Council whenever any action undertaken by one party to an Armistice Agreement constituted a serious violation of that Agreement or of the cease-fire, which in his opinion required immediate consideration by the Security Council; (6) call upon the parties to the Armistice Agreements to take the steps necessary to carry out this resolution, thereby increasing confidence and demonstrating their wish for peaceful conditions; and (7) request the Secretary-General to continue his good offices with the parties, and to report to the Security Council, as appropriate.

On 1 June, the representative of Iran submitted an amendment (S/3602) deleting the paragraph of the preamble that referred to the "need to create conditions in which a peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis of the dispute between the parties could be made". On the same day, the representative of the United Kingdom introduced a second revision (S/3600/Rev.2) to his draft resolution, and on 4 June, accepted the Iranian amendment. The draft resolution thus amended was unanimously adopted on 4 June (S/3605).

Pursuant to the Council's resolution of 4 June 1956, the Secretary-General and the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization continued to exert efforts to implement specific proposals designed to support the cease-fire, in which connexion the Secretary-General again visited the area between 18 and 23 July. They submitted a number of reports to the Council on the situation (S/3632, S/3638, S/3658, S/3659, S/3660, S/3670 and S/3685).

(s) Complaints received from Jordan and Israel in October 1956

In a letter dated 15 October 1956 (S/3678), the representative of Jordan requested an early meeting of the Council to consider the situation arising from an attack by Israel armed forces on 11 October against the villages of Qalqiliya, Sufin, Habla and Nabi Ilyas, as well as a similar attack of 25-26 September against the area of Husan.

In a letter dated 17 October (S/3682), the representative of Israel requested that at its forthcoming meeting the Council consider the following complaint against Jordan: "Persistent violations by Jordan of the General Armistice Agreement and of the cease-fire pledge made to the Secretary-General on 26 April 1956."

The Council considered these complaints at two meetings held on 19 and 25 October.

(t) Steps for the immediate cessation of the military action of Israel in Egypt

In a letter dated 29 October 1956 (S/3706), the representative of the United States of America informed the President of the Council that his Government had received information to the effect that, in violation of the Armistice Agreement between Israel and Egypt, the armed forces of Israel had penetrated deep into Egyptian territory in the Sinai area that day. He requested that the Council be convened as soon as possible to consider an item entitled: "The Palestine question: steps for the immediate cessation of the military action of Israel in Egypt."

The Security Council considered this question during three meetings held on 30 October.

At the 749th meeting (30 October), the United States introduced a draft resolution which, as revised (S/3710), (1) called upon Israel and Egypt immediately to cease fire; (2) called upon all Members, inter alia, to refrain from the use or threat of force in the area and to refrain from giving any military, economic or financial assistance to Israel so long as it had not complied with the resolution; and (3) requested the Secretary-General to keep the Council informed on compliance and to make whatever recommendations he deemed appropriate. The draft resolution was put to the vote at the same meeting and was not adopted owing to the negative votes of two permanent members.

The Council also failed to adopt a USSR draft resolution (S/3713/Rev.1) to call upon all the parties concerned immediately to cease fire and to call upon Israel immediately to withdraw its armed forces behind the established armistice lines.

Following the voting on the USSR draft resolution at the 750th meeting (30 October), the Council went on to consider the next item on the agenda of the meeting (see item 32 below - "Letter dated 30 October 1956 from the representative of Egypt addressed to the President of the Security Council").

(u) Complaint submitted in May 1957 by Syria concerning construction by Israel of a bridge in the Demilitarized Zone

In a letter dated 13 May 1957 (S/3827), the representative of Syria requested that the Council consider the situation arising from the construction of a bridge in the Demilitarized Zone, which he charged would give Israel a military advantage and contravened the provisions of the Israel-Syrian General Armistice Agreement. He referred to a report on the subject (S/3815) submitted on 20 April by the Acting Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and stated that he could not concur in the conclusions reached therein.

The Security Council considered this question in the course of three meetings held between 23 and 28 May. Following discussion by the members of the Council and the parties concerned, the President noted that all seemed to agree that it might be appropriate for the Acting Chief of Staff to submit a supplementary report on the matter.

On 27 June 1957, the Acting Chief of Staff submitted a report (S/3844) relating to the Demilitarized Zone established under article V of the Israel-Syrian General Armistice Agreement, and on 7 August he submitted an addendum (S/3844/Add.1).

(v) Complaints submitted by Jordan and Israel in September 1957

In a letter dated 4 September 1957 (S/3878), the representative of Jordan submitted a complaint to the Council for its consideration, charging Israel with violations of the Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement by carrying out digging operations in No-Man's-Land in the Jerusalem sector.

In a letter dated 5 September (S/3883), the representative of Israel requested that at its forthcoming meeting the Council consider charges by Israel of violations by Jordan of the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement, and in particular of article VIII thereof.

The Security Council considered these complaints at five meetings, on 6 September, 22 November 1957, and 22 January 1958. It decided to hear first the statements of the two interested parties and to postpone until later a decision as to whether the two complaints should be considered simultaneously or consecutively. The President stated his understanding that the Council agreed to request the Acting Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization to submit to it two reports on the complaints before it; the first, covering matters raised in the complaint submitted by Jordan, to be submitted within a fortnight. At its 806th meeting, held on 22 November 1957, the Council renewed consideration of the Jordanian complaint.

In compliance with the request of the Council, the Acting Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization submitted a report (S/3892 and Add.1 and 2), dated 23 September 1957, on the area between the lines (neutral zone) around the Government House area, and on 31 October he submitted a report (S/3913) relating to the Israel complaint against Jordan, which specifically referred to the provisions of article VIII, articles I and III, and article XII of the General Armistice Agreement.[6/]

At the 809th meeting on 22 January 1958, the United Kingdom and the United States introduced a joint draft resolution (S/3940) under which the Council, noting 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 (it being beyond the respective demarcation lines), would: (1) direct the Chief of Staff to regulate activites within the zone subject to such arrangements as might be made pursuant to the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement and paragraph 3 of the resolution, bearing in mind ownership of property there, it being understood that, unless otherwise mutually agreed,

---

6/ The Security Council did not consider further the item submitted by Israel in the period covered by this report.

Israelis should not be allowed to use Arab-owned properties and Arabs should not be allowed to use Israel-owned properties; (2) direct the Chief of Staff to conduct a survey of property records with a view to determining property ownership in the zone; (3) endorse the recommendations of the Acting Chief of Staff to the end that: (a) the parties should discuss through the Mixed Armistice Commission civilian activities in the zone; (b) in order to create an atmosphere more conducive to fruitful discussion, activities in the zone, such as those initiated by Israelis on 21 July 1957, should be suspended until such time as the survey would have been completed and provisions made for the regulation of activities in the zone; (c) such discussions should be completed within a period of two months.

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

13. THE INDIA-PAKISTAN QUESTION

(a) Inclusion of the question in the agenda

By a letter dated 1 January 1948 (S/628), the representative of India, under Article 35 of the Charter, requested the Security Council to call on Pakistan to stop immediately giving assistance to invaders in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, since such assistance was an act of aggression against India. The matter was included in the agenda of the Security Council at the 226th meeting on 6 January 1948. The representatives of India and Pakistan were invited to participate in the discussion without vote, in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter. At the request of the representative of Pakistan, further consideration was postponed until 15 January. By a letter dated 15 January (S/646), the Foreign Minister of Pakistan submitted three documents replying to India's charges and levelling charges by Pakistan on which the Council was requested to take action.

By a letter dated 20 January (S/655), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan requested consideration of matters in the Pakistan complaint other than the Jammu and Kashmir question. In consequence, the Security Council decided, at its 231st meeting (22 January), to change the title of the question, considered until then as the "Jammu and Kashmir Question", to the "India-Pakistan Question".

(b) Establishment of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (Security Council resolutions of 17 January, 20 January, 21 April and 3 June 1948)

At the 227th through 229th meetings (15-17 January), the Security Council heard statements by the representatives of the two parties concerned. At the 229th meeting, a draft resolution submitted by the representative of Belgium (S/651), calling upon the parties to take all measures to improve the situation, was adopted as well as a proposal by the representative of the United Kingdom that the President of the Council meet with the representatives of the two Governments concerned so as to try to find common ground for a settlement.

Following his talks with the parties, the President reported to the Council at its 230th meeting (20 January) and submitted a draft resolution (S/654) which had been drawn up as a result of the talks, establishing a commission of three members to investigate and to exercise mediation. One member was to be selected

by India, one by Pakistan, and the third was to be designated by the two so selected. The resolution was adopted at the same meeting.

At its 286th meeting (21 April), the Council considered and adopted a draft resolution (S/726) submitted jointly by the representatives of Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia, the United Kingdom and the United States, enlarging the membership of the Commission established by the resolution of 20 January 1948 to five and recommending to the Governments of India and Pakistan various measures designed to bring about a cessation of the fighting and to create conditions for a free and impartial plebiscite to decide whether the State of Jammu and Kashmir was to accede to India or Pakistan. At the 287th meeting of the Council (23 April), Belgium and Colombia were nominated as the two additional members of the Commission, the members named earlier being Argentina (chosen by Pakistan) and Czechoslovakia (chosen by India).

After further discussion at the 289th meeting (7 May), the President designated the United States as the third member of the Commission, in view of the failure of Argentina and Czechoslovakia to agree upon a third member.

At the 312th meeting (3 June), the Security Council adopted a modified version of a Syrian draft resolution (S/719), directing the commission of mediation to proceed without delay to the area of dispute and to study and report to the Council, when it considered it appropriate, on the matters raised in the letter dated 15 January 1948 from the Foreign Minister of Pakistan in the order outlined in paragraph D of the Council's resolution of 20 January 1948.

(c) Interim reports of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan and appointment of a United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan

On 22 November 1948, the United Nations Commission submitted to the Security Council an interim report (S/1100) dealing with its activities until 22 September 1948. A second interim report (S/1196) was submitted by the Commission on 15 January 1949. In these reports the Commission informed the Security Council of its adoption, on 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949, of resolutions embodying a cease-fire order and principles to serve as a basis for a truce agreement between the parties, as well as measures relating to the holding

/...

of a plebiscite following implementation of the demilitarization process to be established in the truce agreement. The Commission stated that the cease-fire had become effective as of 1 January 1949.

The United Nations Commission returned to the sub-continent on 4 February 1949 in order to work on the implementation of the agreement embodied in the two resolutions. In presenting the Commission's third interim report to the Security Council (S/1430 and Add.1 and 2), submitted on 5 December 1949, its Chairman reported that since the Commission's return to the sub-continent, despite constant efforts, no substantial progress had been made in implementing part II of the Commission's resolution of 13 August 1948 which dealt with the truce and was concerned principally with the withdrawal of troops. The Commission had therefore deemed it advisable to refer the matter back to the Security Council with the recommendation that the Council should designate, in lieu of the Commission, a single individual with broad authority to endeavour to bring the two Governments together on all unresolved issues.

On 16 December 1949, the representative of Czechoslovakia on the Commission submitted a minority report (S/1430/Add.3) criticizing certain aspects of the work of the Commission and calling for the establishment of a new United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, composed of representatives of all the States members of the Security Council in order to guarantee the full independence of the Commission.

The Council considered these reports at its 457th meeting (17 December), when it decided to request the President of the Council to meet informally with the parties concerned and examine with them the possibility of finding a mutually satisfactory basis for dealing with the question at issue. No agreement was reached as a result of the efforts made by the President. After further discussion, on 14 March 1950 (470th meeting), the Council adopted resolution S/1469, submitted by Cuba, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States, which provided for appointment of a United Nations Representative to assist in the preparation and to supervise the implementation of the programme of demilitarization to be agreed upon by the parties, and to exercise the powers and responsibilities devolving upon the Commission. The Representative was also empowered to explore other possible solutions of the question. On 12 April 1950, the Security Council appointed Sir Owen Dixon, of Australia, as United Nations Representative.

(d) Report of the first United Nations Representative, Sir Owen Dixon, and appointment of a successor, Mr. Frenk P. Graham

Sir Owen Dixon's report, submitted on 15 September 1950 (S/1791) indicated no further progress towards the demilitarization of the State or towards agreement on other means for disposing of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Sir Owen Dixon wondered whether it might not be better to leave the parties to themselves in negotiating terms for the settlement of the problem, and indicated that he was not prepared to recommend any further course of action on the part of the Council.

In a letter dated 14 December (S/1942), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan expressed concern over the delay in dealing with the report of the United Nations Representative, and declared that various steps were being taken by the Government of India and the Maharajah's Government in Kashmir to prejudice the holding of a free and impartial plebiscite to decide on the accession of the State.

At the 503rd meeting (26 September), the President of the Security Council had already expressed the Council's gratitude to the United Nations Representative and had voiced the Council's wish to relieve him of his mission in accordance with Sir Owen Dixon's request. The Council undertook consideration of the report at its 532nd meeting (21 February 1951). After considerable discussion, a revised joint draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States (S/2017/Rev.1) was adopted at the 539th meeting (30 March), inter alia, reminding the Governments and authorities concerned of the principle embodied in various Security Council resolutions that the final disposition of the State of Jammu and Kashmir would be made in accordance with the will of the people expressed through a free and impartial plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the United Nations, providing for appointment of a United Nations Representative to succeed Sir Owen Dixon and instructing that Representative, inter alia, to effect the demilitarization of the State of Jammu and Kashmir on the basis of the two UNCIP resolutions. At the 543rd meeting (30 April), the Council approved the appointment of Mr. Frank P. Graham as United Nations Representative.

/...

(e) Reports submitted to the Security Council by Mr. Graham (1951-1953)

Five reports have been submitted to the Security Council by the United Nations Representative, Mr. Graham (15 October 1951 - S/2375 and Corr.1 and 2; 13 December 1951 - S/2448; 22 April 1952 - S/2611 and Corr.1; 16 September 1952 - S/2783 and Corr.1; and 27 March 1953 - S/2967). In his first report, the United Nations Representative set forth a twelve-point draft agreement between the Governments of India and Pakistan concerning demilitarization of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. The United Nations Representative indicated that agreement had been reached on the first four points in the proposals and set forth the position of the two parties on the remainder of the points. The Security Council began consideration of the first report at its 564th meeting (18 October 1951) and continued at the 566th meeting (10 November) when a resolution (S/2392) submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States requesting the United Nations Representative to continue his efforts was adopted.

In his second report (S/2448), the United Nations Representative informed the Council that agreement had been reached on four more of the points of the draft agreement, but that the basic differences between the two Governments remained essentially the same. After consideration of the report by the Security Council at its 570th to 572nd meetings (17, 30 and 31 January 1952), the President of the Council stated that the consensus of the Council was that the United Nations Representative was empowered to continue his efforts to accomplish his mission.

In his third and fourth reports (S/2611 and S/2783), the United Nations Representative informed the Security Council of acceptance by the two Governments of other points in the twelve-point draft agreement which he had submitted to them. Agreement had not been reached, however, on the number and character of forces to remain on either side of the cease-fire line nor on the date by which the Plebiscite Administrator would be appointed to office. He had accordingly proposed definite minimum figures for those forces, but it had not been possible to secure agreement on the numbers proposed. The United Nations Representative set forth the views of the parties on an alternative draft presentation of principles which would serve as the criteria for fixing the quantum of forces to remain on either side of the cease-fire line at the end of the demilitarization period.

/...

After discussion at the 605th-611th meetings (10 October, 6 November, 5, 8, 16 and 25 December 1952), the Security Council adopted a resolution (S/2883) which urged the Governments of India and Pakistan to negotiate in order to reach agreement on the specific number of forces to remain on each side of the cease-fire line at the end of the period of demilitarization, the numbers to be arrived at bearing in mind the principles or criteria submitted to the parties by the United Nations Representative. The number of forces was to be between 5,000 and 6,000 on the Pakistan side and between 12,000 and 18,000 on the Indian side of the cease-fire line. The United Nations Representative was requested to continue to make his services available to the parties and to keep the Council informed of any progress.

In his fifth report (S/2967), the United Nations Representative informed the Security Council of further meetings and conversations with the two Governments. None of the proposals put forward had proved acceptable to both parties.

(f) Consideration by the Security Council in 1957

On 2 January 1957, Pakistan requested that the Security Council should be convened at an early date to consider the Kashmir question (S/3767). The Council considered the question in a series of meetings held from 16 January 1957 to 21 February 1957 (761st - 774th meetings). On 24 January (765th meeting), the Security Council adopted, by 10 votes in favour, with 1 abstention (USSR), a draft resolution submitted by Australia, Colombia, Cuba, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (S/3778). This resolution provided that the Council, reminding the Governments and Authorities concerned of the principle embodied in previous resolutions of the Council and in the UNCIP resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949, 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, reaffirmed its resolution of 15 March 1951 and declared that the convening of a Constituent Assembly and any action that had been or might be taken by that Assembly to determine the future shape and affiliation of the entire State of Jammu and

/...

Kashmir or any part thereof, or action by the parties concerned in support of any such action by the Assembly, would not constitute a disposition of the State in accordance with the above principle. The Council also decided to continue its consideration of the dispute.

On 20 February (775rd meeting), a draft resolution (S/3787) submitted jointly by Australia, Cuba, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, as well as amendments (S/3789 and S/3791 and Rev.1 and Corr.1) to it, were put to the vote. None of these proposals was adopted. A new joint draft resolution (S/3792 and Corr.1) submitted by Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States of America was voted upon on 21 February and was adopted by 10 votes in favour, with one abstention (USSR). It provided, inter alia, that the Council request its President, the representative of Sweden, to examine with the Governments of India and Pakistan any proposals which, in his opinion, were likely to contribute towards the settlement of the dispute, having regard to the previous resolutions of the Council and of the UNCIP; to visit the sub-continent for that purpose; and to report to the Council not later than 15 April 1957. The Governments of India and Pakistan were invited to co-operate with the President of the Council, and the Secretary-General and the United Nations Representative were requested to render such assistance as the President might request.

(g) Report of the President of the Security Council

On 29 April, Mr. Jarring, President of the Security Council for the month of February 1957, submitted a report (S/3821) on the results of his mission. After a review of the discussions conducted with the parties, he concluded that, while he felt unable to report to the Council any concrete proposals likely at that time to contribute towards a settlement of the dispute, both parties were still desirous of finding a solution to the problem.

(h) Consideration of the report by the Security Council

On 21 August 1957, Pakistan requested (S/3868) that a meeting of the Security Council be held to discuss Mr. Jarring's report (S/3821) and to consider further action. On 27 September 1957, the Council met to consider the report and discussed the India-Pakistan question at fourteen meetings between then and 2 December.

/...

On 16 November 1957, a draft resolution (S/3911) was submitted to the Council by Australia, Colombia, the Philippines, the United Kingdom and the United States. It provided that the Council, (a) thanking Mr. Jarring, (b) observing that the Governments of India and Pakistan recognized and accepted the commitments undertaken by them in the two UNCIP resolutions, which envisaged 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 (c) considering the importance which it had attached to demilitarization of the State as one of the steps towards a settlement; would: (1) request the two Governments to avoid aggravation of the situation and to establish and maintain an atmosphere favourable to the promotion of further negotiations; (2) request the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan to make any recommendations to the parties for further action which he considered desirable in connexion with Part I of the UNCIP resolution of 13 August 1948, having regard to his third and fifth reports and the report of Mr. Jarring, and to enter into negotiations with the two Governments in order to implement Part II of the 13 August 1948 resolution and in particular to reach agreement on a reduction of forces on each side of the cease-fire line to a specific number, arrived at on the basis of the relevant Security Council resolutions and having regard to Dr. Graham's fifth report; and (3) call upon the Governments of India and Pakistan to co-operate with the United Nations Representative in order to formulate an early agreement on demilitarization procedures, which should be implemented within three months of such an agreement being reached.

On 27 November, the representative of Sweden submitted amendments (S/3920) which would replace (1) the reference in the preamble to "commitments" by a reference to the Council's resolution of 17 January 1948, (2) replace operative paragraph 2 by a new text requesting the United Nations Representative to make any recommendations to the parties for further appropriate action with a view to making progress towards the implementation of the UNCIP resolutions and towards peaceful settlement and (3) delete operative paragraph 3.

On 2 December, the amendments and the draft resolution, as amended, were each adopted by 10 votes in favour, with 1 abstention (USSR) (for text of adopted resolution, see S/3922).

/...

(i) Report of the United Nations Representative

On 28 March 1958, the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan submitted his report (S/3984) on his discussions with the Governments of India and Pakistan in pursuance of the Security Council resolution of 2 December 1957 (S/3922).

The India-Pakistan question has not been discussed by the Council since its 808th meeting on 2 December 1957. A number of communications have, however, been received by the Council from the two Governments bearing on this question.

14. THE CZECHOSLOVAK QUESTION

By a letter dated 12 March 1948 (S/694), the representative of Chile informed the Secretary-General that his Government had noted that, on 10 March 1948, Mr. Papanek, permanent representative of Czechoslovakia, had sent a communication to the Secretary-General, alleging that the political independence of Czechoslovakia had been violated by the threat of the use of force by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Charter, the representative of Chile, leaving aside the question whether Mr. Papanek had the status of a private individual or of the legitimate representative of his Government, requested the Secretary-General to refer to the Security Council the question raised in Mr. Papanek's letter. He further requested that the Council should investigate the situation in accordance with Article 34. By a letter dated 15 March (S/696), the representative of Chile communicated to the Secretary-General Mr. Papanek's letter of 10 March.

At its 268th meeting (17 March), the Security Council included the communication dated 12 March from the representative of Chile in its agenda and invited that Government's representative to participate in its discussion.

At the 272nd meeting (22 March), the Security Council invited Mr. Papanek to make a statement, in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

At the 278th meeting (6 April), the Security Council adopted a resolution (S/711) based on a United States draft resolution, inviting the Government of Czechoslovakia to participate without a vote in the discussion of the Czechoslovak question. In reply to that invitation the new representative of Czechoslovakia stated (S/718) that his Government did not find it possible in any way to take part

in the discussion. The matters involved were exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of Czechoslovakia, which rejected the unfounded complaint which had been put before the Security Council.

At the 281st meeting (12 April), the representative of Chile submitted a draft resolution proposing the appointment of a sub-committee, with a membership to be determined by the Security Council, to receive and hear evidence, statements and testimonies and to report to the Council at the earliest possible time. At the 288th meeting (29 April) the representative of Argentina requested that the Chilean proposal be put to the vote, and suggested that the sub-committee should be composed of three members of the Council.

At the 303rd meeting (24 May), the President put to the vote the question whether the Chilean draft resolution should be considered as a matter of procedure. The President interpreted the result as a decision to regard the draft resolution as a matter of substance, since a permanent member had voted negatively on the preliminary question. Several representatives opposed that ruling, and after submitting it to a vote, the President stated that his ruling stood. The Chilean draft resolution, as completed by the representative of Argentina, was then put to the vote and was not adopted, since a permanent member had voted against it.

At the same meeting, the representative of Argentina submitted a draft resolution (S/782), stating that the Security Council considered it advisable to obtain further oral and written evidence regarding the situation in Czechoslovakia and entrusting the Council's Committee of Experts with the task of obtaining such evidence.

Since the 305th meeting (26 May 1948), the Security Council has not discussed this agenda item.

15. THE QUESTION OF THE FREE TERRITORY OF TRIESTE

(a) Yugoslav request

By letter dated 28 July 1948 (S/927), the representative of Yugoslavia requested the Security Council to consider the question of the independence and integrity of the Free Territory of Trieste, and in particular to examine the legality of certain agreements concluded by the administration of the British-United States zone of the Free Territory with the Government of Italy.

He further requested the Council to declare the above-mentioned agreements to be violations of provisions of the Treaty of Peace with Italy pertaining to the independence of the Free Territory of Trieste; to undertake the measures which the Yugoslav Government considered necessary and sufficient to nullify the agreements; and to assure that the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom respected their international obligations, thus guaranteeing the independence of the Free Territory of Trieste.

The Council included this question in its agenda under the title: "The question of the Free Territory of Trieste" at its 344th meeting (4 August 1948), when it invited the representative of Yugoslavia to participate in the discussion. The Council considered the question in the course of eight meetings in the month of August 1948. On 13 August, the representative of Yugoslavia submitted a draft resolution (S/968) by which the Council would determine that a series of agreements concluded between the Allied Military Command and the Government of Italy were in contradiction to certain obligations undertaken by the Allied and Associated Powers and Italy under the Treaty of Peace with Italy; would declare these agreements incompatible with the status of the Free Territory of Trieste and therefore null and void; and would call upon the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States to avoid any future action contrary to the Treaty.

On 19 August, the representative of the Ukrainian SSR submitted a draft resolution (S/980) to the effect that the Security Council considered it urgently necessary to settle the question of the appointment of the Governor of the Free Territory of Trieste.1/

At the 354th meeting (19 August), the Yugoslav draft resolution and the Ukrainian draft resolution were put to the vote and were not adopted.

(b) USSR note

In a communication dated 3 July 1952 (S/2692), the USSR delegation requested circulation of the texts of notes sent by the USSR Government to the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom. These notes dealt with the understanding between the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and Italy, published on 10 May 1952, concerning participation by Italy in the administration of the Anglo-American zone of the Free Territory of Trieste.

1/ See item 6 above entitled Appointment of a Governor for the Free Territory of Trieste.

(c) Memorandum of Understanding

By letter dated 5 October 1954 (S/3301 and Add.1), the Observer of Italy and the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States and Yugoslavia transmitted to the Security Council the text of a Memorandum of Understanding and its Annexes concerning practical arrangements for the Free Territory of Trieste, initialled at London on the same date by representatives of their Governments. On 12 October (S/3305), the representative of the USSR informed the Council that his Government took cognizance of that agreement.

In a letter dated 17 January 1955 (S/3351), the Observer of Italy and the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States and Yugoslavia reported that the necessary steps had been taken to carry out the arrangements provided for in the Memorandum of Understanding.

16. THE HYDERABAD QUESTION

By a cable dated 21 August 1948 (S/986), confirmed by a letter of the same date, the Secretary-General of the Department of External Affairs of the Government of Hyderabad communicated to the President of the Security Council his Government's request that the dispute which had arisen between Hyderabad and India be brought to the Council's attention in accordance with Article 35, paragraph 2, of the Charter. On 8 September 1948, he communicated a decision (S/996) by the Government of Hyderabad to become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

By cable (S/998) dated 12 September 1948, the Government of Hyderabad requested that its complaint be put on the agenda as soon as possible in view of Indian preparations for an imminent invasion of Hyderabad. Another cable (S/1000) of 13 September stated that the invasion was taking place and hostilities had broken out in various parts of Hyderabad. On 15 September, the Government of Hyderabad submitted a memorandum (S/1001) in support of its application to the Council.

The communications of 21 August and 12 and 13 September (S/986, S/998 and S/1000) were included in the agenda at the 357th meeting (16 September) held in Paris. Several representatives made the reservation that this action did not prejudge the Council's competence or any of the merits of the case. Having been

/...

invited to take places at the Council table, the representatives of Hyderabad and India made statements at that meeting. The discussion continued at the 359th meeting (20 September).

By communications dated 22 September (S/1011 and Add.1), the Nizam of Hyderabad requested the Secretary-General to note that the complaint made by his Government to the Security Council had been withdrawn by him and that the delegation to the Security Council had ceased to have any authority to represent him or his State.

By note dated 24 September (S/1015), the Hyderabad delegation gave its views on the situation in Hyderabad and stated that it was imperative that the Security Council should meet to review the situation.

The Council considered these communications at the 357th meeting (28 September) and heard statements by the representatives of Hyderabad and India.

By letter dated 11 October (S/1031), the Head of the Hyderabad delegation informed the President of the Council that he did not propose to ask that the delegation be represented at the next Council meeting on the question.

On 24 November, the leader of the Indian delegation informed the President of the Council that the Indian delegation dealing with the Hyderabad question, which on 6 October in a communication to the then President had requested that the item be removed from the agenda, had been withdrawn (S/1089).

By letter dated 10 December (S/1115), the Government of India informed the Security Council that conditions in Hyderabad were peaceful and normal. In the circumstances, India did not propose to send a representative to the Council to discuss the Hyderabad question.

In a letter dated 12 December (S/1118), the Head of the Hyderabad delegation stated that it was clear that the Nizam was virtually a prisoner of the Indian military authorities. Under the circumstances, his delegation considered it to be its duty to reassert its authority as originally appointed.

In a letter (S/1124) dated 13 December, the representative of India, transmitted to the President of the Council a report on the situation in Hyderabad. The report was made without prejudice to the question of the Council's competence.

At the 364th meeting (15 December), the representative of Pakistan, pursuant to a request of 6 October (S/1027), was invited to participate in the discussion of this question. Further consideration was postponed until after the Council's return to Lake Success.

The representative of India, in a letter dated 18 May 1949 (S/1324) submitted that the question should be removed from the agenda and requested an opportunity to state his Government's views more fully on the question of competence.

The Council heard statements by the representatives of India and Pakistan at the 429th and 426th meetings (19 and 24 May). To date, no further meeting has been held concerning the question.

By letter dated 19 August (S/1380), the representative of Hyderabad submitted charges of ill-treatment of Hyderabad offices, which he desired to present to the Council upon resumption of the debate on this question.

17. IDENTIC NOTIFICATIONS DATED 29 SEPTEMBER 1948 FROM THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC, THE UNITED KINGDOM AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

On 29 September 1948, the Secretary-General received identic notifications (S/1020 and Add.1) from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America drawing attention to the serious situation which had arisen as a result of the imposition, by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of restrictions on transport and communications between the Western Zones of Occupation in Germany and Berlin. The notifications stated that this action by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was contrary to its obligations under Article 2 of the Charter and created a threat to the peace within the meaning of Chapter VII of the Charter. The three Governments requested that the Security Council consider this question at the earliest opportunity.

The identic notifications were placed on the provisional agenda of the 361st meeting (4 October 1948), but the adoption of the agenda was opposed by the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. After further discussion at the 362nd meeting (5 October) the agenda was adopted, whereupon the representatives of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR stated that the Council majority's adoption of this question for

consideration constituted a violation of Article 107 of the Charter and that accordingly their delegations would not participate in the consideration of the question in the Security Council.

The Council continued its consideration of the matter at the 363rd and 364th meetings (6 October) and at the 366th meeting (15 October). The President requested certain additional information, and the Council adjourned until 19 October to allow an opportunity for the representatives concerned to prepare the information, which was furnished at the 368th meeting (19 October) by the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

At the 370th meeting (22 October), a draft resolution (S/1048) was submitted by the representatives of Argentina, Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia and Syria, which would call on the four occupying Powers to prevent any incident which would aggravate the situation in Berlin, remove all restrictions applied since 1 March 1948, and hold an immediate meeting of the four military governors to arrange for the unification of currency in Berlin. The Council adjourned the discussion until 25 October.

At the 372nd meeting (25 October) the joint draft resolution (S/1048) was put to the vote. It was rejected owing to the negative vote cast by a permanent member of the Council. No further meetings have been held on this subject.

By letter dated 4 May 1949 (S/1316), the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States informed the Security Council that their respective Governments had concluded an agreement with the Government of the USSR providing for the lifting of restrictions on communications, transportation and trade with Berlin.

18. INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY[8/]

(a) Introductory note

General Assembly resolution 1 (I) of 24 January 1946, which established the Atomic Energy Commission, directed the Commission to submit its reports and recommendations to the Council and stated that the Council should issue directions to the Commission in matters affecting security.

8/ See also item 5: The General Regulation and Reduction of Armaments and Information on the Armed Forces of the United Nations.

(b) First report of the Commission

By letter dated 31 December 1946 (S/239) the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission transmitted the Commission's first report to the Council. On 13 February 1947 (109th meeting), the Council began its consideration of the report. On 18 February (108th meeting), the representative of the USSR submitted amendments and additions (S/283) to the report. No substantive decisions were reached by the Council upon either the report or the proposed amendments and additions, but it was agreed unanimously (S/296) on 10 March (117th meeting) to return the whole problem to the Commission with a request for the formulation of the specific proposals provided for in the General Assembly resolution.

(c) Second report of the Commission

By letter dated 11 September 1947 (S/557) the Chairman of the Commission transmitted to the Council the Commission's second report. The Council did not place the consideration of that report on its agenda.

(d) Third report of the Commission

By letter dated 26 May 1948 (S/812) the Chairman of the Commission transmitted the Commission's third report to the Council, which considered it at three meetings between 11 and 22 June. At the 318th meeting the United States submitted a draft resolution (S/856) under which the Council would have accepted the three reports of the Commission and proved the general findings and recommendations of the first report, the specific proposals of the second report and the "report and recommendations" of the third report. On 22 June (329th meeting) the United States draft resolution was put to the vote, but as a permanent member voted in the negative the resolution was not adopted. It was then resolved (S/852) to direct the Secretary-General to transmit to the General Assembly, as a matter of special concern, the Commission's three reports together with the records of the Council's deliberations.

(e) The Commission's resolutions of 29 July and the Council's resolution of 16 September 1949

By letter dated 29 July 1949 (S/1377) the Chairman of the Commission transmitted to the Council the texts of two resolutions (AEC/42 and AEC/43) adopted by the Commission on 29 July, which questioned the usefulness of further discussion in the Commission in the absence of a basis for agreement among the

/...

six permanent members. When the Council considered the matter at its 446th and 447th meetings (15 and 16 September), two draft resolutions were introduced: a Canadian draft resolution (S/1386) proposing that the Commission's resolutions be transmitted to the General Assembly and a USSR draft resolution (S/1391/Rev.1) requesting the Commission to continue its work with a view to fulfilling the tasks entrusted to it by the General Assembly's resolutions of 24 January and 14 December 1946. The Canadian draft resolution, as amended by the Ukrainian SSR was adopted and the USSR draft resolution was rejected.

(f) Dissolution of the Atomic Energy Commission and creation of the Disarmament Commission

Since 16 September 1949 the Council has not discussed the international control of atomic energy. The subject, however, has been considered in consultations among the six permanent members of the Commission, between 9 August 1949 and 19 January 1950; at the fifth session of the General Assembly; in the Committee of Twelve (established by resolution 496 (V)); and at the sixth session of the General Assembly particularly in a sub-committee consisting of the President as Chairman and the representative of France, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States. At that session by resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952, the General Assembly, noting the recommendation of the Committee of Twelve that the Assembly should establish a new Commission to carry forward the task originally assigned to the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments, established under the Security Council a Disarmament Commission. The Commission has the same membership as the previous commissions and reports periodically to the Security Council and the General Assembly.9/

9/ For account of the proceedings and reports of the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee, which was established on 19 April 1954, see above 5 (f) and 5 (g), The General Regulation and Reduction of Armaments and Information on the Armed Forces of the United Nations.

19. COMPLAINT OF ARMED INVASION OF TAIWAN (FORMOSA)

In a cable dated 24 August 1950 (S/1715), addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China stated that on 27 June President Truman had announced the decision of the Government of the United States of America to prevent by armed force the liberation of Taiwan by the Chinese People's Liberation Army. The fact that Taiwan was an integral part of China was based on the history and confirmed by the Cairo Declaration of 1943 and the Potsdam communiqué of 1945. It was the Council's duty to take immediate measures to bring about the complete withdrawal of all the United States invading forces from Taiwan and from other territories belonging to China. The representative of the United States replied to these charges in a letter dated 25 August (S/1716).

At the 530th meeting (30 November), the Security Council rejected the following two draft resolutions:

(a) a draft resolution submitted on 2 September (S/1757) by the representative of the USSR, providing, inter alia, that the Council should (i) condemn the action of the United States Government as an act of aggression and as an intervention in the internal affairs of China, and (ii) propose to the United States Government that it immediately withdraw all its air, sea and land forces from the island of Taiwan and from other territories belonging to China;

(b) a draft resolution submitted on 28 November (S/1921) by the representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and sponsored by the representative of the Soviet Union, providing, inter alia, that the Council should (i) condemn the United States Government for its criminal acts of armed aggression against the Chinese territory of Taiwan; and (ii) demand the complete withdrawal by the United States Government of its forces of armed aggression from Taiwan, in order that peace and security in the Pacific and in Asia might be ensured.

Since the 530th meeting the Security Council has not discussed this agenda item.

/...

20. COMPLAINT OF BOMBING BY AIR FORCES OF THE TERRITORY OF CHINA

By a cable dated 28 August 1950 (S/1722), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China informed the Secretary-General that, on 27 August, military aircraft of the United States forces in Korea had flown over Chinese territory on the right bank of the Yalu river, had strafed buildings, railway stations and railway carriages and had killed or wounded a number of people.

By a letter dated 29 August (S/1727), the representative of the United States of America informed the Secretary-General that the instructions under which aircraft were operating under the Unified Command in Korea strictly prohibited them from crossing the Korean frontier into adjacent territory. No evidence had been received to indicate that those instructions had been violated, but the United States would welcome an investigation on the spot by a Commission appointed by the Security Council.

By a cable dated 30 August (S/1743), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China charged that United States military aircraft had again flown over Chinese territory, on 29 August, and had killed or wounded a number of people.

At its 493rd meeting (31 August), the Security Council included the question in its agenda under the title "Complaint of bombing by air forces of the territory of China".

At its 499th meeting (11 September) the Council rejected a USSR proposal (S/1759) that a representative of the Chinese People's Republic be invited to its meetings and considered the following draft resolutions:

(a) a USSR draft resolution submitted on 31 August (S/1745), which, after revision (S/1745/Rev.1), provided that the Council should, inter alia, condemn the illegal acts of the United States Government referred to in the above cables dated 28 and 30 August, and call upon the United States Government to prohibit such acts;

(b) a United States draft resolution submitted on 1 September 1950 (S/1752), providing, inter alia, for the establishment of a Commission composed of two representatives, one appointed by the Government of India and one by the

/...

Government of Sweden, to investigate the allegations contained in the above cables dated 28 and 30 August.

The two draft resolutions were put to the vote at the 501st meeting (12 September). The United States draft resolution was not adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member. The USSR draft resolution was also rejected.

By a letter dated 2 October 1950 (S/1832), the representative of the United States informed the Secretary-General that a detailed investigation of the charges in the communications dated 28 and 30 August had disclosed that two aircraft of the United Nations Command had by mistake flown over the territory of China and fired on an airstrip near Antung. The investigation had corroborated none of the other alleged violations.

Further communications from the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China concerning alleged violations of China's territorial air space were received on 24 September (S/1808), 18 October (S/1857), 26 October (S/1870) and 28 October (S/1876).

Since the 501st meeting the Security Council has not discussed this agenda item.

21. COMPLAINT OF FAILURE BY THE IRANIAN GOVERNMENT TO COMPLY WITH PROVISIONAL MEASURES INDICATED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE IN THE ANGLO-IRANIAN OIL COMPANY CASE

(a) Inclusion of the item in the agenda

On 26 May 1951, the United Kingdom instituted proceedings in the International Court of Justice against Iran in connexion with the application of the Agreement of 1933 between the Imperial Government of Persia and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, Limited. A court order dated 5 July 1951 (S/2239), issued at the request of the United Kingdom, granted interim measures of protection in accordance with Article 41 of the Statute of the Court. The order stated, inter alia, that the indication of such measures in no way prejudged the question of the jurisdiction of the Court to deal with the merits of the case but was intended to preserve the respective rights of the parties pending the Court's decision.

/...

In a letter dated 28 September (S/2357), the representative of the United Kingdom requested the President of the Security Council to place the item on the provisional agenda. He enclosed a draft resolution (S/2358), providing, inter alia, that the Council (1) call upon the Government of Iran to act in all respects in conformity with the provisional measures indicated by the Court and in particular to permit the continued residence at Abadan of the staff affected by the recent expulsion orders or the equivalent of such staff, and (2) request the Government of Iran to inform the Council of the steps taken by it to carry out the resolution.

At the 559th meeting (1 October), the Council decided to include the question in its agenda. The representative of Iran was then invited to participate in the discussion.

(b) Discussion by the Security Council

The Security Council discussed the question in a series of meetings held during the month of October 1951. In the course of the discussion, the representative of the United Kingdom submitted in turn two revisions (S/2358/Rev.1 and 2) of the draft resolution sponsored by his delegation, the second revision incorporating amendments (S/2379) submitted jointly by India and Yugoslavia. Under the second revision, the proposal called for (1) the resumption of negotiations at the earliest practicable moment in order to make further efforts to resolve the differences between the parties in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter; and (2) the avoidance of any action aggravating the situation or prejudicing the positions of the parties.

On 17 October (562nd meeting), the representative of Ecuador submitted a draft resolution (S/2380) under which the Council, without deciding on the question of its own competence, would advise the parties concerned to reopen negotiations as soon as possible with a view to making a fresh attempt to settle their differences in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

After further discussion, the Security Council at its 565th meeting (19 October) adopted a French motion to adjourn the debate until the Court had ruled on its own competence in the matter.

/...

(c) Judgement of the International Court of Justice

On 19 August 1952 the Secretary-General communicated to the members of the Security Council for their information a copy of the judgement of the International Court of Justice, given 22 July 1952, in which the Court by 9 votes to 5, found that it had no jurisdiction in the case (S/2746). It was noted that the Court's order of 5 July 1951 indicating provisional measures of protection in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company case (S/2239) ceased to be operative upon delivery of this judgement and that the provisional measures lapsed at the same time.

22. QUESTION OF AN APPEAL TO STATES TO ACCEDE TO AND RATIFY THE GENEVA PROTOCOL OF 1925 FOR THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE OF BACTERIAL WEAPONS

On 14 June 1952, the representative of the USSR submitted a draft resolution (S/2663) calling on the Security Council to appeal to all States, Members and non-members of the United Nations, which had not ratified or acceded to the Protocol for the prohibition of the use of bacterial weapons, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925, to accede to and ratify the Protocol.

The Council included the item in its agenda at the 577th meeting (18 June). At that meeting the representative of the United States proposed that the USSR draft resolution be referred to the Disarmament Commission.

At the 583rd meeting (26 June) the USSR draft resolution (S/2663) failed of adoption, the vote being 1 in favour (USSR), with 10 abstentions.

In view of this decision, and noting that the question of the control and elimination of weapons of mass destruction was under discussion in the Disarmament Commission, the representative of the United States withdrew his proposal.

Since the 583rd meeting the Council has not discussed this item.

23. QUESTION OF A REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED BACTERIAL WARFARE

On 20 June 1952, the representative of the United States submitted a draft resolution (S/2671) under the terms of which the Security Council, noting,

inter alia, the concerted dissemination by certain Governments and authorities of grave accusations charging the use of bacterial warfare by United Nations forces and recalling that the Unified Command had immediately denied the charges and requested that an impartial investigation be made of them, would request the International Committee of the Red Cross to investigate the charges and to report the results to the Security Council.

The Council included the item in its agenda at the 581st meeting (25 June).

At the 585th meeting (1 July) a USSR draft resolution (S/2674/Rev.1) calling for invitations to representatives of the People's Republic of China and a representative of the Korean People's Democratic Republic to attend the meetings of the Council at which the item was discussed, was rejected.

At the 587th meeting (3 July) the United States draft resolution (S/2671) was put to the vote but was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

At the same meeting the representative of the United States submitted a draft resolution (S/2688) under the terms of which the Security Council, noting, inter alia, that by reason of the negative vote of the USSR the Council was prevented from arranging for an impartial investigation of the charges in question, would (1) conclude that these charges must be presumed to be without substance and false and (2) condemn the practice of fabricating and disseminating such false charges.

At the 590th meeting (9 July) the United States draft resolution (S/2688) was put to the vote and was not adopted since a negative vote was cast by a permanent member of the Council.

Since the 590th meeting the Council has not discussed this item.

24. LETTER DATED 29 MAY 1954 FROM THE ACTING REPRESENTATIVE OF THAILAND TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

In a letter dated 29 May 1954 (S/3220), the acting representative of Thailand requested that a meeting of the Security Council be held to consider a situation which, in the view of his Government, represented a threat to the security of Thailand, the continuance of which was likely to endanger the

/...

maintenance of international peace and security. Referring to large-scale fighting which had repeatedly taken place in the immediate vicinity of Thai territory, and to the dangerous potentialities of the tension in that area which made it essential for the United Nations to have authentic and objective observation and reports, he stated that he was bringing the situation to the attention of the Council to the end that the Council might provide for observation under the Peace Observation Commission.

At the 672nd meeting (3 June), the Council included the item in its agenda and invited the representative of Thailand to participate in the discussion in accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the 673rd meeting (16 June), the representative of Thailand submitted a draft resolution (S/3229), the operative part of which provided that the Council should request the Peace Observation Commission to establish a sub-commission with authority to despatch to Thailand as soon as possible such observers as it deemed necessary, to visit Thailand if necessary, to consider such data as might be submitted to it by its members or observers, and to make such reports and recommendations as it deemed necessary to the Peace Observation Commission and to the Security Council. The draft resolution further provided that if the sub-commission considered that it could not accomplish its mission without observation or visit also in States contiguous to Thailand, it should report to the Peace Observation Commission or to the Security Council for the necessary instruction.

At the 674th meeting (18 June), the draft resolution of Thailand (S/3229) was put to the vote at the request of the representative of the United States. Since a negative vote was cast by a permanent member, the draft resolution was not adopted.

Since the 674th meeting, the Security Council has not considered the item further.

25. CABLEGRAM DATED 19 JUNE 1954 FROM THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL RELATIONS OF GUATEMALA ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

In a cablegram dated 19 June 1954 (S/3232), the Minister for External Relations of Guatemala requested the President of the Security Council to convene a meeting urgently in order that, in accordance with Articles 34, 35 and 39 of the Charter, the Council might take the measures necessary to prevent the disruption of peace and international security in Central America and also to put a stop to the aggression in progress against Guatemala.

At the 675th meeting (20 June), the Council included the cablegram in its agenda, after which the President, under Article 32 of the Charter, invited the representatives of Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua to participate in the discussion.

The representatives of Brazil and Colombia introduced a joint draft resolution (S/3236) which provided that the Council should refer the complaint to the Organization of American States for urgent consideration and should request that Organization to inform the Council as soon as possible, as appropriate, on the measures it had been able to take in the matter.

The representative of France proposed that a final paragraph should be added to the draft resolution whereby the Council, without prejudice to such measures as the Organization of American States might take, would call for the immediate termination of any actions likely to cause further bloodshed and would request all Members of the United Nations to abstain, in the spirit of the Charter, from giving assistance to any such action. The amendment was accepted by the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (S/3236/Rev.1).

The joint draft resolution as amended was put to the vote but was not adopted, since a negative vote was cast by a permanent member.

The representative of France reintroduced his amendment to the joint draft resolution as a separate draft resolution (S/3237), which was unanimously adopted.

At the 676th meeting (25 June), convened at the request of the representative of Guatemala (S/3241 and S/3244) and of the representative of

the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (S/3247), the Security Council had before it, amongst other documents, a cablegram dated 23 June (S/3245) from the Inter-American Peace Committee informing it that the representative of Nicaragua, supported by the representative of Honduras, had proposed that a committee of inquiry of the Inter-American Peace Committee should be set up and immediately proceed to Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua and that the Committee had unanimously decided to inform the Guatemalan Government of the decision, expressing the hope that it would agree to that procedure.

The provisional agenda for the 676th meeting read "Cablegram dated 19 June 1954 from the Minister for External Relations of Guatemala addressed to the President of the Security Council and letter dated 22 June 1954 from the representative of Guatemala addressed to the Secretary-General". After discussion, the Council voted on the adoption of the agenda for the meeting, and failed to approve it.

Three communications, dated 27 June, 5 July and 8 July were later received from the Chairman of the Inter-American Peace Committee (S/3256, S/3262 and S/3267): the first one related to the despatch of a fact-finding committee to Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua; the second stated that the three countries had informed the Committee on 2 July that the dispute between them had ceased to exist; and the third transmitted the report of the Inter-American Peace Committee.

By a cablegram dated 9 July (S/3266), the Minister for External Relations of Guatemala informed the President of the Security Council that peace and order had been restored in his country and that the Junta de Gobierno of Guatemala saw no reason why the Guatemalan question should remain on the agenda of the Council.

26. LETTER DATED 8 SEPTEMBER 1954 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

In a letter dated 8 September 1954 (S/3287), the representative of the United States of America requested that an early meeting of the Security Council be called to consider an incident which had taken place on 4 September when a

United States Navy aircraft on a peaceful mission over international high seas had been attacked and destroyed by two aircraft with Soviet markings.

At the 679th meeting (10 September), the Council included this item in its agenda. Introductory statements were made by the representatives of the United States and the USSR. A letter from the USSR representative was circulated (S/3288) transmitting copies of the notes which his Government had addressed to the United States Government on 5 and 8 September in connexion with the incident of 4 September.

At the 680th meeting held on the same day, the Security Council continued its general debate on the question raised in the letter dated 8 September from the United States representative. At the close of the meeting, the President stated that the list of speakers had been exhausted and that the Council would reconvene if and when any delegation so requested. There has been no further discussion of this item.

27. LETTER DATED 28 JANUARY 1955 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF NEW ZEALAND ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF HOSTILITIES IN THE AREA OF CERTAIN ISLANDS OFF THE COAST OF THE MAINLAND OF CHINA. LETTER DATED 30 JANUARY 1955 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF ACTS OF AGGRESSION BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AGAINST THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA IN THE AREA OF TAIWAN AND OTHER ISLANDS OF CHINA

In a letter dated 28 January 1955 (S/3354), the representative of New Zealand brought to the attention of the Security Council the occurrence of armed hostilities between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China in the area of certain islands off the coast of the mainland of China, stating that those hostilities had made it clear that there existed a situation the continuance of which was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

In a letter dated 30 January (S/3355), the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics charged that the intervention of the United States of America in the internal affairs of China and the recent extension of acts of aggression by the United States against the People's Republic of China in the

area of Taiwan (Formosa) and other islands of China were aggravating tension in the Far East and increasing the threat of a new war. A draft resolution was attached, the operative paragraph of which provided that the Security Council should (1) condemn the acts of aggression by the United States against the People's Republic of China; (2) recommend that the United States Government should take immediate steps to put an end to those acts of aggression and to intervention in the internal affairs of China; (3) recommend that the United States Government should immediately withdraw all its naval, air and land forces from the island of Taiwan and other territories belonging to China; and (4) urge that no military action should be permitted in the Taiwan area by either side, so that the evacuation from the islands in that area of all armed forces not controlled by the People's Republic of China might be facilitated.

On 31 January (S/3356), the representative of the USSR submitted a draft resolution providing that the Security Council should decide to invite a representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to attend its meeting in order to participate in the discussion of the item submitted by the USSR.

At the 689th and 690th meetings (31 January), the Council considered the question of including the two letters in its agenda, and took the following decisions upon a procedural motion by the representative of the United Kingdom: (1) the item proposed by New Zealand was included in the agenda; (2) the item proposed by the USSR was included in the agenda; (3) an amendment by the USSR providing that the Council should include the USSR item as the first item in its agenda was rejected; and (4) the consideration of the New Zealand item would be concluded before the Council would take up the USSR item.

Upon the motion of the representative of New Zealand, the Council then decided to invite a representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to participate in the discussion of the New Zealand item and to request the Secretary-General to convey that invitation to the Central People's Government.

On 4 February (S/3358), the Secretary-General circulated an exchange of cablegrams between himself and the Prime Minister of the State Council and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China regarding the invitation of the Council.

At the 691st meeting (14 February), the Security Council continued its consideration of the New Zealand item in the light of the fact that the People's Republic of China had declined its invitation to be represented. A number of statements were made with regard to a suggestion that in the circumstances the Council could best proceed by adjourning consideration of the item pending further study and consultation on ways to secure the cessation of hostilities. The representative of the USSR moved that since it appeared that consideration of the item had been completed, the Council should proceed to the consideration of the USSR item. The USSR motion was rejected, and the Council adjourned for the time being its consideration of the New Zealand item.

28. SITUATION CREATED BY THE UNILATERAL ACTION OF THE EGYPTIAN GOVERNMENT IN BRINGING TO AN END THE SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONAL OPERATION OF THE SUEZ CANAL, WHICH WAS CONFIRMED AND COMPLETED BY THE SUEZ CANAL CONVENTION OF 1888

In a letter dated 23 September 1956 (S/3654), the representatives of France and the United Kingdom requested the President to convene a meeting on 26 September to consider this item, and referred to their letter of 12 September (S/3645) which had drawn the attention of the President of the Council to the situation created by the action of the Egyptian Government in attempting unilaterally to bring to an end the system of international operation of the Suez Canal, which had been confirmed and completed by the Suez Canal Convention of 1888. The letter had added that since the action of the Egyptian Government had created a situation which might endanger the free and open passage of shipping through the Canal, a conference had been called in London on 16 August 1956. Of the twenty-two States attending that conference, eighteen, representing over ninety per cent of the user interest in the Canal, had put forward proposals to Egypt for the future operation of the Canal. The Egyptian Government had refused to negotiate on the basis of those proposals, which, in the opinion of the French and United Kingdom Governments, offered means for a just and equitable solution. The two Governments considered that the Egyptian refusal was an aggravation of the situation which, if allowed to continue, would constitute a manifest danger to peace and security.

At its 734th meeting (26 September) the Council included this item on its agenda and rejected a proposal to consider it simultaneously with an Egyptian item also relating to the Suez Canal (see item 29 below).

The Council continued its discussion of this question at its 735th through 738th meetings (5, 8 and 9 October), and then continued its consideration in the course of its 739th through 741st meetings, held in private on 9, 11 and 12 October.

Following further consideration at its 742nd and 743rd meetings (13 October), the Council unanimously adopted a resolution (S/3675) agreeing that any settlement of the Suez question should meet the following requirements: (1) there should be free and open transit through the Canal without discrimination, overt or covert - this to cover both political and technical aspects; (2) the sovereignty of Egypt should be respected; (3) the operation of the Canal should be insulated from the politics of any country; (4) the manner of fixing tolls and charges should be decided by agreement between Egypt and the users; (5) a fair proportion of the dues should be allotted to development; and (6) in case of disputes, unresolved affairs between the Suez Canal Company and the Egyptian Government should be settled by arbitration with suitable terms of reference and suitable provisions for the payment of sums found to be due. The principles set out in the resolution had been agreed to in the course of private meetings of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, France and the United Kingdom, held in the office of the Secretary-General.

At the same time the Council, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member, failed to adopt four other operative paragraphs which had followed the adopted part of the resolution as originally submitted by France and the United Kingdom (S/3671). The Council did not vote on a draft resolution of Yugoslavia (S/3672), or on the joint draft resolution submitted previously by France and the United Kingdom (S/3666).

With a letter dated 24 April (S/3818), the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt transmitted a Declaration on the Suez Canal and the arrangements for its operation, made on 24 April by the Government of Egypt "in fulfilment of their participation in the Constantinople Convention of 1888, noting their understanding of the Security Council resolution of 13 October 1956 and in line with their

statements relating to it before the Council", and requested that the Declaration, with the obligations therein, which constituted an international instrument, should be received and registered accordingly by the Secretariat.

In the light of this Declaration, the Security Council gave further consideration to this question at its 776th and 777th meetings (26 April 1957), convened at the request of the United States (S/3817 and Rev.1), and at its 778th and 779th meetings (20 and 21 May), convened at the request of France (S/3829).

With a letter dated 18 July (S/3818/Add.1), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, in pursuance and for the purposes of paragraph 9 (b) of the Egyptian Declaration, transmitted a declaration on the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute.

29. ACTIONS AGAINST EGYPT BY SOME POWERS, PARTICULARLY FRANCE AND THE UNITED KINGDOM, WHICH CONSTITUTE A DANGER TO INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY AND ARE SERIOUS VIOLATIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

In a letter dated 24 September 1956 (S/3656) the representative of Egypt recalled his letter of 17 September (S/3650) concerning the Suez Canal and requested that the Council be urgently convened to consider this item. In that letter the representative of Egypt had stated, inter alia, that on 26 July 1956, the Government of Egypt had enacted a law nationalizing the Suez Canal Company, an action taken by Egypt in the full exercise of its sovereign rights and without challenge to or infringement of the rights of any nation. It had been met by declarations by France and the United Kingdom conveying threats of force, by measures of mobilization and movement of armed forces, by hostile economic measures, and by incitement to the employees and pilots working in the Canal to abandon their work in an attempt to sabotage the operation of the Canal. Several offers by the Government of Egypt to enter into negotiations at a conference for reviewing the Convention of 1888 had been made to no avail, and instead certain Governments had created a "Users Association", which Egypt considered incompatible with its dignity and sovereign rights. Being determined to spare no effort to

reach a peaceful solution of the Suez Canal question on the basis of the recognition of the legitimate and sovereign rights of Egypt and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, Egypt considered it indispensable that an end be put to acts such as those complained of, which were a serious danger to international peace and security and were violations of the Charter.

At its 734th meeting (26 September) the Council included the Egyptian item in its agenda, and rejected a proposal that it be considered simultaneously with the item on the Suez Canal submitted by France and the United Kingdom (see item 28 above).

Following the adoption by the Council of a resolution relating to the complaint of France and the United Kingdom, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt addressed a letter to the President of the Council on 15 October (S/3679) in which he stated that as a contribution by the Government of Egypt to the provision of a proper atmosphere for future negotiations, he had not pressed for the immediate consideration of the item on the Council's agenda which had been submitted by Egypt.

30. THE SITUATION IN HUNGARY

On 27 October 1956, the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America requested (S/3690) a meeting of the Council to consider an item entitled "The situation in Hungary" pursuant to the provisions of Article 34. They stated that foreign military forces in Hungary were violently repressing the rights of the Hungarian people, which were secured by the Treaty of Peace to which Hungary and the Allied and Associated Powers were parties. On 28 October 1956, the representative of the Hungarian People's Republic transmitted (S/3691) a protest against the calling of a meeting to consider questions regarding the events in Hungary which stated that the events of 22 October 1956 and thereafter, and the measures taken in the course of those events, were exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of Hungary.

On 28 October (746th meeting), the Council decided, by 9 votes to 1 (USSR) with 1 abstention (Yugoslavia), to include the question in its agenda. The item was discussed at that meeting and three further meetings (752nd, 753rd and 754th) on 2, 3 and 4 November 1956.

During consideration of the matter by the Security Council, a number of communications were received from the President of the Council of Ministers of Hungary and Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, addressed to the Secretary-General (A/3251, S/3726 and S/3731). In the second of these communications, the Hungarian Government requested the Secretary-General to call upon the great Powers to recognize the declared neutrality of Hungary and to ask the Security Council to instruct the Soviet and Hungarian Governments to start negotiations immediately. These communications also referred to Soviet military movements in Hungary and to proposals for the withdrawal of Soviet troops stationed in that country.

On 3 November, the United States submitted a draft resolution (S/3730) under which, inter alia, the Council would: (1) call upon the USSR to desist forthwith from any intervention, particularly armed intervention, in the internal affairs of Hungary; (2) express the hope that the USSR would withdraw its forces from Hungary without delay; (3) affirm the right of the Hungarian people to a government responsive to its national aspirations and dedicated to its independence and well-being; (4) request the Secretary-General, in consultation with the heads of appropriate specialized agencies, to explore on an urgent basis the need of the Hungarian people for food, medicine and other similar supplies, and to report to the Council as soon as possible; and (5) request all Members, and invite national and international humanitarian organizations, to co-operate in making available such supplies as might be required by the Hungarian people.

On Sunday, 4 November 1956, the Council was urgently summoned to meet at 3 a.m. to consider reports of a new and violent attack by Soviet troops in Budapest and elsewhere in Hungary.

The Council had before it a revised United States draft resolution (S/3730/Rev.1) by which, in addition to the above-mentioned provisions, the Council would call upon the USSR to cease the introduction of additional armed forces into Hungary and to withdraw all its forces from that country without delay. It received 9 votes in favour to 1 against (USSR), and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.

The United States representative then submitted a draft resolution (S/3733), which the Council adopted by 10 votes to 1, by which the Council decided to call an emergency special session of the General Assembly, as provided for in General Assembly resolution 377 (V) entitled "Uniting for peace", to consider the situation in Hungary.

31. MILITARY ASSISTANCE RENDERED BY THE EGYPTIAN GOVERNMENT TO THE REBELS IN ALGERIA

In a letter dated 25 October 1956 (S/3689 and Corr.1) addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of France requested inclusion of the item "Military assistance rendered by the Egyptian Government to the rebels in Algeria" in the agenda of a forthcoming meeting of the Security Council. In an accompanying memorandum, the French Government gave details of the seizure, on 16 October, of a ship loaded with arms and ammunition destined for the Algerian Maquis. It was stated that the ship had been loaded in Alexandria by Egyptian military personnel in uniform, and had been carrying clandestine passengers who had taken military training courses in Egypt.

At the 747th meeting on 29 October 1956, the representative of France repeated the charges made in the above communication and requested the Council to take up the matter immediately in order to put an end to a situation which, if it continued, was likely to threaten the maintenance of international peace and security. The Security Council decided without a vote to include the item in the agenda. The Egyptian delegation was then invited to participate in the debate and the meeting was adjourned to give it time to make its preparations. The Council has not so far resumed consideration of the matter. A further communication on this matter from the representative of France (S/3783) was transmitted to the President of the Security Council on 4 February 1957.

32. LETTER DATED 30 OCTOBER 1956 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF EGYPT ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

By a letter dated 30 October 1956 (S/3712), the representative of Egypt transmitted to the President of the Council a letter from the Egyptian Minister for

Foreign Affairs stating that the United Kingdom Government on that date had handed the Government of Egypt an ultimatum to stop all warlike actions by land, sea and air, withdraw all Egyptian military forces ten miles from the Suez Canal, and accept temporary occupation of Egyptian territory by British and French forces of key positions at Port Said, Ismailia and Suez. Egypt requested that the Security Council be convened immediately to consider the British-French act of aggression.

The Council considered the Egyptian complaint at its 750th and 751st meetings (30 and 31 October), following its completion of consideration of the item: "The Palestine question: steps for the immediate cessation of the military action of Israel in Egypt" (see item 12 (t)).

Following rejection of a motion to declare a Yugoslav draft resolution (S/3719) out of order, the Security Council adopted a resolution (S/3721) which, considering that a grave situation had been created by action undertaken against Egypt and taking into account that the lack of unanimity of its permanent members at the 749th and 750th meetings of the Council had prevented it from exercising its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, decided to call an emergency special session of the General Assembly as provided in the General Assembly's resolution 377 (V) in order to make appropriate recommendations.

33. LETTER DATED 13 FEBRUARY 1958 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF TUNISIA TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING: "COMPLAINT BY TUNISIA IN RESPECT OF AN ACT OF AGGRESSION COMMITTED AGAINST IT BY FRANCE ON 8 FEBRUARY 1958 AT SAKIET-SIDI-YOUSSEF"

34. LETTER DATED 14 FEBRUARY 1958 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF FRANCE TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING: "SITUATION RESULTING FROM THE AID FURNISHED BY TUNISIA TO REBELS ENABLING THEM TO CONDUCT OPERATIONS FROM TUNISIAN TERRITORY DIRECTED AGAINST THE INTEGRITY OF FRENCH TERRITORY AND THE SAFETY OF THE PERSONS AND PROPERTY OF FRENCH NATIONALS" (see item 39 (a) below)

In a letter dated 13 February 1958 to the President of the Security Council (S/3952), the representative of Tunisia requested him to convene the Council for the purpose of considering the complaint by Tunisia (item 33). On 17 February, he addressed a letter (S/3957) to the President of the Security Council in respect of the request contained in document S/3952.

In a letter dated 14 February 1958 to the President of the Security Council (S/3954), the representative of France requested that at its next meeting the Council consider the complaint by France against Tunisia (item 34).

At its 811th meeting (18 February 1958), the Security Council included these two questions in its agenda. After having invited the representative of Tunisia to participate in the discussion and hearing statements by members of the Council and the parties concerned, the Council decided to adjourn under rule 33, in the light of the efforts at conciliation which had been reported to it.

35. LETTER DATED 20 FEBRUARY 1958 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SUDAN ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

By a letter dated 20 February 1958 (S/3963), the permanent representative of the Sudan requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to discuss "the grave situation existing on the Sudan-Egypt border, resulting from the massed concentration of Egyptian troops moving towards the Sudanese frontiers."

The Council considered the question at its 812th meeting on 21 February 1958, and invited the representative of the parties concerned to participate in the discussion.

After statements by the parties concerned and by members of the Council, the President concluded the meeting by summing up the views of the Council to

/...

the effect that it took note of the assurances of the representative of Egypt regarding the postponement of the settlement of the frontier question until after the Sudanese elections.

36. COMPLAINT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE USSR IN A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL DATED 18 APRIL 1958 ENTITLED: "URGENT MEASURES TO PUT AN END TO FLIGHTS BY UNITED STATES MILITARY AIRCRAFT ARMED WITH ATOMIC AND HYDROGEN BOMBS IN THE DIRECTION OF THE FRONTIERS OF THE SOVIET UNION"

By a letter dated 18 April 1958 (S/3990), the representative of the USSR requested the President to convene an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the question of "Urgent measures to put an end to flights by United States military aircraft armed with atomic and hydrogen bombs in the direction of the frontiers of the Soviet Union". On the same day, he transmitted a statement (S/3991) on this question made by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

At its 813th meeting (21 April 1958), the Security Council included the item in its agenda. The representative of the USSR introduced a draft resolution (S/3993) providing that the Security Council, having examined the questions submitted by the Soviet Union and considering that the practice of making such flights increased tension in international relations, constituted a threat to the security of nations and, if continued, might lead to a breach of world peace and the unleashing of an atomic war of annihilation, should call upon the United States to refrain from sending its military aircraft carrying atomic and hydrogen bombs towards the frontiers of other States for the purpose of creating a threat to their security or staging military demonstrations.

The representatives of the USSR, the United States, Canada, China, France, the United Kingdom, Japan, Iraq, Colombia and Panama made statements concerning the question. A motion by the representative of the USSR to adjourn further consideration of the matter until the afternoon of the following day, 22 April, was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions. Following further discussion, the Council rejected another USSR motion to adjourn consideration under the morning of 22 April, by 5 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions. The representative of the USSR, after making a statement, declared that his delegation would not press its draft resolution to the vote, and withdrew it.

/...

The Security Council continued its consideration of this question at its 814th through 817th meetings, held on 29 April and 2 May 1958. The Council had the following proposals before it for consideration:

(1) A draft resolution submitted by the United States on 28 April (S/3995) providing that the Security Council, inter alia, should (1) recommend that there be promptly established the Northern zone of international inspection against surprise attack, comprising the area north of the Arctic Circle with certain exceptions and additions, that was considered by the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee of Canada, France, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States during August 1957; (2) call upon the five States mentioned, together with Denmark and Norway, and any other States having territory north of the Arctic Circle which desired to have such territory included in the zone of inspection, at once to designate representatives to participate in immediate discussions with a view to agreeing on the technical arrangements required; and (3) decide to keep the matter on its agenda for such further consideration as might be required.

(2) A draft resolution submitted by the USSR on 28 April (S/3997) identical to the draft resolution (S/3993) withdrawn at the previous meeting, with the addition of a new paragraph providing that the Security Council, mindful of the necessity for taking steps as soon as possible to avert the threat of atomic warfare and ease international tension, should note with satisfaction that preliminary talks were in progress between the interested States with a view to the convening of a summit conference to discuss a number of urgent problems, including the question of drawing up measures to preclude the danger of surprise attack, and should express the hope that the summit conference would be held at the earliest possible date.

(3) An amendment by Sweden (S/3998) to the United States draft resolution, submitted on 29 April, providing for the insertion of a new next-to-last paragraph whereby the Council would express the view that such discussions might serve as a useful basis for the deliberations on the disarmament problem at the summit conference on the convening of which talks were in progress.

/...

At the 816th meeting (2 May), the United States accepted the Swedish amendment, with the substitution of the word "a" for the word "the" before the words "summit conference". This change was accepted by Sweden.

At the 817th meeting (2 May), the Council voted on the proposals before it. The United States draft resolution (S/3995), as revised by incorporating the Swedish amendment (S/3998) received 10 votes in favour and 1 against (USSR). The negative vote being that of a permanent member of the Council, the draft resolution was not adopted. The USSR draft resolution (S/3997) was rejected by 9 votes to 1 (USSR), with 1 abstention (Sweden).

37. LETTER DATED 22 MAY 1958 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF LEBANON ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING: "COMPLAINT BY LEBANON IN RESPECT OF A SITUATION ARISING FROM THE INTERVENTION OF THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF LEBANON, THE CONTINUANCE OF WHICH IS LIKELY TO ENDANGER THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY"

By a letter dated 22 May 1958 (S/4007), the representative of Lebanon requested that an urgent meeting of the Council be held to consider the following question: "Complaint by Lebanon in respect of a situation arising from the intervention of the United Arab Republic in the internal affairs of Lebanon, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security". The intervention, it was stated, included the infiltration of armed bands from Syria, the participation of United Arab Republic nationals in acts of terrorism and rebellion against the established authorities in Lebanon, the supply of arms from Syria to individuals and bands in Lebanon rebelling against the established authorities, and the waging of a violent radio and press campaign in the United Arab Republic calling for strikes, demonstrations and the overthrow of the established authorities in Lebanon.

The question was included in the Council's agenda at its 818th meeting (27 May 1958).

The representatives of Lebanon and of the United Arab Republic were invited to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The Council then postponed discussion of the question, first until 3 June and then successively to 5 and 6 June. At the 823rd meeting (6 June) statements were made by the representatives of Lebanon and the United Arab Republic.

/...

At the 824th meeting (10 June) a draft resolution (S/4022) was submitted by Sweden. It provided that the Council, having heard the charges of the representative of Lebanon and the reply by the representative of the United Arab Republic, would decide to dispatch urgently an observation group to proceed to Lebanon so as to ensure that there was no illegal infiltration of personnel or supply of arms or other material across the Lebanese borders; would authorize the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps to that end and would request the observation group to keep the Security Council currently informed through the Secretary-General. This draft resolution was adopted by 10 votes in favour, with 1 abstention, at the 825th meeting (11 June).

On 16 June 1958, the Secretary-General submitted an interim report (S/4029) on the steps he had taken toward implementing the resolution of 11 June. The first report of the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon (S/4040 and Corr.1) was submitted on 3 July. The representative of Lebanon submitted his Government's comments on this report in a letter dated 8 July 1958 (S/4043). A second (S/4069) and a third report (S/4085) were submitted by the Observation Group on 30 July and 14 August respectively. It also submitted two interim reports (S/4051 and S/4052) on 16 and 17 July.

Discussion was continued at the 827th-834th meetings (15-18 July). The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted a draft resolution (S/4047 and Corr.1) which provided, inter alia, that the Council call upon the United States Government to cease armed intervention in the domestic affairs of the Arab States and to remove its troops from the territory of Lebanon immediately.

By a letter dated 17 July (S/4053) the representative of Jordan requested consideration by the Council of his Government's complaint of interference in its domestic affairs by the United Arab Republic (see item 40 below). The USSR draft resolution was revised (S/4047/Rev.1) to provide that the Council would call upon the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom to cease armed intervention in the domestic affairs of the Arab States and to remove their troops from the territory of Lebanon and Jordan immediately.

A United States draft resolution (S/4050/Rev.1) provided, inter alia, that the Council invite the Observation Group in Lebanon to continue to develop its activities; request the Secretary-General to consult the Government of Lebanon

/...

and other Member States to make arrangements for additional measures to protect the territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon; and call for the immediate cessation of all illegal infiltration of personnel or supply of arms or other materiel across the Lebanese borders as well as attacks upon the Government of Lebanon by government-controlled radio and other information media calculated to stimulate disorders.

The Council also had before it a draft resolution (S/4054) submitted by Sweden on 17 July, under which the Council would request the Secretary-General to suspend the activities of the observers in Lebanon until further notice. At the 834th meeting (18 July), the USSR draft resolution (S/4047/Rev.1) was rejected by 8 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions. The United States draft resolution (S/4050/Rev.1) received 9 votes in favour, 1 against with 1 abstention and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member. The Swedish draft resolution (S/4054) was rejected by 9 votes to 2.

On 19 July, another draft resolution (S/4055) was submitted by Japan. As subsequently revised (S/4055/Rev.1), it provided, inter alia, that the Council request the Secretary-General to make arrangements for such additional measures as he might consider necessary with a view to ensuring the territorial integrity and political independence of Lebanon, so as to make possible the withdrawal of United States forces from that country.

Consideration of the question continued at the 835th meeting (21 July) and 836th and 837th meetings (22 July). The United States submitted a draft resolution (S/4056) providing that the Council decide to call an emergency special session of the General Assembly in order to make appropriate recommendations concerning the Lebanon complaint. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics also submitted a draft resolution (S/4057), under which the Council would decide to call an emergency special session of the General Assembly to consider the question of the intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom in Lebanon and Jordan.

On 22 July, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted amendments (S/4063) to the Japanese draft resolution (S/4055/Rev.1). These were voted upon at the 837th meeting, when they were rejected by 8 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions. The Japanese draft resolution received 10 votes in

favour, 1 against and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member. The Secretary-General then stated that he would use all opportunities offered to him, within the limits set by the Charter, towards developing the United Nations effort, so as to help to prevent a further deterioration of the situation in the Middle East. That would mean the further development of the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon so as to give it all the significance it could have, consistent with its basic character as determined by the Security Council in its resolution (S/4023) of 11 June 1958 and the Purposes and Principles of the Charter. The Secretary-General concluded by stating that the Security Council would be kept fully informed on the steps to be taken by him in that respect and, were the Council to disapprove of those steps, he would accept the consequences of its judgement.

By a letter dated 5 August 1958 (S/4078), the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics requested an immediate emergency meeting of the Security Council to consider the USSR draft resolution concerning the convening of an emergency special session of the General Assembly (S/4057). The Security Council resumed consideration of the question at its 838th meeting (7 August). Prior to this meeting, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had submitted a revised version of the USSR draft resolution (S/4057/Rev.1) and the representative of the United States of America had submitted a revised version of the United States draft resolution (S/4056/Rev.1). The representative of the United States accepted a number of amendments to the revised United States draft resolution during the 838th meeting. The revised United States draft resolution, as thus modified, was adopted unanimously [illegible] as recorded that the Council, having considered items 2 and 3 [illegible] items 39 and 40 of the present statement) on its agenda as contained in [illegible] S/Agenda/838, taking into account that the lack of unanimity of its permanent members at its 834th and 837th meetings had prevented it from exercising its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, decided to call an emergency special session of the General Assembly.

/...

38. LETTER DATED 29 MAY 1958 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF TUNISIA TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING: "COMPLAINT BY TUNISIA IN RESPECT OF ACTS OF ARMED AGGRESSION COMMITTED AGAINST IT SINCE 19 MAY 1958 BY THE FRENCH MILITARY FORCES STATIONED IN ITS TERRITORY AND IN ALGERIA"

39. LETTER DATED 29 MAY 1958 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF FRANCE TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING: (a) "THE COMPLAINT BROUGHT BY FRANCE AGAINST TUNISIA ON 14 FEBRUARY 1958" (SEE ITEM 34 ABOVE); AND (b) "THE SITUATION ARISING OUT OF THE DISRUPTION, BY TUNISIA, OF THE MODUS VIVENDI WHICH HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED SINCE FEBRUARY 1958 WITH REGARD TO THE STATIONING OF FRENCH TROOPS AT CERTAIN POINTS IN TUNISIAN TERRITORY"

In a letter dated 29 May 1958 (S/4013), the representative of Tunisia requested the President of the Security Council to convene a meeting to consider the complaint by Tunisia (item 38). He transmitted an explanatory memorandum on the question, and on 1 June (S/4019) transmitted a further memorandum outlining the events complained of.

In a letter dated 29 May (S/4015), the representative of France requested that at its next meeting the Security Council consider the complaint by France (item 39 above), and also transmitted an explanatory memorandum.

At its 819th meeting (2 June 1958), the Security Council included these two items on its agenda and invited the representative of Tunisia to participate in their consideration. Following statements by the representatives of Tunisia and of France at the 819th and 820th meetings on 2 June, the Council proceeded with the discussion of the two questions, and continued that consideration at the 821st meeting on 4 June. It was agreed, without objection, to adjourn further discussion of the two questions until 18 June.

At its 826th meeting (18 June 1958), the Security Council continued its consideration of the two items. The representatives of France and Tunisia informed the Council that on 17 June an agreement, in the form of an exchange of letters, had been reached between their two Governments, providing for the evacuation of French troops from Tunisian territory within four months, with the exception of those stationed in Bizerte, and for negotiations to define a provisional status for the base at Bizerte. The President of the Security Council welcomed the statements of the representatives of France and Tunisia and congratulated both Governments for having succeeded in removing their difficulties through direct negotiations.

40. LETTER DATED 17 JULY 1958 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF JORDAN ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING: "COMPLAINT BY THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN OF INTERFERENCE IN ITS DOMESTIC AFFAIRS BY THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC"

In a letter dated 17 July 1958 (S/4053) the representative of Jordan requested the President to inscribe on the agenda of the Security Council, for urgent consideration by the Council, his Government's complaint of interference in its domestic affairs by the United Arab Republic.

At its 831st meeting on 17 July, the Security Council decided to include this item in its agenda and invited the representative of Jordan to participate in the discussion without vote. The Council also agreed that after initial statements on the Jordanian complain had been concluded, it would proceed to consider simultaneously the complaints submitted by Lebanon and Jordan. (See item 37 above.)