



UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

S/7382
5 July 1966

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

	<u>Page</u>
1. The Iranian question.	3
2. Special agreements under Article 43 and the organization of the armed forces to be made available to the Security Council	11
3. Rules of procedure of the Security Council.	11
4. Statute and rules of procedure of the Military Staff Committee	12
5. The general regulation and reduction of armaments and information on the armed forces of the United Nations	12
6. Appointment of a Governor for the Free Territory of Trieste	16
7. The Egyptian question	17
8. The Indonesian question	13
9. Voting procedure in the Security Council.	21
10. Reports on the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the resolution of the Security Council of 7 March 1949	22

* This consolidated summary statement on matters of which the Security Council is seized and on the stage reached in their consideration as of 2 July 1966, is being issued for the convenience of the members of the Security Council, in order that a brief account of the proceedings of the Council on all matters of which it remains seized may be found in one document.

Table of contents (continued)

Page

11. Applications for membership	22
12. The Palestine question.	24
13. The India-Pakistan question	44
14. The Czechoslovak question	53
15. The question of the Free Territory of Trieste	59
16. The Hyderabad question.	61
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	63
18. International control of atomic energy.	65
19. Complaint of armed invasion of Taiwan (Formosa)	66
20. Complaint of bombing by air forces of the territory of China.	68
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.	70
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.	71
23. Question of a request for investigation of alleged bacterial warfare	72
24. Letter dated 29 May 1954 from the acting representative of Thailand to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council	73
25. Cablegram dated 19 June 1954 from the Minister of External Relations of Guatemala addressed to the President of the Security Council	74
26. Letter dated 8 September 1954 from the representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council	75

Table of contents (continued)

Page

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	76
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.	73
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.	30
30.	The situation in Hungary.	32
31.	Military assistance rendered by the Egyptian Government to the rebels in Algeria.	33
32.	Letter dated 30 October 1956 from the representative of Egypt addressed to the President of the Security Council	34
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"	35
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"	35
35.	Letter dated 20 February 1958 from the representative of the Sudan addressed to the Secretary-General	35

Table of contents (continued)

Page

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"	36
37.	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"	38
38.	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 <u>modus vivendi</u> which had been established since February 1958 with regard to the stationing of French troops at certain points in Tunisian territory"	38
39.	Report by the Secretary-General on the letter received from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Royal Government of Laos, transmitted by a note from the Permanent Mission of Laos to the United Nations, 4 September 1959.	39
40.	Letter dated 25 March 1960 from the representatives of Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic and Yemen addressed to the President of the Security Council	90
41.	Cable dated 18 May 1960 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council.	92
42.	Letter dated 23 May 1960 from the representatives of Argentina, Ceylon, Ecuador and Tunisia addressed to the President of the Security Council	93
43.	Letter dated 15 July 1960 from the Secretary-General of the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.	95

Table of contents (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
44. Letter dated 11 July 1960 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cuba addressed to the President of the Security Council.	104
45. Letter dated 31 December 1960 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Minister for External Affairs of Cuba	106
46. Letter dated 20 February 1961 from the representative of Liberia addressed to the President of the Security Council	107
47. Letter dated 26 May 1961 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen and Yugoslavia.	103
48. Complaint by Kuwait in respect of the situation arising from the threat by Iraq to the territorial independence of Kuwait, which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. Complaint by the Government of the Republic of Iraq in respect of the situation arising out of the armed threat by the United Kingdom to the independence and security of Iraq, which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security	109
49. Telegram dated 20 July 1961 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Tunisia. Letter dated 20 July 1961 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia addressed to the President of the Security Council	111
50. Letter dated 21 November 1961 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba addressed to the President of the Security Council	114
51. Letter dated 13 December 1961 from the Permanent Representative of Portugal addressed to the President of the Security Council	115

Table of contents (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
52. Letter dated 22 October 1962 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council; letter dated 22 October 1962 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba addressed to the President of the Security Council; letter dated 23 October 1962 from the Deputy Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council.	116
53. Complaints by Senegal of violations of its air space and territory	119
54. Telegram dated 5 May 1963 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Haiti to the President of the Security Council.	120
55. Reports by the Secretary-General to the Security Council concerning developments relating to Yemen	122
56. Question concerning the situation in territories under Portuguese administration: letter dated 11 July 1963 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of thirty-two Member States	124
57. The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa: letter dated 11 July 1963 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of thirty-two Member States.	128
58. Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia: letters dated 2 and 30 August 1963 addressed to the President of the Security Council on behalf of the representatives of thirty-two Member States	133
59. Letter dated 26 December 1963 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus addressed to the President of the Security Council	142
60. Letter dated 10 January 1964 from the Permanent Representative of Panama addressed to the President of the Security Council.	152
61. Letter dated 1 April 1964 from the Deputy Permanent Representative of Yemen, Chargé d'Affaires a.i., addressed to the President of the Security Council.	153

Table of contents (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
62. Complaint concerning acts of aggression against the territory and civilian population of Cambodia	154
63. Letter dated 4 August 1964 from the Permanent Representative of the United States addressed to the President of the Security Council.	155
64. Letter dated 3 September 1964 from the Permanent Representative of Malaysia addressed to the President of the Security Council.	156
65. Letter dated 5 September 1964 from the Permanent Representative of Greece addressed to the President of the Security Council, and letter dated 8 September 1964 from the Permanent Representative of Greece addressed to the President of the Security Council	157
66. Letter dated 6 September 1964 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey addressed to the President of the Security Council.	157
67. Letter dated 1 December 1964, addressed to the President of the Security Council from the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia and Zambia	158
68. Letter dated 9 December 1964 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the President of the Security Council	158
69. Letter dated 1 May 1965 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council	160
70. Letter dated 31 January 1966 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council.	166

1. THE IRANIAN QUESTION

On 19 January 1946 Iran stated (Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, First Series, Supplement No. 1, page 16) 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. It 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.

On 24 January the USSR delegation stated (Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, First Series, Supplement No. 1, page 17) 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 on its agenda.

At the fifth meeting (30 January), the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 2, of 30 January 1946, 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.

On 18 March, Iran, in accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Charter, brought to the attention of the Security Council (S/15) a dispute between Iran and the Soviet Union, the continuance of which was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. It 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.

On 19 March, the USSR informed the Secretary-General (S/16) 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 by 9 votes, the USSR being absent, a draft resolution submitted by 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 (resolution 3 of 4 April 1946).

On 6 April, the Soviet Union proposed (S/30) 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.

On 9 April, the Iranian Ambassador stated (S/35) that it was his Government's desire that the question should remain on the agenda of the Security Council. On 15 April, he communicated the text of a telegram (S/37) 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 (25 April), the Security Council rejected, by 3 votes in favour, a draft resolution submitted by 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.

On 6 May, Iran reported (S/53) 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, by 10 votes, the USSR being absent, a draft resolution submitted by 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 (resolution 5 of 8 May 1946).

On 20 and 21 May, the Iranian Ambassador submitted additional information (S/66 and S/68) with respect to the matters brought to the Security Council's attention by his Government, including 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, by 9 votes to 1, the USSR being absent, a proposal submitted by 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.

On 5 December 1946, Iran forwarded a report (S/204) concerning the existing state of affairs in Azerbaijan.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 22 May 1946.

2. SPECIAL AGREEMENTS UNDER ARTICLE 43 AND THE
ORGANIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES TO BE 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 its 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. This request was renewed at the 105th meeting (13 February 1947), when the Council requested the Committee's recommendations on the basic principles which would govern the organization of armed forces to be made available to the Council. The Military Staff Committee's report (S/336) was submitted on 30 April and was discussed by the Security Council in the course of meetings held in June and July 1947. During these meetings, the Council adopted provisionally a number of the articles in the Committee's report, but failed to reach agreement on the remaining articles.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 15 July 1947.

3. RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

At its first meeting on 17 January 1946, the Security Council considered and adopted the provisional rules of procedure recommended by the Preparatory Commission. At the same meeting, it also established a Committee of Experts composed of a representative of each member of the Council to examine and report on these rules of procedure. At subsequent meetings, the Council considered and adopted recommendations made in reports of the Committee of Experts on alterations in the provisional rules of procedure, together with certain amendments made in the course of discussion in the Council.

The provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council as amended to date are contained in document S/96/Rev.4 published on 29 July 1952.

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

At its second meeting (25 January 1946), the Council unanimously adopted resolution 1 of 25 January 1946 which directed its Military Staff Committee to draw up and submit proposals for the Committee's organization and procedure. Upon receipt of the report (S/10, revised in S/115), the Council referred it to the Committee of Experts and authorized the Military Staff Committee to carry out its business along the lines suggested in its report. The report of the Committee of Experts (S/421) has not so far been discussed by the Council.

5. THE GENERAL REGULATION AND REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS AND INFORMATION ON THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED NATIONS^{1/}

On 27 December 1946, the USSR transmitted for inclusion in the agenda of the Council a draft resolution (S/229) having to do with the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41 (I) of 14 December 1946 concerning the general regulation and reduction of armed forces. The proposal was placed on the agenda at the eighty-eighth 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/235) presented at the eighty-eighth 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 (9 January 1947), General Assembly resolution 42 (I) of 14 December 1946 concerning "Information on Armed Forces of the United Nations" was placed on the agenda of the Council. At the 102nd meeting (11 February) examination of the two items was combined.

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

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). Draft resolutions were introduced by France (S/243), Australia (S/249), Colombia (S/251) and the United States (S/264). At the 105th meeting (13 February), the Security Council, by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention, adopted resolution 18 of 13 February 1947, in which it decided, 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.

On 25 June, the Chairman of the Commission transmitted a first progress report to the Council (S/387), 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 (1 July), the Council approved, by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions, 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).

By a letter dated 14 January 1949 (S/1216), the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council General Assembly resolution 192 (III) of 19 November 1948. At the 407th meeting of the Council (8 February), 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 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 USSR proposed (S/1249) that its 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 by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 68 of 10 February 1949), and rejected both USSR draft resolutions (S/1246/Rev.1 and S/1249) by votes of 2 to none with 9 abstentions and 5 to none with 8 abstentions.

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

On 27 September 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 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. 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). The French draft resolution (S/1399/Rev.1) received 9 votes to 2 and was not adopted, as one of the negative votes was that of a permanent member. The USSR draft resolution (S/1405/Rev.1) received 3 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions and was not adopted, and the alternative French draft resolution (S/1408/Rev.1) received 8 votes to 2 with 1 abstention and was also not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

A draft resolution (S/1410) introduced by 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 by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 78 of 18 October 1949).

Also on 4 August 1949, the Chairman of the Commission for Conventional Armaments had transmitted (S/1371) 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 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 received 9 votes to 2 and was not adopted, one of the negative votes being that of a permanent member. The Council then adopted, by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions, a draft resolution (S/1403) submitted by the United Kingdom to transmit to the General Assembly the resolutions of the Commission and its report (resolution 77 of 11 October 1949).

On 6 December, the Secretary-General transmitted General Assembly resolution 300 (IV) of 5 December 1949 to the President of the Security Council (S/1429). A draft resolution (S/1445), submitted at the 461st meeting (13 January 1950) by 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) by 9 votes to none with 1 member not participating and the USSR absent (resolution 79 of 17 January 1950).

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

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) of 13 December 1950, 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 (resolution 97).

Since January 1952, the reports of the Disarmament Commission and of various other subsidiary bodies established in that field have been examined by the General Assembly.

6. APPOINTMENT OF A GOVERNOR FOR THE FREE TERRITORY OF TRIESTE

At its ninety-first meeting (10 January 1947), the Security Council formally accepted the responsibilities devolving upon it under the provisions of the peace treaty with Italy relevant to the establishment of a Free Territory of Trieste (resolution 16 of 10 January 1947, adopted by 10 votes to none with 1 abstention). Under article 11, paragraph 1 of the Permanent Statute of the territory (annex VI of the Treaty), the Council was to appoint the Governor of the Free Territory after consultation with the Governments of Yugoslavia and Italy. Discussions took place on several occasions in the course of 1947 on the question of the appointment of a Governor. However, these efforts, including the work of a committee established to collect information about candidates, failed to produce agreement in the Security Council. A request to the Governments of Italy and Yugoslavia to consult with each other also failed. After discussion early in 1948, the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, on 20 March 1948, issued a joint declaration (S/707) stating that in view of the evident impossibility of agreement on the selection of a Governor, the three Governments had decided to recommend the return of the Free Territory to Italian sovereignty and had proposed an additional protocol to the treaty of peace to provide for such a solution.

At the 411th meeting (17 February 1949), the USSR submitted a draft resolution (S/1200) providing for appointment of Colonel Flückiger as Governor, but

at the 424th meeting (10 May) this proposal was rejected, receiving 2 votes to none with 9 abstentions. It was resubmitted by the USSR in October 1953 (S/3105) but discussion of it was finally postponed at the 647th meeting (14 December 1953) pending the outcome of efforts to find a solution to the Trieste problem.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 14 December 1953. (See related item 15, below.)

7. THE EGYPTIAN QUESTION

On 8 July 1947, Egypt informed the Secretary-General (S/410) that British troops were being maintained in Egyptian territory against the unanimous will of the people and that 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 Egypt and the United Kingdom. After the failure of attempts at direct negotiations, the Egyptian Government brought the question to the Council, requesting the latter to direct (a) the total and immediate evacuation of British troops from Egypt, including the Sudan, and (b) the termination of the existing administrative regime in the Sudan.

The Council included this question in its agenda at the 159th meeting (17 July) and discussed it in the course of a series of meetings held in August and September 1947. Various proposals were submitted to the Council but all failed of adoption. At the 201st meeting (10 September), the President stated that the question would remain on the agenda and that the Council would reconsider it at the request of any of its members or of either of the parties.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 10 September 1947.

8. THE INDONESIAN QUESTION

The Indonesian question was brought before the Council by two letters dated 30 July 1947 from India (S/447) and Australia (S/449). The Indian Government drew the Council's attention to the situation in Indonesia as endangering the maintenance of international peace and security and requested it to take the necessary measures to put an end to the situation. The Australian letter stated that the hostilities in progress in Java and Sumatra constituted a breach of peace and urged the Council to take immediate action.

The question was included in the Council's agenda at the 171st meeting (31 July), when the representatives of India and the Netherlands were invited to participate in the discussion. The Council subsequently invited representatives of the Philippines, the Republic of Indonesia, Burma and Pakistan to participate, in addition to Australia and Belgium when those countries ceased to be members of the Council.

At the 173rd meeting (1 August), the Council adopted resolution 27 of 1 August 1947 calling upon the parties to cease hostilities forthwith, to settle their disputes by arbitration or other peaceful means and to keep the Security Council informed about the progress of the settlement.

On 3, 4 and 5 August, the parties informed the Council of orders by their Governments for a cessation of hostilities. At the 194th meeting (25 August), the Council adopted resolutions 30 and 31 of 25 August 1947. The first, adopted by 7 votes to none with 4 abstentions, provided for the establishment of a Commission composed of the consular representatives in Batavia of members of the Council to report on the situation in Indonesia. The other, adopted by 8 votes to none with 3 abstentions, tendered the good offices of the Council to the parties and expressed readiness to assist in the settlement of the dispute through a committee consisting of three of the members of the Council, each of the parties selecting one member with a third to be chosen by the two so selected. Belgium and Australia were subsequently selected by the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia to serve on the Committee, and the United States was selected as the third member.

At its 219th meeting (1 November), the Council adopted resolution 36 of 1 November 1947, by 7 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions, providing that the Committee of Good Offices should assist the parties in reaching agreement on an arrangement

to ensure the observance of the cease-fire resolution. In its first interim report (S/649) the Committee of Good Offices informed the Council of signature of what came to be known as the "Renville" Agreement, involving a truce agreement, an agreement on twelve political principles to form the agreed basis for discussion concerning the settlement of the dispute, and six additional political principles. At its 259th meeting the Council adopted resolution 40 of 28 February 1948 by 8 votes to none with 3 abstentions, noting the first interim report of the Committee and maintaining its offer of good offices. Another resolution (41 of 28 February 1948, adopted by 7 votes to none with 4 abstentions) requested the Committee to pay particular attention to political developments in Western Java and Madura. A series of reports was submitted by the Committee during 1948, ending with accounts of the collapse of direct talks between the parties in December 1948.

Following an emergency meeting (the 387th) on 20 December due to the resumption of military operations in Indonesia on 18 December, the Council, at the 392nd meeting, adopted resolution 63 of 24 December 1948 by 7 votes to none with 4 abstentions. It called upon the parties to cease hostilities forthwith and on the Netherlands immediately to release the President of the Republic of Indonesia and other political prisoners arrested since 18 December, and instructed the Committee of Good Offices to report urgently on recent events and on the parties' compliance with the Council's directives. (At that point the Committee of Good Offices had already submitted a number of reports on developments.) At the 395th meeting, the Council adopted resolutions 64 and 65 of 28 December 1948 by 8 votes to none with 3 abstentions and by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions, respectively. Resolution 64 reiterated the Council's call upon the Netherlands Government to set free the political prisoners forthwith, and resolution 65 requested the Consular Commission at Batavia to report as soon as possible on the situation.

Following further discussion between 7 and 28 January 1949, the Council, at its 406th meeting, voting by paragraphs, adopted resolution 67 of 28 January 1949. This resolution, inter alia, reiterated the Council's call upon the Netherlands Government to ensure the immediate discontinuance of all military operations and to release immediately and unconditionally all political prisoners arrested since

17 December; recommended that the parties undertake negotiations for the establishment of a federal, independent and sovereign United States of Indonesia at the earliest possible date, the transfer of sovereignty to take place no later than 1 July 1950. The Committee of Good Offices was renamed the United Nations Commission for Indonesia and was to assist the parties in these negotiations.

After receiving a report from the Commission (S/1270 and Corr.1 and Add. 1-3) on 1 March, the Council, at its 421st meeting (23 March) approved by 3 votes to none with 3 abstentions a directive to the Commission to the effect that the holding of a round table conference on the Indonesian question and participation in it by the Commission would be consistent with the purposes and objectives of resolution 67 of 28 January 1949. On 9 May and 4 August, the Commission submitted further reports (S/1320 and S/1373), dealing with a cease-fire ordered by the two Governments on 2 August, the restoration of the Government of the Republic of Jogjakarta, and the settling of time and conditions for the Round Table Conference at The Hague. A special report by the Commission (S/1417) on the Round Table Conference was submitted on 8 November. 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 would observe in Indonesia the implementation of these decisions.

The Council discussed this special report at meetings held on 12 and 13 December 1949 but was unable to adopt the proposals submitted to it.

The United Nations Commission for Indonesia submitted a series of reports in the course of 1950 (S/1449, S/1663, S/1842 and S/1873 and Corr.1) dealing with developments in connexion with implementation of the Hague agreements and other matters. On 3 April 1951, it submitted a report (S/2087) on its activities since the transfer of sovereignty on 27 December 1949. 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 13 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.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 12 December 1949.

9. VOTING PROCEDURE IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 2 January 1947, the Secretary-General transmitted to the Council the text (S/237) 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 the 197th meeting (27 August) the Council referred the matter to the Committee of Experts, which was instructed to submit to the Council its recommendations on the measures to be adopted in view of the Assembly's recommendations. The Committee was unable to submit a report on the matter.

On 2 December, the Secretary-General transmitted to the Council the text (S/620) of General Assembly resolution 117 (II) of 21 November 1947 concerning co-operation between the Interim Committee and a committee of the Council in the study of the problem of the voting procedure in the Council. A further Assembly resolution was transmitted to the Council on 25 April 1949 (S/1312). Resolution 267 (III) of 14 April 1949 recommended 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.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 18 October 1949.

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

On 17 February 1947, the United States submitted for the approval of the Security Council, in accordance with Article 83 of the Charter, the text (S/281) of a draft Trusteeship Agreement for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. After discussion at the 113th meeting (26 February) and subsequent meetings, the Council, at its 124th meeting, unanimously adopted resolution 21 of 2 April 1947 in which it approved the Agreement 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 are held between committees appointed by the Security and Trusteeship Councils and the resulting agreement was embodied in resolution 70 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 the time of circulation of the present statement the General Assembly, upon the recommendation of the Security Council, had approved the admission to membership in the United Nations 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 (19 April 1948), Israel (11 May 1949), Indonesia (28 September 1950),* Albania (14 December 1955), Jordan (14 December 1955), Ireland (14 December 1955), Portugal (14 December 1955), Hungary (14 December 1955), Italy, (14 December 1955), Austria (14 December 1955), Romania (14 December 1955), Bulgaria (14 December 1955), Finland (14 December 1955), Ceylon (14 December 1955), Nepal (14 December 1955), Libya (14 December 1955), Cambodia (14 December 1955), Laos (14 December 1955), Spain (14 December 1955), Sudan (12 November 1956), Morocco (12 November 1956), Tunisia (12 November 1956), Japan (18 December 1956), Ghana (8 March 1957), Malaysia (17 September 1957), Guinea (12 December 1958), Cameroon (20 September 1960), Togo (20 September 1960), Somalia (20 September 1960), Madagascar (20 September 1960), the Democratic Republic of the Congo (20 September 1960), Congo (Brazzaville) (20 September 1960), Dahomey (20 September 1960), Niger (20 September 1960), Upper Volta (20 September 1960), Ivory Coast (20 September 1960), Chad (20 September 1960), Gabon (20 September 1960), Central African Republic (20 September 1960), Cyprus (20 September 1960), Senegal (28 September 1960), Mali (28 September 1960), Nigeria (7 October 1960), Sierra Leone (27 September 1961), the Mongolian People's Republic (27 October 1961), Mauritania (27 October 1961), Tanganyika (14 December 1961),** Rwanda (18 September 1962), Burundi (18 September 1962), Jamaica (18 September 1962), Trinidad and Tobago (18 September 1962), Algeria (8 October 1962), Uganda (25 October 1962), Kuwait (14 May 1963), Zanzibar (16 December 1963),** Kenya (16 December 1963), Malawi (1 December 1964), Malta (1 December 1964), Zambia (1 December 1964), Gambia (21 September 1965), Maldives Islands (21 September 1965), and Singapore (21 September 1965).

At the 1287th meeting (21 June 1966) the Security Council adopted resolution 223 recommending to the General Assembly that Guyana be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

The following applications which have been discussed by the Security Council have so far failed to obtain its recommendation. the Republic of Korea, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Republic of Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

* Withdrawn from membership on 20 January 1965.

** On 1 May 1964 Tanganyika and Zanzibar became a single Member State as Tanzania.

12. THE PALESTINE QUESTION

A. Inclusion of the item in the agenda

At its 222nd meeting (9 December 1947), the Security Council took note of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 concerning the future Government of Palestine (Plan of Partition), in which the Assembly had, inter alia, addressed certain requests to the Council. Discussion was postponed and began at the 253rd meeting (24 February 1948), when the Council agreed to invite the Chairman of the Palestine Commission and the representatives of Egypt and Lebanon to take part in the discussion, and to invite the Jewish Agency for Palestine and the Arab Higher Committee to have representatives sit during the debate for the purpose of supplying such assistance as the Council might require.

At the 263rd meeting, the Council, voting by paragraphs, adopted resolution 42 of 5 March 1948, 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, the permanent members of the Council recommended that the Council should make it clear to the parties concerned that it 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 25 April 1948 of the Consular Truce Commission

At the 277th meeting the Council adopted two resolutions. Resolution 43 of 1 April 1948, adopted unanimously, called for a truce in Palestine, and resolution 44, adopted by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions, requested the Secretary-General to convoke a special session of the General Assembly to consider further the question of the future Government of Palestine.

Owing to failure to reach agreement on the basis for a truce in discussions between representatives of the Jewish Agency and of the Arab Higher Committee with the President of the Council, the Council at its 283rd meeting, by a vote of 9 to none with 2 abstentions, adopted resolution 46 of 17 April 1948 calling for a truce and outlining the proposals and machinery therefor. By resolution 48 of

23 April, adopted at the 287th meeting by 8 votes to none with 3 abstentions, it established a Truce Commission to assist in the implementation by the parties of resolution 46, to be composed of representatives of those members of the Council, except Syria, who had career consular officers in Jerusalem.

C. The Security Council truce resolution of 29 May 1948

The Truce Commission, in messages brought to the attention of the Council at its 289th meeting (7 May) reported on its negotiations for a truce in Jerusalem (S/741 and S/742) and informed the Council of the alleged invasion of Palestine by foreign forces (L, 732).

When the Mandate came to an end on 15 May, the State of Israel was proclaimed within the limits of the boundaries recommended in General Assembly resolution 181 (II), while the armed forces of the Arab League States moved across the borders of Palestine, resulting in widespread fighting, particularly in Jerusalem. At the 292nd meeting (15 May), the Council was informed of a message from the Jewish Agency (S/744) concerning the presence and activity of the Arab Legion in Palestine, and of another from Egypt (S/745) relating to the armed intervention of Egyptian forces in Palestine.

After addressing questionnaires to all the parties concerned at its 295th meeting (18 May) the Council at its 302nd meeting adopted resolution 49 of 22 May 1948, by 8 votes to none with 3 abstentions, calling upon the parties to issue cease-fire orders within thirty-six hours.

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 first be observed so that the cease-fire might lead to a just and lasting solution (S/792).

At its 310th meeting (29 May), the Council, voting by paragraphs, adopted resolution 50 calling, inter alia, for a cessation of hostilities for a period of four weeks, and instructing Count Folke Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator,* in concert with the Truce Commission, which was to be provided with a sufficient

* In resolution 186 (S-2) of 14 May 1948, the General Assembly had empowered a United Nations Mediator to promote a peaceful settlement of the future situation of Palestine. The Mediator was directed to conform with such instructions as the Assembly or the Security Council might issue.

number of military observers to supervise the cease-fire, 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 resolution 50 (S/804, S/805, S/810 and S/815). At the 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.

D. The Security Council truce resolution of 15 July 1948

The four-week truce in Palestine went into effect on 11 June 1948. Since it was to expire on 9 July, the Council, at its 331st meeting, by 8 votes to none with 3 abstentions, adopted resolution 53 of 7 July 1948 containing an urgent appeal to both sides for its prolongation; nevertheless, fighting was resumed.

Following written and oral reports by the Mediator, calling upon the Council to order an immediate cease-fire (S/888), at its 336th meeting, by 7 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions, the Council adopted resolution 54 of 15 July 1948 determining that the situation in Palestine was a threat to the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter, ordering a definite 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 Council, especially in the Negev area, it took various decisions to remedy the situation and to call upon the parties to negotiate an armistice (resolutions 56 of 19 August, 59 of 19 October, 60 of 29 October, 61 of 4 November, 62 of 16 November and 66 of 29 December 1948). On 17 September, the Council was informed of the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte, the Mediator. On 18 September (358th meeting), it unanimously adopted resolution 57 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

Under resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948 (S/1122), the General Assembly established a Palestine Conciliation Commission which was, inter alia, to assume

the functions 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.

On 6 January 1949, the Acting Mediator informed the Council (S/1187) that the Government of Egypt and the provisional Government of Israel had unconditionally accepted a proposal for a cease-fire in the Negev area to be immediately followed by direct negotiations under United Nations chairmanship, on the implementation of resolutions 61 and 62 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 and Rev.1), Lebanon (S/1296/Rev.1), Jordan (S/1302/Rev.1) and Syria (S/1355/Rev.1), on the other. On 21 July, the Acting Mediator submitted a final report (S/1357) on the status of the armistice negotiations and the truce in Palestine.

At the 437th meeting (11 August), the Council unanimously adopted resolution 72, paying tribute to Count Folke Bernadotte and, upon completion of their responsibilities, expressing appreciation to the Acting Mediator and the members of the staff of the Palestine Mission. By 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions it also adopted resolution 73 of 11 August 1949, in which, inter alia, it expressed the hope that the parties, by means of negotiations conducted by the Conciliation Commission, would soon achieve agreement on a final settlement and, meanwhile, reaffirmed the cease-fire order contained in the resolution of 15 July; relieved the Acting Mediator of any further responsibility under 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 Security Council on the observance of the cease-fire in Palestine.

F. The demilitarization of Jerusalem

The question of the 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 (25 October 1949) at the request of the

representative of Egypt. Further discussion was adjourned indefinitely pending discussion of the Palestine question by the Assembly and has not been resumed.

G. Complaint by Egypt in September 1950 concerning alleged violations of the Egyptian-Israel Armistice Agreement

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

At the 524th meeting (17 November), the Council, by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions, adopted resolution 89 of 17 November 1950 which called upon the parties to consent to handling of the complaints in accordance with the Armistice Agreements; requested the Israel-Egyptian Mixed Armistice Commission to give urgent attention to the Egyptian complaint of expulsion of thousands of Palestine Arabs and called upon both parties to give effect to any finding of that 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 UNTSO to recommend such steps as he considered necessary to control the movements of nomadic Arabs across international frontiers or armistice lines.

H. Complaint by Syria in April 1951 in connexion with the Huleh Marshes

At the 541st meeting (17 April 1951), the Council took up charges submitted by Syria and Israel alleging violations of the Syrian-Israel General Armistice Agreements. At the 545th meeting it adopted by 10 votes to none with 1 abstention resolution 92 of 8 May 1951 calling upon the parties to cease the fighting in the demilitarized zone. At the 547th meeting, by the same vote, it adopted resolution 93 of 18 May 1951 in which it, inter alia, 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 IEMAC for the continuation of the project; found that the aerial action taken by Israel 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 Council's resolution 54 of 15 July 1948; and 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 ISMAC should supervise their return and rehabilitation.

I. Complaint by Israel in July 1951 regarding the Suez Canal

On 11 July 1951, the representative of Israel requested urgent consideration of an item (S/2241) concerning restrictions imposed by Egypt on the passage of ships through the Suez Canal.

The Council took the question up at its 549th meeting (26 July).

Following considerable discussion, the Council, at its 558th meeting, by a vote of 8 to none with 3 abstentions, adopted resolution 95 of 1 September 1951 which found, inter alia, that the practice of interfering with passage through the 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 Canal and to cease all interference with such shipping beyond that essential to safety in the Canal itself and to the observance of the international conventions in force.

J. Compliance with and enforcement of the General Armistice Agreements: the incident at Qibiyà on 14-15 October 1953

On 17 October 1953, France, the United Kingdom and the United States (S/3109-3111) requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider 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.

After a series of meetings on the subject between 19 October and 24 November, the Council at its 642nd meeting, by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions, adopted resolution 101 in which, inter alia, it found that the retaliatory action at Qibiyà taken by armed forces of Israel was a violation of the cease-fire provision of resolution 54 of 15 July 1948 and was inconsistent with obligations under the

Armistice Agreements and the Charter; expressed the strongest censure of that action, calling upon Israel to take effective measures to prevent all such actions in the future; 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 Jordan to strengthen measures to prevent such crossings; recalled to Israel and Jordan their obligations under Council resolutions and the Armistice Agreement to prevent all acts of violence on either side of the demarcation line; reaffirmed that it was essential that the parties abide by those obligations; and requested the Chief of Staff to report within three months with such recommendations as he might consider appropriate, on compliance with and enforcement of the General Armistice Agreements.

K. Complaint by Syria concerning work on the west bank of the River Jordan in the demilitarized zone

On 16 October 1953 Syria complained (S/3108/Rev.1) that on 2 September Israel had started works in the demilitarized zone to divert the Jordan River with a view to making it flow through its own territory. That action, it was charged, violated the Armistice Agreement, and particularly article V. Following a report by the Chief of Staff (S/3122) at its 629th meeting, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 100 of 27 October 1953, stating that it deemed it desirable that the work started in the demilitarized zone should be postponed pending the urgent examination of the question by the Council, and took note with satisfaction of Israel's undertaking to do so. After further discussion at subsequent meetings between 30 October 1953 and 22 January 1964, the Council failed to adopt one of the proposals (S/3151/Rev.2) submitted to it, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member, and other proposals were not put to a vote.

L. Complaints by Israel and Egypt in January and February 1954

On 28 January 1954 Israel requested (S/3168) that a complaint concerning restriction 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. Those acts, it was charged constituted violations of the Council's resolution of 1 September 1951 and of the Armistice Agreement.

On 3 February, Egypt requested (S/3172) urgent consideration of a complaint concerning violations of the Armistice Agreement by Israel in the demilitarized zone of El-Auja. At the 657th meeting (4 February) the Council decided to consider the two complaints consecutively and discussed the first at a series of meetings in February and March 1954. At the 664th meeting (27 March) the Council failed to adopt a draft resolution (S/3188) owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

M. Complaints by Jordan and Israel in March and April 1954

On 30 March 1954, Jordan charged (S/3192) that on 28 March a large Israel military force had attacked the Jordan village of Nahhalin, killing nine and wounding eighteen civilians. The Mixed Armistice Commission had adopted a resolution condemning Israel in the strongest terms and calling upon the Israel authorities to take effective measures to prevent such aggressions and to apprehend and punish those responsible.

On 5 April Israel requested (S/3196) consideration of four complaints concerning repudiation by Jordan of its obligations under the Armistice Agreement, and an armed attack on an Israeli bus near Scorpion Pass on 17 March. After discussion at meetings in April and May 1954, a draft resolution (S/3209) was submitted by the representative of Lebanon at the 670th meeting (4 May). At the 671st meeting (12 May), the President drew attention to a preliminary question raised by Israel (S/3210) relating to the basis for participation in the discussion of Jordan, which was a non-member State. On 26 May (S/3219), the representative of Jordan informed the President of the Council that he was not empowered to represent his Government before the Council or to take part in the current discussion.

On 19 June, the Chief of Staff of UNTSO transmitted reports on the Scorpion Pass (S/3252) and Nahhalin incidents (S/3251).

N. The S.S. Bat Galim

On 28 September 1954, Israel informed the Council (S/3296) of the seizure of the Israel vessel S.S. Bat Galim at the southern entrance of the Suez Canal, which was but the latest example of the Egyptian Government's disregard for the Council and its resolutions, especially resolution 95 of 1 September 1951. On 29 September Egypt replied (S/3297) that the vessel in question had opened fire without provocation on Egyptian fishing boats within Egyptian territorial waters. The Egyptian authorities had taken preliminary measures of arresting the crew and ordering an immediate inquiry to determine responsibility for the incident.

The question was then discussed by the Council between 14 October 1954 and 13 January 1955, during which time the Council received a report (S/3323) from the Chief of Staff of UNTSO concerning MAC proceedings on the subject. On 4 December 1954, Egypt informed (S/3326) the Council that the charges of murder, attempted murder and unlawful carrying of weapons had been set aside, that the seamen would be released as soon as the necessary formalities had been concluded and that it was prepared to release the seized cargo immediately.

At the 688th meeting (30 January 1955), the President summed up the discussion in the Council and stated that it was evident that most representatives regarded resolution 95 of 1 September 1951 as having continuing validity and effect. He noted expressions of hope that a continued attitude of conciliation on both sides would speedily bring about agreement on the arrangements for release of the ship and cargo.

O. Complaints by Egypt and Israel in March 1955 concerning incidents in the Gaza area

On 2 March 1955 Egypt requested (S/3367) a meeting of the Council to consider a complaint concerning violent and premeditated aggression committed on 28 February by Israel armed forces against Egyptian armed forces near Gaza, causing many casualties including twenty-nine dead and thirty-two wounded.

On 3 March, Israel requested (S/3368) consideration of a complaint of continuous violations by Egypt of the Armistice Agreement and of resolutions of the Security Council.

In a report dated 17 March (S/3373), the Chief of Staff informed the Council that the MAC had decided that the Israel attack constituted a violation of the Armistice Agreement. Infiltration from Egyptian-controlled territory, he added, was one of the main causes of the prevailing tension, and he suggested that the parties meet informally to consider measures to decrease tension along the demarcation line.

At the 695th meeting (28 March), France, the United Kingdom and the United States submitted two joint draft resolutions (S/3378 and S/3379). The first provided that the Council condemn the attack on Gaza; call again upon Israel to take all necessary measures to prevent such action; and express its conviction that maintenance of the Armistice Agreement was threatened by any deliberate violation and that no progress toward 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 resolution 54 of 15 July 1948. The second draft resolution requested the Chief of Staff to continue consultations with the two Governments on practical steps to preserve security in the area; noted that he had made certain proposals to that effect; and called upon the Governments of Egypt and Israel to co-operate with the Chief of Staff, 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 those lines. At the 694th and 695th meetings both these draft resolutions were adopted unanimously (resolutions 106 of 29 March and 107 of 30 March 1955).

On 4 April, Israel brought to the Council (S/3385) a complaint concerning repeated attacks by Egypt and especially (1) the armed attack at Patish on 4 March; (2) frequent mining and firing on Israel army units patrolling the border; and (3) an attack on an Israel army patrol in the village of Nahal-Oz on 3 April. On 14 April the Chief of Staff dealt (S/3390) with these and other incidents and stressed the desirability of instituting joint patrols along the demarcation line.

After discussion at the 697th and 698th meetings (6 and 19 April) the President appealed to both sides to give full effect to resolutions 106 and 107 of 29 and 30 March.

P. Complaints by Israel and Egypt in August and September 1955 concerning incidents in the Gaza area

In a series of communications beginning on 29 August 1955 (S/3425-3428), Israel informed the Council of new and grave outbreaks of violence in the Gaza area starting on 22 August.

On 6 September Egypt informed the Council (S/3431) that since 22 August Israel armed forces had embarked upon vast military operations culminating on 31 August in an incident in the area of Khan-Yunis.

Meanwhile, on 5 September, the Chief of Staff (S/3430) had expressed the view 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.

At its 700th meeting (8 September) the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 108, calling inter alia upon both parties to take all steps necessary to bring about order and tranquillity in the area; endorsing the view of the Chief of Staff that the armed forces of both parties should be separated by measures such as those he had proposed; declaring that freedom of movement must be afforded to United Nations Observers in the area; and calling upon both parties to meet with the Chief of Staff and to co-operate fully with him.

Q. Complaints by Syria and Israel in December 1955 concerning incidents on Lake Tiberias

On 13 December 1955, Syria informed the Council (S/3505) of a large-scale attack by Israel armed forces on the night of 11-12 December in the area 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-715th meetings). On 21 December, Israel informed the Council (S/3518) that evidence found on Syrian prisoners proved that Syrian outposts had been instructed to fire upon Israel boats within 250 to 400 metres of the shore. On 15 and 30 December, the Chief of Staff reported (S/3516 and Add.1) on the background of the incident and made certain suggestions to prevent further incidents from arising.

Three proposals were submitted to the Council in its discussion: a Syrian draft resolution (S/3518), subsequently amended by the USSR; a joint draft

resolution by France, the United Kingdom and the United States (S/3530/Rev.3); and a draft resolution by Yugoslavia (S/3536). The Council gave priority to the three-Power draft and adopted it unanimously at the 715th meeting (resolution 111 of 19 January 1956). The resolution, inter alia, condemned the Israel attack of 11 December and requested the Chief of Staff to pursue his suggestions for improving the situation in the area of Lake Tiberias.

R. The status of compliance given to the General Armistice Agreements

On 20 March 1956, the United States requested (S/3561) 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. At the 717th meeting (26 March), the United States submitted draft resolution (S/3562). The Council discussed the question at six meetings from 26 March to 4 April (717th to 722nd meetings). After rejecting a number of amendments (S/3574) to the draft, the United States proposal was adopted unanimously at the 722nd meeting (resolution 113 of 4 April 1956). Among other things, it provided that the Council: considered that the situation prevailing between the parties concerning the enforcement of the Armistice Agreements and the compliance given to resolutions 107 of 30 March 1955, 108 of 8 September 1955 and 111 of 19 January 1956 was such that its continuance was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security; requested 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 resolutions under reference; requested the Secretary-General to arrange with the parties for the adoption of any measures which, after discussion with them and with the Chief of Staff, he considered would reduce tensions along the Armistice Demarcation Line.

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 Council texts of communications related to negotiations between him and the authorities in Egypt and Israel (S/3584, S/3586 and S/3587), as well as a progress report (S/3594). A full account of his mission was given in his report of 9 May (S/3596) which described the unconditional assurances from the parties regarding a cease-fire and agreements reached on arrangements to ensure compliance with the Armistice Agreements.

The Council discussed this report in six meetings from 29 May to 4 June (723rd to 728th meetings). A United Kingdom draft resolution (S/3600 and Revs. 1 and 2) provided, as revised in the course of the debate, that the Council would, inter alia: commend the Secretary-General and the parties on the progress achieved; declare that the parties to the Armistice Agreements should speedily carry out the measures already agreed upon and should co-operate with the Secretary-General and the Chief of Staff to put into effect their further practical proposals, pursuant to resolution 113 of 4 April, with a view to full implementation of that resolution and for compliance with the Armistice Agreements; declare that full freedom of movement of United Nations observers must be respected in all areas along the Demarcation Lines, in the Demilitarized Zones and in the Defensive Areas as defined in the Armistice Agreements; endorse the Secretary-General's view that 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; request the Chief of Staff to continue to carry out his observation of the cease-fire, pursuant to the Council's resolution of 11 August 1949, and to report to the 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; call upon the parties to take the steps necessary to carry out the resolution; and request the Secretary-General to continue his good offices with the parties, and to report to the Council, as appropriate. At the 728th meeting this proposal was unanimously adopted (resolution 114 of 4 June 1956).

The Secretary-General and the Chief of Staff of UNTSO continued to exert efforts to implement specific proposals designed to support the cease-fire, and the Secretary-General again visited the area between 18 and 23 July. Subsequently, a number of reports were submitted to the Council on the situation (S/3632, S/3638, S/3658, S/3659, S/3660, S/3670 and S/3685).

S. Complaints by Jordan and Israel in October 1956

On 15 October, Jordan requested (S/3679) an early meeting of the Council to consider the situation arising from an attack by Israel armed forces on 11 October against four Jordanian villages, as well as an attack carried out on 25-26 September.

On 17 October, Israel requested (S/3682) consideration at the same meeting of a complaint alleging persistent violations by Jordan of the Armistice Agreements and of the cease-fire pledge made to the Secretary-General on 26 April 1956.

The Council considered these complaints at its 744th and 745th meetings (19 and 25 October), but no decision was taken.

T. Steps for the immediate cessation of the military action of Israel in Egypt

On 29 October 1956, the United States (S/3706), citing information that the armed forces of Israel had penetrated deep into Egyptian territory in the Sinai area that day, requested that the Council meet 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 Council considered this question at its 748th-749th and 750th meetings (30 October). At the first of these meetings a United States draft resolution (S/3710) was presented, under which the Council would call upon Israel and Egypt immediately to cease fire; call upon all Members, inter alia, to refrain from the use or threat of force in the area and to refrain from giving new military, economic or financial assistance to Israel so long as it had not complied with the resolution; and request 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 749th meeting. It received 7 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions, and was not adopted owing to the negative votes of two permanent members.

At its 750th meeting the Council also voted on a USSR 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. This draft resolution also received 7 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions, and was not adopted owing to the negative votes of two permanent members. (The Council then proceeded to consider the next item on the agenda of the meeting concerning the Egyptian complaint against the United Kingdom and France, summarized below under item 32.)

U. Complaint by Syria in May 1957

On 13 May 1957, Syria requested (S/3827) that the Council consider the situation arising from the construction of a bridge in the Demilitarized Zone, charging that it would give Israel a military advantage and contravene the provisions of the Israel-Syrian General Armistice Agreement. The Council discussed the question at its 780th to 782nd meetings (25 to 28 May), during which it had before it a report on the subject (C/3815) by the Acting Chief of Staff of UNTSO. Following suggestions in the debate, the Acting Chief of Staff submitted a further report (S/3844) on 27 June and 7 August (S/3844/Add.1).

V. Complaints by Jordan and Israel in September 1957

On 4 September 1957, Jordan charged (S/3878) Israel with violations of the Armistice Agreement by carrying out digging operations in No-Man's Land in the Jerusalem sector. On 5 September, Israel requested (S/3883) consideration of charges of violations by Jordan of the Armistice Agreements and, in particular, of Article VIII thereof.

Following requests by the Council at its 787th and 788th meetings (6 September), the Acting Chief of Staff of UNTSO submitted reports dated 23 September (S/3892 and Add.1 and 2) and 31 October (S/3913) in connexion with these complaints.

After further discussion, the Council, at its 809th meeting, unanimously adopted resolution 127 of 22 January 1958 under which, inter alia, it directed the Chief of Staff to regulate activities within the zone between the Armistice Demarcation Lines, subject to such arrangements as might be made pursuant to the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement and the last paragraph below, bearing in mind ownership of properties there, it being understood that, unless otherwise mutually agreed, Israelis should not be allowed to use Arab-owned properties and Arabs should not be allowed to use Israel-owned properties; directed the Chief of Staff to continue a survey of property records with a view to determining property ownership in the zone; endorsed the recommendations of the Acting Chief of Staff to the end that: (a) the parties should discuss through the MAC civilian activities in the zone; (b) in order to create an

atmosphere more conducive to 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 provision made for regulation of activities in the zone; (c) such discussions should be completed within two months.

W. Complaint by Israel in December 1958 regarding an incident in the Huleh area

On 4 December 1958, Israel submitted a complaint (S/4123) to the Council for its urgent consideration concerning an alleged act of aggression committed on 3 December by the armed forces of the United Arab Republic against Israel territory in the Huleh area in northeast Galilee, which it was charged was only the latest and most serious of a number of recent attacks by Syrian forces.

The Security Council included this question on its agenda at the 841st meeting (8 December). A report (S/4124) by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization concerning the incident was circulated on that date.

Following further discussion of the matter at the 844th meeting (15 December), the Council adjourned consideration after the President had summed up the debate by stating that the authority of the United Nations should be respected and the parties should continue their co-operation with the Chief of Staff of the UNTSO in the spirit of the Armistice Agreement.

X. Complaint by Israel in January 1959 concerning an incident on the Israel-Syrian border

On 26 January 1959, Israel submitted to the Council (S/4151) a complaint of the renewal of aggression by United Arab Republic armed forces on the Israel-Syrian border on 23 January, when a shepherd from the village of Maaleh Habashan in Galilee had been killed.

On 29 January, the Secretary-General circulated a report (S/4154) by the Chief of Staff of UNTSO concerning the incident of 23 January.

The Security Council included the question in its agenda at its 845th meeting (30 January), and after discussion adjourned without taking any decision.

Y. Complaint by Jordan in April 1961

On 1 April 1961, Jordan complained (S/4777) that the contemplated Israel military parade to be held on 20 April in the Israel-occupied part of Jerusalem would be an act of military provocation and a violation of the Armistice Agreement,

which would be taken in defiance of a prior decision of the MAC calling a dress rehearsal for the parade on 16-17 March a breach of the Agreement. The contemplated action would endanger international peace and security. On 2 April, Israel replied (S/4778) that the allegation of danger to peace and security was without foundation, Jordan already having received full assurance regarding the purely ceremonial character of the parade.

The Council considered the complaint at the 947th-949th meetings (6, 10 and 11 April).

On 10 April, a joint draft resolution was submitted by Ceylon and the United Arab Republic (S/4784), under the operative part of which the Council would: (1) endorse the decision of the MAC of 20 March 1961; and (2) urge Israel to comply with that decision.

On 11 April, the United States submitted an amendment (S/4785) to add a third operative paragraph requesting the members of the MAC to co-operate so as to assure compliance with the Armistice Agreement.

At the 949th meeting, the United States amendment was adopted by 7 votes in favour, with 4 abstentions, and the joint draft resolution, as so amended, was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 3 abstentions, as resolution 162 of 11 April 1961.

On 17 and 19 April, the Secretary-General circulated his report (S/4792) and that of the Chief of Staff of UNTSO (S/4792/Add.1) concerning compliance with the Armistice Agreement.

Z. Complaints by Syria and Israel in March 1962

On 20 March 1962, the representative of Syria requested (S/5096) a meeting of the Security Council, charging that acts of aggression committed by Israel on the Syrian frontier and in the demilitarized zone threatened the peace and security of the region.

On 21 March, the representative of Israel presented (S/5098) charges of a recurrence of acts of aggression and provocation by Syrian armed forces against citizens and territory of Israel, and requested an early meeting of the Council. In a further letter dated 22 March (S/5100), he forwarded additional charges of a similar character.

The Security Council considered the two complaints at the 999th-1006th meetings (28 March, 3, 5, 6 and 9 April). Before the Council was a report (S/5102) dated 26 March from the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization reviewing the recent dangerous developments in the Lake Tiberias area. The Council agreed to request the Chief of Staff of UNTSO to come to New York in order to be available for consultations. Also before the Council were draft resolutions submitted by Syria (S/5107/Rev.1) and Israel (S/5109) on 3 and 4 April respectively, which were not put to the vote.

At the 1001st meeting (4 April), the replies of the Chief of Staff to questions raised by the representatives of Syria, the United Arab Republic, Ghana and the United States at the previous meeting were distributed and annexed to the official records of the Council.

On 6 April, the United Kingdom and the United States of America submitted a draft resolution (S/5110/Corr.1), the operative part of which provided that the Council would: (1) deplore the hostile exchanges between Syria and Israel starting on 8 March 1962, and call upon the two Governments concerned to comply with their obligations under Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter by refraining from the threat as well as the use of force; (2) reaffirm resolution 111 of 19 January 1956 which condemned Israel military action in breach of the General Armistice Agreement, whether or not undertaken by way of retaliation; (3) determine that the Israel attack of 16-17 March 1962 constituted a flagrant violation of that resolution and call upon Israel scrupulously to refrain from such action in the future; (4) endorse the measures recommended by the Chief of Staff for the strengthening of the Truce Supervision Organization in its tasks of maintaining and restoring the peace and of detecting and deterring future incidents, and call upon the Israel and Syrian authorities to assist the Chief of Staff in their early implementation; (5) call upon both parties to abide scrupulously by the cease-fire arranged by the Chief of Staff on 17 March 1962; (6) call for strict observance of article V of the General Armistice Agreement which provided for the exclusion of armed forces from the demilitarized zone, and annex 4 of that Agreement, which set limits on forces in the defensive area, and call upon the Governments of Israel and Syria to co-operate with the Chief of Staff in eliminating any violations thereof; (7) call upon the two Governments to co-operate with the Chief of Staff

in carrying out his responsibilities under the General Armistice Agreement and the pertinent resolutions of the Security Council and urge that all steps necessary for reactivating the Mixed Armistice Commission and for making full use of the Mixed Armistice machinery be promptly taken; and (8) request the Chief of Staff to report as appropriate concerning the situation.

At the 1006th meeting, the United States-United Kingdom draft resolution was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention as resolution 171 of 9 April 1962.

AA. Complaints by Israel and Syria in August 1963

On 20 August 1963, Israel charged (S/5394) that on 19 August a group of at least ten Syrian soldiers had ambushed and attacked three unarmed members of an Israel settlement at Almagor in the Galilee, resulting in the murder of two of the farmers. On 21 August, Syria complained (S/5395) that on 20 August fifteen Israel armoured cars had opened fire on Syrian positions from the Israel settlement of El Dardara within the demilitarized zone.

On 24 August, the Secretary-General circulated to the members of the Security Council a report from the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), in which he described the events leading up to the situation and the incidents complained of (S/5401/Add.1-4).

At the 1057th meeting (23 August), the Security Council decided to consider the two complaints simultaneously. It discussed the matter at the 1057th to 1063rd meetings (23 August to 3 September).

A draft resolution (S/5407) was submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States on 29 August under the terms of which the Council would, inter alia, condemn the wanton murder of two Israel citizens on 19 August and call the Syrian Government's attention to evidence in the Secretary-General's report that those responsible for the killings appeared to have entered Israel territory from the direction of the Jordan River. The draft resolution also called upon the parties to offer the Chief of Staff all co-operation in carrying out his proposed measures to restore tranquillity in the area.

On 30 August, Morocco submitted amendments (S/5410/Rev.1) to the draft resolution proposing, inter alia, that the first paragraph should read "regrets the death of two persons at Almagor on 19 August 1963", that the paragraph implying

Syria's responsibility for the murder should be deleted and that the draft resolution should take note of the presence of an armoured personnel carrier in the Israel defensive area and of Israel's failure since 1951 to co-operate with the Syrian-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission.

At the 1063rd meeting (3 September), the Moroccan amendments were put to the vote, but were not adopted. The vote was 2 in favour and none against, with 9 abstentions. The United Kingdom-United States draft resolution was then put to the vote. It received 8 votes in favour and 2 against, with 1 abstention. The draft resolution was not adopted since one of the negative votes was cast by a permanent member of the Council.

BB. Complaints by Syria and Israel in November 1964

Syria and Israel, on 14 and 15 November 1964, respectively, requested (S/6044 and S/6046) an urgent meeting of the Security Council, charging each other with aggression along the border.

At the 1162nd meeting (16 November), the Security Council decided to consider the two complaints simultaneously. It discussed the matter at the 1162nd, 1164th, 1169th, 1179th and 1182nd meetings held between 16 November and 21 December.

On 24 November, the Secretary-General circulated the Chief of Staff's report (S/6061 and Corr.1-3 and Add.1) on the incident of 13 November 1964.

A draft resolution (S/6085/Rev.1) was submitted by Morocco on 8 December, whereby the Council would, inter alia, condemn the Israel air action against Syrian territory on 13 November 1964, call upon Israel to prevent the repetition of such actions, and call upon Syria and Israel to apply the provisions of the Armistice Agreement and to participate in the meetings of the Mixed Armistice Commission.

On 17 December, the United Kingdom and the United States submitted a draft resolution (S/6113) whereby the Council would deplore the renewal of military action on the Israel-Syrian border on 13 November 1964 and recommend that the parties, in the light of the observations made by the Chief of Staff in his report:

(1) co-operate fully with the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission in his efforts to maintain peace in the area; (2) co-operate in the continuation of the work, begun in 1963, of survey and demarcation, commencing in the area of Tel-El-Qadi and continuing to completion, as suggested by the Chief of Staff; and (3) participate fully in the meetings of the Mixed Armistice Commission. The draft

resolution also requested the Secretary-General to inform the Council on 31 March 1965 of the progress that had been made towards implementing these suggestions.

At the 1179th meeting (17 December), the Moroccan draft resolution was put to the vote, but was not adopted. The vote was 3 in favour and none against, with 8 abstentions.

At the 1182nd meeting (21 December), Morocco introduced five amendments (S/6116) to the joint draft resolution, proposing, inter alia, that the Security Council should, in operative paragraph 1, deplore Israel's violation of the Armistice Demarcation Line, as well as Israel's unjustified resort to aerial action. Another amendment called for the rewording of paragraph 2 (b) to the effect that the suggested survey would include the entire Armistice Demarcation Line.

At the same meeting the Moroccan amendments were put to the vote paragraph by paragraph. Two of the amendments were adopted but those described above failed of adoption.

The draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States, as amended, was then put to the vote. It received 8 votes in favour and 3 against, and was not adopted since one of the negative votes was cast by a permanent member of the Council.

13. THE INDIA-PAKISTAN QUESTION

A. Inclusion of the question in the agenda

On 1 January 1948, India, under Article 35 of the Charter, requested the Security Council (S/628) 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. On 6 January (226th meeting), the question was included in the agenda and representatives of India and Pakistan were invited to participate in the discussion. On 15 January, Pakistan replied (S/646) to India's charges and levelled charges against India on which the Council was requested to take action. On 20 January, Pakistan requested (S/655) consideration of matters in the Pakistan complaint other than the Jammu and Kashmir question. In consequence, the Security Council decided on 22 January (231st meeting) to change the title of the item from the "Jammu and Kashmir question" to the "India-Pakistan question".

B. Establishment of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan

On 15 to 17 January (227th to 229th meetings), the Council heard statements by the two parties concerned and then adopted by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions a draft resolution by Belgium (S/651) calling upon the parties to take all measures to improve the situation (resolution 38 of 17 January 1948). It also agreed that the President of the Council should meet with representatives of the two Governments to try to find common ground for a settlement.

On 20 January (230th meeting), the President reported to the Council and submitted a draft resolution (S/654) to establish a Commission of three members to investigate the facts 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. Resolution 39 of 20 January 1948 was adopted by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions.

At the 286th meeting, the Council adopted paragraph by paragraph resolution 47 of 21 April 1948, originally submitted by Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia, the United Kingdom and the United States. It provided, inter alia, for enlarging membership of the Commission established by the resolution of 20 January to five and recommended 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. On 23 April (287th meeting), Belgium and Colombia were nominated as the two additional members of the Commission, the first two being Argentina (chosen by Pakistan) and Czechoslovakia (chosen by India). On 7 May (289th meeting), in view of the failure of Argentina and Czechoslovakia to agree upon a third member, the President designated the United States as the third member of the Commission.

At the 304th meeting, the Council by 8 votes to none with 3 abstentions adopted a modified version of a Syrian draft resolution (S/819) in which it directed the Commission to proceed without delay to the area of dispute and to study and report to the Council on the matters raised in the Pakistan letter of 15 January (resolution 51 of 3 June 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 13 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 declared by the two Governments 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 stated at the 457th meeting (17 December) 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, by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions, 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, the Council, at its 470th meeting, by 8 votes to none with 2 abstentions and 1 member absent, adopted resolution 80 of 14 March 1959, originally submitted by Cuba, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States. It provided inter alia 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 within five months 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. At the 471st meeting (12 April), the Security Council, by 8 votes to none with 2 abstentions and 1 member absent, appointed Sir Owen Dixon, of Australia, as United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan.

D. Report of the first United Nations Representative, Sir Owen Dixon, and appointment of a successor, Mr. Frank 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.

At the 503rd meeting (26 September), the President of the Security Council expressed the Council's gratitude to the United Nations Representative and its agreement to relieve him of his mission in accordance with Sir Owen Dixon's request.

On 14 December (S/1942), 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.

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 by 8 votes to none with 3 abstentions at the 539th meeting (30 March). Resolution 91 of 30 March 1951, inter alia, reminded 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, provided for appointment of a United Nations Representative to succeed Sir Owen Dixon, and instructed 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, by a vote of 7 to none with 4 abstentions.

E. Reports submitted to the Security Council by Mr. Graham

Six reports were submitted to the Security Council by the United Nations Representative, Mr. Graham (15 October 1951 - S/2375 and Corr.1 and 2; 18 December 1951 - S/2448; 22 April 1952 - S/2611 and Corr.1; 16 September 1952 - S/2703 and Corr.1; 27 March 1953 - S/2967 and 28 March 1958 - S/3984). 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) and continued at the 566th meeting, when it adopted, by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions, resolution 96 of 10 November 1951, originally submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States, requesting the United Nations Representative to continue his efforts.

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 to 611th meetings (10 October, 6 November, 5, 8, 16 and 23 December 1952), the Security Council adopted by 9 votes to none with 1 abstention and 1 member not participating, resolution 98 of 23 December 1952 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 3,000 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 to 21 February

(761st to 774th meetings). At the 765th meeting, the Security Council adopted, by 10 votes to none with 1 abstention, resolution 122 of 24 January 1957, originally submitted by Australia, Colombia, Cuba, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. 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 resolution 91 of 30 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 Jammua and Kashmir or any part thereof, or action by the parties concerned in support of any such action by that 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.

At the 773rd meeting (20 February), a draft resolution (S/3787) submitted jointly by Australia, Cuba, the United Kingdom and the United States, as well as amendments by the USSR and Colombia (S/3789 and S/3791 and Rev.1 and Corr.1), 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 was voted upon at the 774th meeting and was adopted by 10 votes to none, with one abstention as resolution 123 of 21 February 1957. 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.

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.

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, 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, inter alia, thanking Mr. Jarring, observing that the Governments of India and Pakistan recognized and accepted the commitments undertaken by them in the two UNCIP resolutions, and 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, Sweden submitted amendments (S/3920) which would replace the reference in the preamble to "commitments" by a reference to resolution 38 of 17 January 1948, 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 delete operative paragraph 3.

At the 808th meeting, the amendments and the draft resolution, as amended, were each adopted by 10 votes in favour, with 1 abstention as resolution 126 of 2 December 1957.

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 resolution 126 of 2 December 1957, and on his recommendations which had not been accepted. He expressed the hope that a high-level conference between the two Governments would contribute towards progress.

G. Consideration in 1962

On 11 January 1962, Pakistan requested (S/5058) a meeting of the Security Council to consider further action in the dispute concerning the State of Jammu and Kashmir, in the light of the last report of the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan. Pakistan stated that it was forced to do this because efforts at the highest level for direct negotiations with India had failed. Moreover, recent statements by responsible people in India were a great threat to the peace.

On 16 January, India stated (S/5060 and Corr.1) that the Security Council should refuse to comply with Pakistan's request because India considered that the eve of its general elections was hardly the proper time for direct negotiations or for discussion of the situation in the Security Council. India also stated that Pakistan's allegations that efforts for direct negotiations had failed and that a threat to the peace had arisen were unfounded. So far as India was concerned, the avenues for direct negotiations had not been finally closed. Moreover, it was Pakistan which was threatening peace in the area by instigating attempts at subversion and sabotage.

On 29 January, Pakistan stated (S/5068) that a very grave situation prevailed between India and Pakistan which called for immediate consideration by the Security Council and requested the Council to take up the question as an urgent matter.

At the 990th meeting (1 February), the Security Council agreed, without objection, to include the item in its agenda, but deferred further consideration until the 1007th to 1016th meetings held between 21 April and 22 June 1962.

At the 1016th meeting, Ireland submitted a draft resolution (S/5134) whereby the Security Council, inter alia, having considered the report of the United Nations Representative, Dr. F. Graham and expressing its thanks to him, noting with satisfaction the pledges made by the two parties that their Governments would not resort to force and being conscious of the responsibility of the Security Council under the Charter for helping the parties to reach a peaceful solution, would remind both parties of the principles contained in resolution 38 of 17 January 1948, and in the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan dated 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949; urge the Governments of India and Pakistan to enter into negotiations on the question at the earliest convenient time with the view to its ultimate settlement in accordance with Article 33 and other relevant provisions of the Charter; appeal to the two Governments to take all possible measures to ensure the creation and maintenance of an atmosphere favourable to the promotion of negotiations; urge the two Governments to refrain from making any statements, or taking any action, which might aggravate the situation; and request the Acting Secretary-General to provide the two Governments with such services as they might request for the purpose of carrying out the terms of the resolution.

At the 1016th meeting (22 June), the draft resolution received 7 votes in favour to 2 against, with 2 abstentions, and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.

H. Consideration in 1964

On 16 January 1964, Pakistan requested (S/5517) a meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation that had arisen in the State of Jammu and Kashmir as a consequence of the steps that India was reported to be taking to "destroy the special status of the state of Jammu and Kashmir".

On 24 January, India replied (S/5522) that constitutional arrangements between the state of Jammu and Kashmir and the Indian Union were purely an internal matter.

The Council considered the matter at the 1087th to 1093rd, 1104th and 1105th, and 1112th to 1117th meetings held between 3 February and 18 May 1964.

At the 1117th meeting on 18 May, the President set forth six points where agreement existed among the members of the Council and the different views that had been expressed on another point. Among other things, the members agreed in expressing hope that the parties would take measures to re-establish an atmosphere of moderation and would resume their contacts in order to resolve their differences by negotiation. While a number of members of the Security Council felt that the Secretary-General of the United Nations might eventually give useful assistance to the parties to facilitate the resumption of negotiations on the question of Jammu and Kashmir or to assist them in carrying out these negotiations if they should meet with any difficulties, other members of the Council expressed the view that the negotiations between India and Pakistan might be complicated by the intervention of any outside elements, and that the parties should be left to come to agreement on the very principle of turning to the Secretary-General. The India-Pakistan question would remain on the agenda of the Council.

I. Consideration in 1965

At its 1237th meeting (4 September 1965), the Security Council resumed consideration of the India-Pakistan question.

The Council had before it telegrams dated 1 September from the Secretary-General addressed to the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan (S/6647) appealing for restoration of the Cease-Fire Agreement and a report by the Secretary-General (S/6651) on the current situation in Kashmir with particular reference to the Cease-Fire Agreement, the Cease-Fire Line and the functioning of the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (S/6651).

Malaysia introduced a joint draft resolution sponsored by Bolivia, the Ivory Coast, Jordan, Malaysia, the Netherlands and Uruguay (S/6657).

Resolution 209 of 4 September 1965 was adopted unanimously. In it the Council called upon the Governments of India and Pakistan to take forthwith all steps for an immediate cease-fire; to respect the Cease-Fire Line and have all armed personnel of each party withdrawn to its own side of the line; and to co-operate fully with UNMOGIP in its task of supervising the observance of the cease-fire;

and, finally, requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council within three days on the implementation of the resolution.

At the 1238th meeting (6 September), Malaysia introduced a joint draft resolution, sponsored by Bolivia, the Ivory Coast, Jordan, Malaysia, the Netherlands and Uruguay (S/6662) which was unanimously adopted as resolution 210 of 6 September 1965. In its operative part the Council called upon the parties to cease hostilities immediately in the entire area of conflict and promptly withdraw all armed personnel to the positions held by them before 5 August 1965; requested the Secretary-General to exert every possible effort to give effect to this resolution and resolution 209 of 4 September 1965, to take all measures possible to strengthen UNMOGIP and to keep the Council promptly and currently informed on the implementation of the resolutions and on the situation in the area; and decided to keep this issue under urgent and continuous review so that the Council might determine what further steps might be necessary to secure peace and security in the area.

Discussion continued at the 1239th to 1241st meetings (17 and 18 September), when the Council had before it a preliminary report by the Secretary-General on his visits to the Governments of India and Pakistan (S/6683), his second report on his mission, presented to the Council at its 1239th meeting (S/6686), and his report on the military situation in the area of conflict between India and Pakistan (S/6687).

At the 1242nd meeting, the Netherlands introduced a draft resolution (S/6694) which was adopted by the Council by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention as resolution 211 of 20 September 1965. Under its operative part the Council demanded that a cease-fire should take effect on Wednesday, 22 September 1965, at 0700 hours GMT and called upon both Governments to issue orders for a cease-fire at that moment and a subsequent withdrawal of all armed personnel back to the positions held by them before 5 August 1965; requested the Secretary-General to provide the necessary assistance to ensure supervision of the cease-fire and withdrawal of all armed personnel; called on all States to refrain from any action which might aggravate the situation in the area; decided to consider, as soon as operative paragraph 1 of resolution 210 of 6 September had been implemented, what steps could be taken to assist towards a settlement of the

political problem underlying the present conflict, and in the meantime called on the two Governments to utilize all peaceful means, including those listed in Article 33 of the Charter, to that end; and requested the Secretary-General to exert every possible effort to give effect to the resolution, to seek a peaceful solution, and to report to the Security Council thereon.

The 1244th meeting (22 September) was convened on the basis of the Secretary-General's report (S/6699) on his efforts to give effect to Security Council resolution 211 of 20 September 1965 and of a request from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan. At the close of the meeting, the President, after noting the statements of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan and the representative of India, expressed the Council's satisfaction that resolution 211 of 20 September 1965 had been accepted by the two parties and added that it called upon the Governments concerned to implement their adherence to the cease-fire call as rapidly as possible and in any case not later than 2200 hours GMT, 22 September.

At the 1245th meeting (27 September), the President read out a draft resolution which reflected the consensus of the members of the Council. Resolution 214 of 27 September 1965, adopted without objection, inter alia, expressed the grave concern of the Council that the cease-fire agreed to unconditionally by the Governments of India and Pakistan was not holding; recalled that the cease-fire demand in the Council's resolutions had been unanimously endorsed by the Council and agreed to by the Governments of both India and Pakistan; demanded that the parties urgently honour their commitments to the Council to observe the cease-fire; and further called upon the parties promptly to withdraw all armed personnel as necessary steps in the full implementation of resolution 211 of 20 September.

The Security Council resumed its consideration of the item at its 1247th meeting (25 October 1965) on the basis of a letter dated 22 October 1965 from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan (S/6821) and of reports by the Secretary-General on withdrawals (S/6719/Add.3) and on the observance of the cease-fire (S/6710/Add.5). The Council continued consideration of the question at three meetings between 27 October and 5 November 1965. At the 1251st meeting a draft resolution (S/6876) was introduced by the Netherlands on behalf of Bolivia, the Ivory Coast, Malaysia, the Netherlands and Uruguay, by which the Council, regretting

the delay in the achievement of a cease-fire and a withdrawal of armed personnel, would: reaffirm resolution 211 of 20 September 1965; request India and Pakistan to co-operate towards a full implementation of paragraph 1 of that resolution; demand the prompt and unconditional execution of the proposal for a meeting of representatives of the two parties with a representative of the Secretary-General for the formulation of an agreed plan and schedule for the withdrawals by both parties, and request the Secretary-General to submit a report on compliance with the resolution. Resolution 215 of 5 November 1965 was adopted by a vote of 9 in favour, none against and 2 abstentions.

A series of reports by the Secretary-General on his efforts to give effect to resolutions 210, 211 and 215 (S/6699/Add.10-12), on the observance of the cease-fire (S/6710/Add.10-17), and on compliance with the withdrawal provisions of resolutions 211 and 215 (S/6719/Add.4-6) were subsequently submitted to the Council.

—14. THE CZECHOSLOVAK QUESTION

On 12 March 1948, the representative of Chile informed the Secretary-General (S/694) 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 Chile in its agenda by 9 votes to 2 and by the same vote invited that Government's representative to participate in its discussion.

At the 272nd meeting (22 March), the Security Council, by 9 votes to 2, 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 decided by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions, on the basis of a United States draft resolution, to invite 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), 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 testimony and to report to the Council at the earliest possible time. At the 288th

meeting (29 April), 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. There were 8 votes in favour, 2 against and 1 abstention, and 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 putting the challenge to a vote, the President stated that his ruling stood, since there had been 6 votes to 2 with 2 abstentions. The Chilean draft resolution, as modified by Argentina, was then put to the vote. It received 9 votes to 2 and was not adopted, since a permanent member had voted against it.

At the 305th meeting (26 May), 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. Following a statement by the USSR, the discussion was adjourned without any vote being taken.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 26 May 1948.

15. THE QUESTION OF THE FREE TERRITORY OF TRIESTE

(a) Yugoslav request

By letter dated 28 July 1948 (S/927), 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. The Council was further requested 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.

At the 344th meeting (4 August), the Council included this question in its agenda, and 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, 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 with 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 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. The first received 2 votes to none with 9 abstentions, and the second 4 votes to none with 6 abstentions and one member not participating.

(b) USSR note

On 3 July 1952, the USSR delegation requested (S/2692) circulation of the texts of notes sent by the USSR Government to the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom on 24 June. 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, the representative of the USSR informed the Council (S/3305) that his Government took cognizance of that agreement.

On 17 January 1955 (S/3351), the Observer of Italy and 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.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 19 August 1948.

16. THE HYDERABAD QUESTION

On 21 August 1948, the Secretary-General of the Department of External Affairs of the Government of Hyderabad communicated to the President of the Security Council (S/986) 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 (2) of the Charter. On 8 September 1948, he communicated (S/996) a decision by the Government of Hyderabad to become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

On 12 September 1948, the Government of Hyderabad requested (S/998) that its complaint be put on the agenda as soon as possible in view of Indian preparations for an imminent invasion of Hyderabad. On 13 September, it stated (S/1000) 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, by a vote of 8 in favour, none against and 3 abstentions, at the 357th meeting (15 September) held in Paris. Several

representatives made the reservation that this action did not prejudice 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).

On 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.

On 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 360th meeting (28 September).

On 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 (S/1089) 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.

Further discussion of the question was postponed at the 382nd and 383rd meetings (25 November and 2 December).

On 10 December, the Government of India informed the Security Council (S/1115) 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.

On 12 December, the head of the Hyderabad delegation stated (S/1118) 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.

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

At the 384th meeting (15 December), 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.

On 4 May 1949 Pakistan requested (S/1317) an early meeting to resume consideration of the question.

The representative of India, on 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 continued its consideration of the question at the 425th and 426th meetings (19 and 24 May), without taking any decision.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 24 May 1949.

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 unilateral 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 USSR 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 USSR and the Ukrainian SSR. After further discussion at the 362nd meeting (5 October) the agenda was adopted by 9 votes to 2, whereupon the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR stated that the Council's majority 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 France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

At the 370th meeting (22 October), a draft resolution (S/1048) was submitted by 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 on communications, transport and commerce applied since 1 March 1948, and hold an immediate meeting of the four Military Governors to arrange for the unification of currency in Berlin on the basis of the German mark of the Soviet Zone.

At the 372nd meeting (25 October) the joint draft resolution (S/1048) was put to the vote, receiving 9 votes to 2, and was rejected owing to the negative vote cast by a permanent member of the Council.

On 4 May 1949, France, the United Kingdom and the United States informed the Security Council (S/1316) 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, and for the convening of a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers on 23 May to consider the question of Berlin currency.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 25 October 1948.

18. INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY^{1/}

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 Security Council and stated that the Council should issue directions to the Commission in matters affecting security.

On 31 December 1946, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission transmitted the Commission's first report (S/239) to the Council. At the 105th meeting (13 February 1947) the Council began consideration of the report, and continued it at seven meetings between then and 10 March. On 18 February 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 at the 117th meeting the Council unanimously adopted resolution 20 of 10 March 1947 urging the Atomic Energy Commission to continue its work and to develop as quickly as possible the specific proposals called for in General Assembly resolutions 1 (I) and 41 (I) of 24 January and 14 December 1946.

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

On 26 May 1948 the Chairman of the Commission transmitted the Commission's third report to the Council (S/812), which considered it at three meetings between 11 and 22 June. At the 318th meeting the United States submitted a draft resolution (S/836) under which the Council would accept the three reports of the Commission and approve 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 (325th meeting) the United States draft resolution was put to the vote and received 9 votes to 2, but as a permanent member voted in the negative the resolution was not adopted. The Council then, by 9 votes to none with 2 abstentions, adopted resolution 52 of 22 June 1948, directing the Secretary-General to transmit to the General Assembly and to the Member States, as a matter of special concern, the Commission's three reports together with the records of the Council's deliberations.

^{1/} See also item 5: The General Regulation and Reduction of Armaments and Information on the Armed Forces of the United Nations.

On 29 July 1949 the Chairman of the Commission transmitted to the Council (S/1377) the texts of two resolutions 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 445th to 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. At the 447th meeting the Canadian draft resolution, as amended by the Ukrainian SSR, was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions as resolution 74 of 16 September 1949. The USSR draft resolution was rejected, receiving 2 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

Thereafter, the Council did not discuss the international control of atomic energy. At its sixth 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 had the same membership as the previous commissions and reported periodically to the Security Council and the General Assembly.

19. COMPLAINT OF ARMED INVASION OF TAIWAN (FORMOSA)

On 24 August 1950, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, in a cablegram (S/1715) addressed to the President of the Security Council, 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 (Formosa) by the Chinese People's Liberation Army. The fact that Taiwan was an integral part of China was based on 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 United States replied to these charges on 25 August (S/1716).

The item was included in the Council's agenda under the above title at the 492nd meeting (29 August), by 7 votes to 2, with 1 abstention, 1 member not participating. After rejecting, by 4 votes to 4 with 3 abstentions, a USSR draft resolution (S/1732) to invite a representative of the People's Republic of China to attend Council meetings, the Council continued its discussion at the 497th and 503rd to 506th meetings, held between 7 and 29 September. At the 506th meeting, by 7 votes to 3 with 1 abstention, the Council adopted resolution 87 of 29 September 1950, based on a draft resolution of Ecuador (S/1823/Corr.1), which provided for deferment of consideration of the question until 15 November and for an invitation to a representative of the People's Republic of China to attend meetings on the question after that date. At the following meeting (29 September) a vote was taken on whether the Ecuadorean draft resolution was procedural. The vote was 9 to 1, with 1 abstention, and the President ruled that the proposal had been adopted.

At the 525th meeting (27 November) consideration of the item was linked with that of the item "Complaint of aggression upon the Republic of Korea", despite the objection of the USSR, which was rejected by 7 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions. (The Korean question was subsequently deleted from the Council's agenda.) Discussion continued at the 526th through 530th meetings (28 to 30 November).

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 USSR, providing, inter alia, that the Council should condemn the action of the United States Government as an act of aggression and as an intervention in the internal affairs of China, and 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. It received 1 vote in favour, 9 against, with 1 member not participating.

(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 condemn the United States Government for its criminal acts of armed aggression against the Chinese territory of Taiwan; and

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. The results of the vote were the same as on the USSR draft resolution.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 30 November 1950.

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

In a cablegram 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.

On 29 August the United States of America informed the Secretary-General (S/1727) 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.

On 30 August, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China charged (S/1743) 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, by 8 votes to 3, included the question in its agenda under the title "Complaint of bombing by air forces of the territory of China".

Discussion continued at the 497th and 499th meetings (7 and 11 September). At the 499th meeting the Council, by a vote of 6 in favour, 3 against and 2 abstentions, 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/1750), 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 on the spot 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 received 7 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions, and 1 member not participating, and was not adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member. The USSR draft resolution was also rejected, receiving 1 vote in favour and 3 against, with 1 abstention, and 1 member not participating.

On 2 October 1950 (S/1332), 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/1303), 13 October (S/1357), 26 October (S/1370) and 28 October (S/1376).

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 12 September 1950.

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.

On 28 September the United Kingdom requested the President of the Security Council (S/2357) to place the item on the provisional agenda. An enclosed draft resolution (S/2358), provided, inter alia, that the Council 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 request 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 by 9 votes to 2 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 at six meetings held during the month of October 1951. In the course of the discussion, the United Kingdom submitted two revisions (S/2358/Rev.1 and 2) of its draft resolution, the second revision incorporating amendments (S/2379) submitted jointly by India and Yugoslavia. Under the second revision, the proposal called for 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 the avoidance of any action aggravating the situation or prejudicing the positions of the parties.

On 17 October (562nd meeting), 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 by 8 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions 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 (S/2746) a copy of the judgement of the International Court of Justice, given on 22 July 1952, in which the Court, by 9 votes to 5, found that it had no jurisdiction in the case. 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 its judgement and that the provisional measures lapsed at the same time.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 19 October 1951.

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 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 yet 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 that Protocol.

The Council included the item in its agenda at the 577th meeting (18 June). At that meeting the United States proposed that the USSR draft resolution be referred to the Disarmament Commission. Discussion continued at six meetings held between 18 and 26 June.

At the 583rd meeting (26 June) the USSR draft resolution (S/2663) failed of adoption, the vote being 1 in favour 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 United States withdrew its proposal.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 18 June 1952.

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

On 20 June 1952, 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 for Korea 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.

After discussion at the 580th meeting (20 June), the Council included the item in its agenda at the 581st meeting (25 June) by 10 votes to 1.

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 the Korean People's Democratic Republic to attend the meetings of the Council at which the item was discussed was rejected by 10 votes to 1.

At the 587th meeting (3 July) the United States draft resolution (S/2671) was put to the vote and received 10 votes to 1, but was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

At the same meeting 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 conclude that those charges must be presumed to be without substance and false and condemn the practice of fabricating and disseminating such false charges.

After further discussion the United States draft resolution (S/2688) was put to the vote at the 590th meeting (9 July) and received 9 votes to 1 with 1 abstention. It was not adopted since a negative vote was cast by a permanent member of the Council.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 9 July 1952.

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

On 29 May 1954 Thailand requested (S/3220) that a meeting of the Security Council be held to consider a situation which in the view of his Government represented a threat to its security and 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, Thailand stated that it was bringing the situation to the Council's attention 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 by 10 votes to 1, 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), 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 dispatch 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. It received 9 votes to 1, with 1 abstention, and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 18 June 1954.

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

On 19 June 1954, Guatemala requested (S/3232) 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 item in its agenda without objection, after which the President, under Article 32 of the Charter, invited the representatives of Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua to participate in the discussion.

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 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.

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 received 10 votes to 1, but was not adopted, since a negative vote was cast by a permanent member.

France reintroduced its amendment to the joint draft resolution as a separate draft resolution (S/3237), which was unanimously adopted as resolution 104 of 20 June 1954.

At the 675th meeting (25 June), convened at the request of Guatemala (S/3241 and S/3244) and 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 rejected the adoption of the agenda for the meeting, the vote being 5 to 4 with 2 abstentions.

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 dispatch 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.

On 9 July (S/3265), 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.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 25 June 1954.

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

On 8 September 1954, the United States of America requested (S/3287) 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 by 10 votes to 1.

At the 600th meeting held on the same day, the Security Council continued its discussion of the question. 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.

Subsequently letters from the USSR were circulated transmitting copies of the notes which it had addressed to the United States in connexion with the incident of 4 September (S/3288) and with incidents of 7 October 1952 and 29 July 1953 (S/3308); and letters from the United States were circulated transmitting copies of its notes to the USSR relating to incidents of 7 October 1952 (S/3295), 29 July 1953 (S/3304) and 10 March 1953 (S/3391).

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 10 September 1954.

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

On 28 January 1955, New Zealand brought to the attention of the Security Council (S/3354) 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.

On 30 January, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics charged (S/3355) 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 condemn the acts of aggression by the United States against the People's Republic of China; 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, 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 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, the USSR submitted a draft resolution (S/3356) 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 United Kingdom: (1) the item proposed by New Zealand was included in the agenda (9 votes to 1 with 1 abstention); (2) the item proposed by the USSR was included in the agenda (10 votes to 1); (3) an amendment by the USSR providing that the Council should include the USSR item as the first item in its agenda was rejected (10 votes to 1); and (4) the consideration of the New Zealand item would have to be concluded before the Council would take up the USSR item (10 votes to 1).

Upon the motion of New Zealand, the Council then decided by 9 votes to 1 with 1 abstention 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, the Secretary-General circulated an exchange of cablegrams (S/3350) 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 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 by 10 votes to 1 and the Council adjourned its consideration of the New Zealand item.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 14 February 1955.

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

On 23 September 1956, France and the United Kingdom requested (S/3654) 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 15 August 1956. Of the twenty-two States attending that conference, eighteen, representing over 90 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. 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 (25 September) the Council unanimously included this item on its agenda and rejected by 5 votes to 2 with 5 abstentions a proposal to consider it simultaneously with an Egyptian item also relating to the Suez Canal (see item 29 below). The Council also invited the representative of Egypt to participate in the discussion.

The Council continued its discussion of this question at its 735th to 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 resolution 118 of 13 October 1956 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 cases 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 meeting 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 vote was 9 to 2. 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 1957, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt transmitted (S/3818) 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 1863, 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). The Council took no new decision on the item, but the President made a statement summarizing the views of the majority and declaring that the Council remained seized of the question. The USSR and Egypt expressed reservations on the President's summary.

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.

With a letter dated 20 May 1958 (S/4014), the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic (formerly Egypt) transmitted, in connexion with paragraph 8 of the Declaration on the Suez Canal, the text of Heads of Agreement signed by his Government and representatives of the stockholders of the Universal Suez Canal Company, which dealt with arrangements for full and final settlement of compensation due stockholders of that Company.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 21 May 1957.

(See related items 12T above and 29 and 32 below.)

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

On 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 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 by 7 votes to none with 4 abstentions, and rejected by 6 votes to 2 with 3 abstentions 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 resolution 118 of 13 October 1956 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.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 26 September 1956.

(See related items 12F and 28 above and 32 below.)

/...

30. THE SITUATION IN HUNGARY

On 27 October 1956, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America requested (S/5690) a meeting of the Council to consider an item entitled "The situation in Hungary" pursuant to the provisions of Article 34. It was 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/5691) a protest by his Government against the calling of a meeting to consider questions regarding the events in Hungary. It 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.

At the 746th meeting (28 October), the Council decided, by 9 votes to 1 with 1 abstention, to include the question in its agenda and invited the representative of Hungary to participate in the discussion. The item was discussed at that meeting and three further meetings (752nd to 754th) on 2, 3 and 4 November 1956.

On 3 November, the United States submitted a draft resolution (S/3730) under which, inter alia, the Council would: call upon the USSR to desist forthwith from any intervention, particularly armed intervention, in the internal affairs of Hungary; express the hope that the USSR would withdraw all its forces from Hungary without delay; affirm the right of the Hungarian people to a government responsive to its national aspirations and dedicated to its independence and well-being; 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 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 the question.

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, and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council. One member did not participate in the vote but subsequently requested that its vote be recorded as an abstention.

~~The United States then submitted a draft resolution (S/3733), which the Council adopted by 10 votes to 1 as resolution 1200 of 4 November 1956, under 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. The matter was thereafter dealt with by the General Assembly.~~

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 4 November 1956.

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

On 25 October 1956, France requested (S/3689 and Corr.1) 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 allegedly destined for the Algerian Maquis. It was charged 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 (29 October), 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 took no further decision on the item. A subsequent communication on the matter from the representative of France (S/3783) was transmitted to the President of the Security Council on 4 February 1957.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 29 October 1956.

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

On 30 October 1956, Egypt stated (S/3712) 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 on 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.

At its 750th meeting (30 October) the Council included the Egyptian complaint in its agenda by 7 votes to none with 4 abstentions and discussed it following the 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) above).

Discussion was continued at the 751st meeting (31 October).

Following rejection by 6 votes to 4 with 1 abstention of a motion by the United Kingdom to declare a Yugoslav draft resolution (S/3719) out of order, the Security Council adopted it as resolution 119 of 31 October 1956 by a vote of 7 to 2 with 2 abstentions. Under its provisions the Council decided to call an emergency special session of the General Assembly as provided in General Assembly resolution 377 (V) of 3 November 1950 in order to make appropriate recommendations. The matter was thereafter dealt with by the General Assembly.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 31 October 1956.

(See related items 12T, 28 and 29 above.)

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"

On 13 February 1958 (S/3952), Tunisia requested the President to convene the Council for the purpose of considering the complaint by Tunisia (item 33). On 17 February, in a further letter (S/3957) Tunisia attributed the threat to its security to the presence of French troops, which it wished withdrawn, and to the war in Algeria.

On 14 February (S/3954), France requested that at its next meeting the Council consider the complaint by France against Tunisia (item 34).

At its 811th meeting (18 February), the Security Council included these two questions in its agenda without objection. After having invited the representative of Tunisia to participate in the discussion and discussing the questions, the Council decided without objection to adjourn under rule 33, in the light of the efforts at conciliation which had been reported to it.

No further request for discussion of these items has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 18 February 1958.

(See related items 37 and 38 below.)

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

On 20 February 1958 the Sudan requested (S/3963) 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 included the question in its agenda without objection at its 812th meeting (21 February) and invited the representatives of Egypt and the Sudan 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.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 21 February 1958.

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"

On 18 April 1958 the USSR requested (S/3990) 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, the USSR representative transmitted a statement (S/3991) on this question made by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

At its 813th meeting (21 April), the Security Council included the item in its agenda without objection. The USSR introduced a draft resolution (S/3993) providing that the Security Council, 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.

After a discussion by the Council, a motion by 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 until the morning of 22 April, by 6 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions. The representative of the USSR made a statement and withdrew his draft resolution.

The Security Council continued its consideration of this question at its 814th through 817th meetings (29 April to 2 May). 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 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; 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 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. 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, with 1 abstention.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 2 May 1958.

37. 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"
38. 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 HAD BEEN ESTABLISHED SINCE FEBRUARY 1958 WITH REGARD TO THE STATIONING OF FRENCH TROOPS AT CERTAIN POINTS IN TUNISIAN TERRITORY"

On 29 May 1958, Tunisia requested (S/4013) the President of the Security Council to convene a meeting to consider the complaint by Tunisia (item 37), and transmitted an explanatory memorandum on the question. On 1 June, it transmitted a further memorandum (S/4019) outlining the events complained of.

On 29 May, France requested (S/4015) that at its next meeting the Security Council consider the complaint by France (item 38 above), and also transmitted an explanatory memorandum.

At its 819th meeting (2 June), the Security Council included these items in its agenda without objection and invited the representative of Tunisia to participate in their consideration. After discussion at the 819th and 820th meetings (2 June) and at the 821st meeting (4 June), the Council agreed without objection to a French proposal that discussion be adjourned until 18 June to allow conversations to take place between the parties.

At its 826th meeting (18 June), the Security Council continued its consideration of the two items. 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.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 18 June 1958.

(See related items 33 and 34 above.)

39. REPORT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE LETTER RECEIVED FROM THE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE ROYAL GOVERNMENT OF LAOS, TRANSMITTED BY A NOTE FROM THE PERMANENT MISSION OF LAOS TO THE UNITED NATIONS, 4 SEPTEMBER 1959

In a letter dated 5 September 1959 (S/4213), the Secretary-General requested the President to convene the Security Council urgently to consider an item entitled "Report by the Secretary-General on the letter received from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Royal Government of Laos, transmitted by a note from the Permanent Mission of Laos to the United Nations, 4 September 1959". The communication from Laos to which he referred (S/4212) charged that since 16 July 1959, foreign troops had been crossing the northeastern frontier of Laos and engaging in military action against garrison units of the Royal Laotian Army. Elements from the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam had taken part in a more violent attack on 30 August, with support by artillery fire from across the frontier. In these circumstances, Laos requested the assistance of the United Nations, and asked that an emergency force should be dispatched at a very early date in order to halt the aggression and prevent it from spreading. The letter requested the Secretary-General to take the appropriate procedural action on its request.

The Security Council included the question in its agenda at its 847th meeting (7 September 1959) and continued the discussion at its 848th meeting.

A joint draft resolution (S/4214) was submitted by France, the United Kingdom and the United States, which provided that the Council would decide to appoint a sub-committee, consisting of Argentina, Italy, Japan and Tunisia, with instructions to examine the statements made before the Council concerning Laos, to receive further statements and documents and to conduct such inquiries as it might determine necessary, and to report to the Council as soon as possible.

Following a request made by the representative of the USSR, the Council voted on the question whether the vote on the joint draft resolution should be considered procedural in character. There were 10 votes in favour to one against, the negative vote being that of a permanent member, and the President ruled that the vote on the joint draft resolution should be regarded as procedural. The joint draft resolution was then adopted by 10 votes in favour to one against (resolution 132 of 7 September 1959).

The report of the Sub-Committee (S/4236) was submitted on 3 November 1959. It has not been discussed by the Council.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 7 September 1959.

40. LETTER DATED 25 MARCH 1960 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF AFGHANISTAN, BURMA, CAMBODIA, CEYLON, ETHIOPIA, FEDERATION OF MALAYA, GHANA, GUINEA, INDIA, INDONESIA, IRAN, IRAQ, JAPAN, JORDAN, LAOS, LEBANON, LIBERIA, LIBYA, MOROCCO, NEPAL, PAKISTAN, PHILIPPINES, SAUDI ARABIA, SUDAN, THAILAND, TUNISIA, TURKEY, UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC AND YEMEN ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

In a letter dated 25 March 1960 (S/4279 and Add.1), twenty-nine African and Asian Member States requested the President of the Security Council under Article 35 (1) of the Charter to convene an urgent meeting of the Council to consider "the situation arising out of the large-scale killings of unarmed and peaceful demonstrators against racial discrimination and segregation in the Union of South Africa". They considered that the situation had grave potentialities for international friction, which endangered the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Security Council placed the item on its agenda at its 851st meeting (30 March 1960) and decided, pursuant to their requests, to invite the representatives of the Union of South Africa, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Liberia and Pakistan to participate, without vote, in its deliberations. At the 853rd meeting (31 March) it extended a similar invitation to the representative of Jordan.

The Security Council discussed the item at its 851st through 856th meetings, held on 30 and 31 March and 1 April 1960. At the 854th meeting, Ecuador submitted a draft resolution (S/4299) which provided, inter alia, that the Security Council should: recognize that the situation in the Union of South Africa was one that had led to international friction and if continued might endanger international peace and security; deplore that the recent disturbances in the Union should have led to the loss of life of so many Africans and extend to the families of the victims its deepest sympathies; deplore the policies and actions of the Union Government which had given rise to the present situation; call upon that Government to initiate measures aimed at bringing about racial harmony based on equality in order to ensure that the present situation did not continue or recur and to abandon its policies of apartheid and racial discrimination; and request the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Government of the Union of South Africa, to make such arrangements as would adequately help in upholding the purposes and principles of the Charter and to report to the Security Council whenever necessary and appropriate.

At its 856th meeting, the Security Council adopted the draft resolution by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 134 of 1 April 1960).

Pursuant to that resolution, the Secretary-General informed the Security Council on 23 January 1961 (S/4635) that he had visited the Union of South Africa and had held consultations with the Prime Minister of the Union; however, with regard to his mandate under paragraph 5 of the resolution, no mutually acceptable arrangement had been found to date.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 1 April 1960.

(See related item 57.)

41. CABLE DATED 18 MAY 1960 FROM THE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS ADDRESSED TO THE
PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

By a cable dated 18 May 1960 (S/4314), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics requested the President of the Security Council to convene the Council urgently to examine the question of "Aggressive acts by the Air Force of the United States of America against the Soviet Union, creating a threat to universal peace". On 19 May, the Foreign Minister of the USSR transmitted an explanatory memorandum (S/4315 and Corr.1) in amplification of his request.

At its 857th meeting the Security Council included this question in its agenda, and considered it at its 857th through 860th meetings, held between 23 and 26 May.

On 23 May, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics introduced a draft resolution (S/4321) whereby the Security Council, having examined the question of "Aggressive acts by the Air Force of the United States of America against the Soviet Union, creating a threat to universal peace", noting that violations of the sovereignty of other States are incompatible with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, and considering that such actions create a threat to universal peace, would condemn the incursions by United States aircraft into the territory of other States and regard them as aggressive acts; and would request the Government of the United States to adopt immediate measures to halt such actions and to prevent their recurrence.

The USSR draft resolution was put to the vote at the 860th meeting (26 May 1960). It received 2 votes in favour to 7 against, with 2 abstentions and was not adopted.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 26 May 1960.

---42. LETTER DATED 23 MAY 1960 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF
ARGENTINA, CEYLON, ECUADOR AND TUNISIA ADDRESSED TO
THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

By a letter dated 23 May 1960 (S/4323), Argentina, Ceylon, Ecuador and Tunisia submitted a draft resolution for the consideration of the Security Council and requested the inclusion of the subject as an item in the agenda to be considered by the Council at the conclusion of the item contained in document S/4314 (item 41 above). According to the draft resolution accompanying the letter, the Security Council, inter alia, noting with regret that the hopes of the world for a successful meeting of the Heads of Government of France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the USSR had not been fulfilled, and considering that those developments had caused great disappointment and concern in world public opinion and that the resulting situation might lead to an increase of international tensions likely to endanger peace and security, would (1) recommend that the Governments concerned seek solutions of existing international problems by negotiation or other peaceful means as provided in the Charter of the United Nations; (2) appeal to all Member Governments to refrain from any action which might increase tensions; (3) request the Governments concerned to continue their efforts towards disarmament and the prohibition of nuclear weapons tests under an international control system and their negotiations on the technical aspects of measures against the possibility of surprise attack, as recommended by the General Assembly in its resolutions; and (4) urge the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the USSR to resume discussions as soon as possible and to avail themselves of the assistance that the Security Council and other appropriate organs of the United Nations might be able to render to that end.

The Security Council included this question in its agenda at the 861st meeting (26 May 1960) and continued the consideration at its 862nd and 863rd meetings (27 May).

At the 861st meeting, the USSR introduced amendments (S/4326) to the four-Power draft resolution (S/4323). They provided as follows: (1) to insert, after the first preambular paragraph, a paragraph reading: "Considering that the incursion of foreign military aircraft into the territory of other States is incompatible with the principles and purposes of the United Nations and

constitutes a threat to peace and international security"; (2) to add the following words to the end of the second operative paragraph: "including the dispatch of their aircraft into the airspace of other States"; and (3) to redraft the third operative paragraph to read: "Requests the Governments concerned to continue their efforts towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament and the discontinuance of all nuclear weapons tests under an appropriate international control system as well as their negotiations on measures to prevent surprise attack".

At the 863rd meeting, Argentina, Ceylon, Ecuador and Tunisia introduced a revised text (S/4323/Rev.2) of their draft resolution, in which the second and third operative paragraphs were redrafted as follows: "2. Appeals to all Member Governments to refrain from the use or threat of force in their international relations; to respect each other's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence; and to refrain from any action which might increase tensions"; and "3. Requests the Governments concerned to continue their efforts to achieve a constructive solution of the question of general and complete disarmament under effective international control in accordance with resolution 1378 (XIV) of the General Assembly and the discontinuance of all nuclear weapons tests under an appropriate international control system as well as their negotiations on measures to prevent surprise attack, including technical measures, as recommended by the General Assembly".

At the 863rd meeting, the representative of the USSR stated that he would not press for a vote on the third amendment submitted by his delegation. The Council then voted upon the first and second USSR amendments (S/4326), which were rejected by a vote of 2 in favour, to 6 against, with 3 abstentions. The Council then adopted the revised four-Power draft resolution by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 135 of 27 May 1960).

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 27 May 1960.

43. LETTER DATED 13 JULY 1960 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF
THE SECURITY COUNCIL

In a letter dated 13 July 1960 (S/4381) the Secretary-General informed the President of the Security Council that he had to bring to the attention of the Council a matter which in his opinion might threaten the maintenance of international peace and security. Accordingly, he requested an urgent meeting of the Council to hear his report on a demand for United Nations action in relation to the Republic of the Congo. He also circulated cablegrams dated 12 and 13 July (S/4382) from the President and the Prime Minister of the Republic of the Congo transmitting their Government's request for the urgent dispatch by the United Nations of military assistance to the Congo.

The Security Council placed the item on its agenda at its 873rd meeting on 13 July. Further consideration took place at meetings on 20 to 22 July, 8 and 9 August, 21 August, and 9 through 16 September. In the course of its discussion, the Council extended invitations to participate to representatives of Belgium, the Republic of the Congo, Yugoslavia, Indonesia, Ghana, Guinea, Morocco, the United Arab Republic, Ethiopia and Liberia.

At the 873rd meeting, the Council, after rejecting USSR amendments (S/4386) to a Tunisian draft resolution (S/4383), adopted the latter by 8 votes to none, with 3 abstentions (resolution 143 of 14 July 1960). By that resolution, the Council, inter alia, (1) called upon the Government of Belgium to withdraw its troops from the territory of the Republic of the Congo; and (2) decided to authorize the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps, in consultation with the Government of the Republic of the Congo, to provide the Government with such military assistance as might be necessary until, through the efforts of the Congolese Government with the technical assistance of the United Nations, the national security forces might be able, in the opinion of the Government, to meet fully their tasks.

On 22 July, at the 874th meeting, the Council unanimously adopted a draft resolution of Ceylon and Tunisia (S/4404), inter alia, (1) calling upon the Government of Belgium to implement speedily the Council resolution of 14 July on the withdrawal of its troops and authorizing the Secretary-General to take all

necessary action to that effect; (2) requesting all States to refrain from any action which might tend to impede the restoration of law and order and the exercise by the Government of the Congo of its authority and also to refrain from any action which might undermine the territorial integrity and the political independence of the Republic of the Congo; and (3) commending the Secretary-General for the prompt action he had taken to carry out Council resolution 143 and his first report (resolution 145 of 22 July 1960). A USSR draft resolution (S/4402), which would have insisted on the immediate cessation of armed intervention against the Republic of the Congo and the withdrawal within three days of aggressor troops, was not pressed to a vote.

At the 885th meeting (8 August 1960) Tunisia introduced a draft resolution (S/4424), sponsored by Ceylon and Tunisia. Under the terms of that draft resolution, the Security Council, inter alia, noting with satisfaction the progress made in carrying out its resolution in respect of the territory of the Republic of the Congo other than the Province of Katanga and recognizing that the withdrawal of Belgian troops from that Province would be a positive contribution to and essential for the proper implementation of the Council's resolutions, would:

- (1) confirm the authority given to the Secretary-General by the resolutions of 14 and 22 July and request him to continue to carry out the responsibility placed on him thereby;
- (2) call upon the Government of Belgium to withdraw immediately its troops from the Province of Katanga under speedy modalities determined by the Secretary-General and to assist in every possible way the implementation of the Council's resolutions;
- (3) declare that the entry of the United Nations force into the Province of Katanga was necessary for the full implementation of the resolution;
- (4) reaffirm that the United Nations force in the Congo would not be a party to or in any way intervene in or be used to influence the outcome of any internal conflict, constitutional or otherwise;
- (5) call upon all Member States, in accordance with Articles 25 and 49 of the Charter, to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council and to afford mutual assistance in carrying out measures decided upon by the Council; and
- (6) request the Secretary-General to implement the resolution and to report further to the Council as appropriate.

The USSR introduced a draft resolution (S/4425) at the same meeting, according to which the Security Council would (1) note that the Belgian Government

was grossly violating the decisions of the Council calling for the speedy withdrawal of Belgian troops from the territory of the Congo and the maintenance of the territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of the Congo; (2) impose on the Secretary-General the obligation to take decisive measures, without hesitating to use any means to that end, to remove the Belgian troops from the territory of the Congo and to put an end to acts directed against the territorial integrity of the Republic of the Congo; and (3) instruct the Secretary-General to report within a period of three days on the measures taken to implement that decision of the Council.

The Security Council proceeded to the vote at its 886th meeting, which had run over into 9 August. The joint draft resolution of Ceylon and Turisia (S/4424) was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 146 of 9 August 1960), and the representative of the USSR stated that his delegation did not press for a vote on its draft resolution (S/4425).

At the 888th meeting (21 August 1960), the USSR introduced a draft resolution (S/4455) according to which the Security Council would decide to establish a group consisting of representatives of those States Members of the United Nations which had supplied armed forces to assist the Republic of the Congo, in order that the group, acting in conjunction with the Secretary-General, might ensure on the spot and without delay the execution of the decisions of the Council, including the withdrawal of Belgian troops from Congolese territory and the safeguarding of the territorial integrity and political independence of the Congo. The resolution would further deem it necessary that the Secretary-General and the group should consult daily with the lawful Government of the Congo during their implementation of the Council's decisions, and instruct the Secretary-General to furnish the Council with a report on the implementation of the resolution.

At the 890th meeting the representative of the USSR, noting that a majority was not prepared to support the USSR draft resolution at that stage, stated that his delegation would not press for a vote on the draft resolution.

At the 906th meeting (16 September 1960), the Council, by 7 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions, rejected a USSR draft resolution (S/4515) which would, inter alia, have invited the Secretary-General and the Command of the United Nations Force in the Congo to cease forthwith any form of interference in the internal affairs of

the Republic of the Congo, and would have instructed the Secretary-General to remove the present Command of the force, whose actions constituted flagrant violation of the Council's decisions.

At the same meeting, the Council also rejected, by votes ranging from 6 to 4 with 1 abstention to 9 to 2 with no abstentions, amendments (S/4524) by the USSR to a joint draft resolution of Ceylon and Tunisia (S/4523). The joint draft resolution would have, inter alia, (1) reaffirmed the previous resolutions of the Council and urged the Secretary-General to continue to give vigorous implementation to them; (2) called upon all Congolese within the Republic to seek a speedy solution by peaceful means of all their internal conflicts for the unity and integrity of the Congo; (3) reaffirmed that the United Nations force should continue to act to restore and maintain law and order as necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security; and (4) reaffirmed specifically its request to all States to refrain from any action which might tend to impede the restoration of law and order and the exercise by the Government of the Congo of its authority and also to refrain from any action which might undermine the territorial integrity and the political independence of the Republic, and decide that no assistance for military purposes be sent to the Congo except as part of the United Nations action, and also reaffirm its call to all Member States to accept and carry out the decisions of the Council and to afford mutual assistance in carrying out measures decided upon by the Council. The joint draft resolution received 8 votes to 2, with 1 abstention, and failed of adoption owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.

The Council then, by 8 votes to 2, with 1 abstention, adopted a draft resolution (S/4525) submitted by the United States, which provided that the Council, taking into account that the lack of unanimity of its permanent members at the 906th meeting 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 General Assembly resolution 577 A (V) of 3 November 1950, in order to make appropriate recommendations (resolution 157 of 17 September 1960).

The Security Council resumed its consideration of the question at the 912th to 920th meetings (7 to 13 December), on the basis of a note by the Secretary-General (S/4571) transmitting a report of 5 December from his Special

Representative and a statement dated 6 December (S/4573) by the USSR, both relating to actions taken against Mr. Lumumba by the Congolese National Army.

At the 914th meeting (8 December) the USSR submitted a draft resolution (S/4579) whereby the Security Council would, inter alia, call upon the Secretary-General to secure the immediate release of Mr. Lumumba, Prime Minister of the Republic of the Congo, Mr. Okito, President of the Senate, Mr. Kasongo, President of the Chamber of Deputies and other ministers and deputies and, at the same time, take all the necessary steps to ensure the resumption of the activities of the lawful Government and Parliament of the Republic; request the Command of the troops dispatched to the Congo by decision of the Council immediately to disarm the terrorist bands of Mobutu, and call upon the Government of Belgium, in accordance with the decision of the Council and the General Assembly, immediately to withdraw Belgian military, paramilitary and civilian personnel from the Congo.

At the same meeting, a draft resolution (S/4578) was submitted by Argentina, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States, under which the Council would: (1) declare that any violation of human rights in the Congo was inconsistent with the purposes that guide the United Nations and expect that no measures contrary to recognized rules of law and order would be taken by anyone against any persons held prisoner or under arrest anywhere in the Congo; (2) express the hope that the International Committee of the Red Cross would be allowed to examine detained persons throughout the Congo and their places and conditions of detention and otherwise to obtain the necessary assurances for their safety; and (3) request the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to assist the Republic in the restoration of law and order throughout its territory and in ensuring respect for the human dignity of all persons within the country.

At the 920th meeting (13 December) the USSR submitted amendments (S/4597) to the four-Power draft resolution (S/4578), providing, inter alia, for the replacement in operative paragraph 1 of the words following "United Nations" by a request that the Command of troops sent to the Congo in accordance with the Council's decision would take energetic action to ensure the immediate cessation of the criminal violation of law and order in the country by Mobutu's armed bands; the deletion of operative paragraph 2; and the replacement of operative paragraph 3 by a request that the Command should take immediate steps to disarm and disperse

Mobutu's bands, thereby creating the essential conditions for the restoration of law and order in the country.

At the same meeting, the USSR amendments were rejected by separate votes, and the four-Power draft resolution received 7 votes to 3, with 1 abstention, and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member. The Council then rejected the USSR draft resolution as a whole by 8 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Following the voting, Poland introduced a draft resolution (S/4598) whereby the Council would request the Secretary-General to undertake necessary measures in order to obtain the immediate release of Mr. Lumumba and of all persons who were under arrest or detention despite their parliamentary immunity; and also to inform the Council as soon as possible on the measures taken and the results thereof. The draft resolution was rejected by a vote of 6 to 3, with 2 abstentions.

The Council resumed its consideration of the question at its 924th to 927th meetings (12 to 14 January 1961), being convened in response to a request of the USSR in a letter dated 7 January (S/4616) that it examine charges that fresh acts of Belgian aggression were being committed against the Congo in flagrant violation of the international status of the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

At the 926th meeting (13 January), a draft resolution of Ceylon, Liberia and the United Arab Republic (S/4625) was submitted, whereby the Council would call upon Belgium as the Administering Authority of Ruanda-Urundi immediately to cease all action against the Congo and to observe strictly its international obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement and to take immediate steps to prevent the utilization of Ruanda-Urundi contrary to the purposes of the Council's resolutions; call upon Belgium to withdraw immediately from the Congo all Belgian military and paramilitary personnel, advisers and technicians; and recommend that the Assembly consider the Belgian action as a violation of the Trusteeship Agreement.

At the 927th meeting (14 January), the draft resolution received 4 votes to none, with 7 abstentions, and was not adopted.

Further consideration of the question took place at the 928th to 942nd meetings held between 1 and 21 February. Requests for the meeting had been made by Ceylon, Ghana, Guinea, Libya, Mali, Morocco, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia in a letter of 26 January (S/4641) which asked for examination of recent

developments which were hampering efforts to restore law and order, and by the USSR (S/4644) which desired urgent consideration of the situation resulting from new acts of Belgian aggression. The 933rd meeting (13 February) was adjourned by 10 votes to 1, following receipt of a report concerning the murder of Mr. Lumumba and two of his aides.

At the 934th meeting (15 February), the USSR submitted a draft resolution (S/4706) whereby the Security Council, having regard to the murder of the Prime Minister of the Congo, Mr. Lumumba, would decisively condemn the actions of Belgium which had led to that crime; deem it essential that the sanctions provided under Article 41 should be applied to Belgium as an aggressor and call on the States Members of the United Nations for the immediate application of those sanctions; enjoin the Command of the troops in the Congo pursuant to the Council's decision immediately to arrest Tshombé and Mobutu in order to deliver them for trial, to disarm all the military units and the gendarmerie forces under their control, and to ensure the immediate disarming and removal from the Congo of all Belgian troops and Belgian personnel; direct that the "United Nations operation" in the Congo should be discontinued within one month and all foreign troops withdrawn from there so as to enable the Congolese people to decide its own internal affairs; and deem it essential to dismiss Dag Hammarskjöld from the post of Secretary-General as a participant in and organizer of the violence committed against the leading statesmen of the Congo.

At the 938th meeting (17 February), Ceylon, Liberia and the United Arab Republic submitted draft resolutions (S/4722) under the first of which the Council would urge that the United Nations take immediately all appropriate measures to prevent the occurrence of civil war in the Congo, including arrangements for cease-fires, the halting of all military operations, the prevention of clashes, and the use of force, if necessary, in the last resort; urge that measures be taken for the immediate withdrawal and evacuation from the Congo of all Belgian and other foreign military and paramilitary personnel and political advisers not under the United Nations Command, and mercenaries; call upon all States to take immediate and energetic measures to prevent the departure of such personnel from the Congo from their territories, and for the denial of transit and other facilities to them; decide that an immediate and impartial investigation be held

in order to ascertain the circumstances of the death of Mr. Lumumba and his colleagues and that the perpetrators of those crimes be punished; and reaffirm its previous resolutions on the question and remind all States of their obligations thereunder.

Under the second joint draft resolution, the Security Council would urge the convening of the Congolese Parliament and the taking of necessary protective measures in that connexion; urge that Congolese armed units and personnel should be reorganized and brought under discipline and control, and arrangements be made on impartial and equitable bases to that end and with a view to the elimination of any possibility of interference by such units and personnel in the political life of the Congo; and call upon all States to extend their full co-operation and assistance and take such measures as might be necessary for the implementation of the resolution.

At the 941st meeting (20 February), Ceylon, Liberia and the United Arab Republic submitted another draft resolution (S/4733), for which they asked priority. Under its provisions the Security Council would strongly condemn the unlawful arrests, deportations and assassinations of political leaders of the Congo; call upon the authorities in Leopoldville, Elisabethville and Kasai immediately to put an end to such practices; call upon the United Nations authorities in the Congo to take all possible measures to prevent the occurrence of such outrages including, if necessary, the use of force as a last resort; and decide upon an impartial investigation to determine the responsibility for those crimes and punishment of perpetrators of such crimes. The motion for priority for that draft resolution was rejected, at the same meeting, by 4 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

At the 942nd meeting (20/21 February), the Council voted on the draft resolutions before it. The USSR draft resolution (S/4706) was rejected by 8 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions. The first draft resolution of Ceylon, Liberia and the United Arab Republic (S/4722) was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 161 of 21 February 1961). The second draft resolution of Ceylon, Liberia and the United Arab Republic (S/4735/Rev.1) was modified by the deletion, by a separate vote, of the authorization in paragraph 3 of the use of force as a last resort. Oral amendments were adopted owing to the negative

vote of a permanent member, and the draft resolution as a whole received 6 votes to none, with 5 abstentions, and failed of adoption.

The Security Council next took up the question at its 973rd to 979th and 982nd meetings (13 to 24 November), having on its agenda a letter of 3 November (S/4973) from Ethiopia, Nigeria and the Sudan requesting consideration of the situation in the Province of Katanga caused by the lawless acts of mercenaries.

At the 974th meeting (15 November), Ceylon, Liberia and the United Arab Republic submitted a draft resolution (S/4985) whereby the Security Council, inter alia, reaffirming the policies and purposes of the United Nations with respect to the Congo, would: strongly deprecate the secessionist activities illegally carried out by the provincial administration of Katanga, with the aid of external resources and manned by foreign mercenaries; further deprecate the armed action against United Nations forces and personnel in the pursuit of such activities and insist that they cease forthwith, authorize the Secretary-General to take vigorous action, including the use of requisite measures of force if necessary, for the immediate apprehension, detention pending legal action and/or deportation of all foreign mercenaries and hostile elements and to take all necessary measures to prevent the entry or return of such elements; request all States to refrain from the supply of arms, equipment or other material which could be used for warlike purposes and prevent their nationals from doing the same, and also to deny transportation and transit facilities for such supplies; demand that all secessionist activities in Katanga should cease forthwith, declare full and firm support for the Central Government of the Congo and the determination to assist it to maintain law and order and national integrity and urge all Member States to lend their support to that Government in conformity with the decisions of the United Nations.

In a revision submitted at the 976th meeting (17 November), the sponsors changed a paragraph (S/4985/Rev.1) to declare all secessionist activities against the Republic of the Congo contrary to the loi fondamentale and the decisions of the Council, and specifically demand that such activities which were taking place in Katanga should cease forthwith.

At the 978th meeting (21 November), the United States introduced a series of amendments (S/4989) to the three-Power draft resolution, which, inter alia, would

add a new paragraph authorizing the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Government of the Congo, to neutralize, where necessary to prevent their use for military purposes against the United Nations, the Republic or the civilian population, aircraft and other weapons of war which had entered the Congo contrary to its laws and United Nations resolutions; and other paragraphs requesting the Secretary-General to assist the Government to reorganize and retrain Congolese armed units and personnel and authorizing him to take all such steps as he considered necessary, including negotiation and conciliation, to achieve the immediate political unity and territorial integrity of the Congo.

At the same meeting, the USSR submitted sub-amendments (S/4991) to the first United States amendment described above, under which the Secretary-General would be authorized, in consultation with the Government of the Congo, to remove, to prevent their use for military purposes against the United Nations, the Republic or the civilian population, aircraft and other weapons of war which had entered Katanga contrary to the laws of the Congo.

At the 582nd meeting (24 November), the Council voted on the various draft resolutions and amendments before it. The USSR sub-amendment (S/4991) was rejected by 2 votes to 6, with 3 abstentions. The United States amendments (S/4589/Rev.2) were put to the vote separately, some being adopted and some failing of adoption owing to the negative vote of a permanent member. The three-Power draft resolution (S/4985/Rev.1) as modified was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 169 of 24 November 1961).

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and the Security Council has not discussed it since 24 November 1961.

(See related items 67 and 68 below.)

44. LETTER DATED 11 JULY 1960 FROM THE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF CUBA ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

In a letter dated 11 July 1960 (S/4378), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cuba charged that a grave situation existed with manifest danger to international peace and security as a consequence of the repeated threats, harassments, intrigues, reprisals and aggressive acts to which his country had been subjected by the Government of the United States of America. He requested the President to convene

the Security Council immediately in order to study the situation and, after hearing the statements of the Cuban Minister for Foreign Affairs, take such measures as it deemed fit.

The Security Council included the question on its agenda without objection at its 874th meeting (18 July 1960), and invited the representative of Cuba to participate, without vote, in its deliberations. At the same meeting a draft resolution (S/4392) was introduced by Argentina and Ecuador. Under the operative paragraphs of that proposal, the Security Council would decide to adjourn the consideration of the question pending the receipt of a report from the Organization of American States; invite the members of the Organization of American States to lend their assistance toward the achievement of a peaceful solution of the situation in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter; and urge all other States in the meantime to refrain from any action which might increase the existing tensions between Cuba and the United States of America.

The Council continued its consideration of the question at its 875th and 876th meetings on 18 and 19 July. At the 876th meeting, the USSR submitted amendments (S/4394) to the joint draft resolution by which the paragraph deciding to adjourn consideration of the question would be deleted and the words "Organization of American States" in the penultimate paragraph replaced by the words "United Nations".

The Council proceeded to vote at the 876th meeting (19 July). The USSR amendments were rejected by 8 votes to 2, with 1 abstention. The joint draft resolution (S/4392) was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 144 of 19 July 1960).

(See related item 45 below.)

45. LETTER DATED 31 DECEMBER 1960 ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY THE MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OF CUBA

On 31 December 1960, Cuba requested the Council (S/4605) to consider charges that the United States was about to commit direct military aggression against Cuba. In that connexion it stated that plans for an invasion had been developed by the United States with the co-operation of Cuban war criminals and of various Governments in the Western hemisphere and asked the Council to take the measures which it deemed necessary to prevent that action. On 3 January 1961, Cuba informed the Council of the decision of the United States to break off diplomatic relations with Cuba.

The Cuban complaint was discussed at the 921st to 923rd meetings on 4 and 5 January 1961. The representative of Cuba was invited to take part in the discussion.

On 4 January, a joint draft resolution was submitted by Ecuador and Chile (S/4612) under which the Council, considering the tension in relations between Cuba and the United States and considering that it was the duty of Member States to resolve their international disputes by the peaceful means provided for in the Charter, would: (1) recommend to the two Governments that they make every effort to resolve their differences by the peaceful means provided for in the Charter; and (2) urge Member States to refrain from any action which might aggravate the tension between the two countries.

Subsequently, the representatives of Ecuador and Chile indicated that since there was not the desired unanimity for adoption of their draft resolution they would not press it to the vote.

(See related item 44 above).

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 5 January 1961.

46. LETTER DATED 20 FEBRUARY 1961 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF LIBERIA
ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 20 February 1961, Liberia requested (S/4738) an urgent meeting of the Council in order to "deal with the crisis in Angola". It stated that recent developments in Angola necessitated immediate action by the Council to prevent further deterioration and abuse of human rights in Angola. On 7 March, Portugal protested (S/4760) against this request on the ground that it concerned a matter within the exclusive jurisdiction of Portugal and was consequently a contravention of Article 2 (7) of the Charter. On 10 March, Afghanistan, Burma, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, the Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Upper Volta and Yemen associated themselves with Liberia's request (S/4762). On 10 March, the request was included in the agenda of the Council. It was discussed at the 943rd to 946th meetings from 10 to 15 March 1961. The representatives of Congo (Brazzaville), Ghana and Portugal took part in the Council's discussions.

On 14 March, Ceylon, Liberia and the United Arab Republic submitted a joint draft resolution (S/4769) whereby the Council would, inter alia, (1) call upon the Government of Portugal to consider urgently the introduction of measures and reforms in Angola for the purpose of implementing General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), and (2) appoint a sub-committee to examine the statements made before the Council concerning Angola, to receive further statements and documents and to conduct such inquiries as it might deem necessary, and to report to the Council as soon as possible.

At the 946th meeting (15 March 1961), the joint draft resolution received 5 votes in favour, none against, and 6 abstentions, and was therefore not adopted.

(See related item 47 below).

47. LETTER DATED 26 MAY 1961 ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF AFGHANISTAN, BURMA, CAMBODIA, CAMEROON, CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC, CEYLON, CHAD, CONGO (BRAZZAVILLE), CONGO (LEOPOLDVILLE), CYPRUS, DAHOMEY, ETHIOPIA, FEDERATION OF MALAYA, GABON, GHANA, GUINEA, INDIA, INDONESIA, IRAN, IRAQ, IVORY COAST, JAPAN, JORDAN, LAOS, LEBANON, LIBERIA, LIBYA, MADAGASCAR, MALI, MOROCCO, NEPAL, NIGERIA, PAKISTAN, PHILIPPINES, SAUDI ARABIA, SENEGAL, SOMALIA, SUDAN, TOGO, TUNISIA, UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC, UPPER VOLTA, YEMEN AND YUGOSLAVIA

On 26 May 1961, forty-two Member States requested (S/4816) that a meeting of the Security Council be called, as a matter of urgency, to consider the situation in Angola. They charged that the massacres in Angola were continuing and human rights were being continually suppressed, and that this, together with the armed suppression of the Angolan people and the denial of the right of self-determination in contravention of the United Nations Charter and of General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV) of 20 April 1961 on Angola, constituted a serious threat to international peace and security. Togo and Pakistan subsequently associated themselves with this request (S/4816/Add.1 and 2).

On 5 June, Portugal protested (S/4821) against the request for inscription on the Council's agenda of a matter which it claimed was within its exclusive jurisdiction. The question was included in the Council's agenda at the 950th meeting (6 June). The representatives of Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria and Portugal were invited to take part in the discussion. The item was considered at the 950th to 956th meetings held from 6 to 9 June 1961.

On 6 June, Ceylon, Liberia and the United Arab Republic submitted a joint draft resolution (S/4828) whereby the Security Council, inter alia, after deeply deploring the large-scale killings and the severely repressive measures in Angola and expressing the conviction that the continuance of that situation was an actual and potential cause of international friction and a threat to international peace and security, would: (1) reaffirm General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV) and called upon Portugal to act in accordance with its terms; (2) request the sub-committee appointed under that resolution to implement its mandate without delay; (3) call upon the Portuguese authorities to desist forthwith from repressive measures and further to extend every facility to the sub-committee to enable it to perform its task expeditiously; and (4) request the sub-committee to report to the Council and the Assembly as soon as possible.

On 9 June, Chile submitted amendments (S/4833/Rev.1) to this joint draft resolution, proposing that the reference in the preamble to a "threat to" international peace and security be replaced by the phrase "is likely to endanger the maintenance of" international peace and security, and to insert a new operative paragraph in which the Council would express the hope that a peaceful solution would be found to the problem of Angola in accordance with the Charter. An amendment submitted by the USSR (S/4834) would have the Council add the words "continuing the colonial war against the Angolan people" in the beginning of the third operative paragraph.

On the same day, the Council adopted the Chilean amendments by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions. The USSR amendment received 4 votes in favour, 5 against and 4 abstentions and was not adopted. The three-Power draft resolution as amended was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 163 of 9 June 1961).

(See related item 46 above).

48. COMPLAINT BY KUWAIT IN RESPECT OF THE SITUATION ARISING FROM THE THREAT BY IRAQ TO THE TERRITORIAL INDEPENDENCE OF KUWAIT, WHICH IS LIKELY TO ENDANGER THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

COMPLAINT BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRAQ IN RESPECT OF THE SITUATION ARISING OUT OF THE ARMED THREAT BY THE UNITED KINGDOM TO THE INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY OF IRAQ, WHICH IS LIKELY TO ENDANGER THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

On 1 July 1961, the State Secretary of Kuwait, in a telegram to the President of the Council (S/4844), requested urgent consideration, under Article 35 (2) of the Charter, of the following question: "Complaint by Kuwait in respect of the situation arising from threats by Iraq to the territorial independence of Kuwait, which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security". On the same day, the representative of the United Kingdom informed the President (S/4845) that his Government supported the request and asked that the Council be convened accordingly.

On the following day, Iraq requested (S/4847) that the Council consider the "Complaint by the Government of the Republic of Iraq in respect of the situation

arising out of the armed threat by the United Kingdom to the independence and security of Iraq, which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security".

In a further communication dated 2 July (S/4848), the representative of Iraq asserted that the complaint of Kuwait was not receivable by the Council since Article 35 (2) of the Charter related to the right of States not Members of the United Nations to bring questions to the attention of the Council. Kuwait was not and had never been an independent State, but had always been considered part of Iraq.

The Security Council agreed to place both complaints on its agenda and considered them at the 957th to 960th meetings, on 2, 5, 6 and 7 July. The representatives of Iraq and Kuwait took part in the discussion.

On 6 July, the United Kingdom submitted a draft resolution (S/4855), the operative part of which provided that the Council would: (1) call upon all States to respect the independence and territorial integrity of Kuwait; (2) urge that all concerned should work for peace and tranquility in the area; and (3) agree to keep the situation under review.

On 7 July, the United Arab Republic submitted a draft resolution (S/4856), the operative part of which provided that the Council would: (1) urge that the question be solved by peaceful means; and (2) call upon the United Kingdom to withdraw immediately its forces from Kuwait.

At the 960th meeting (7 July 1961), the Council voted on the United Kingdom draft resolution, which received 7 votes in favour and 1 against, with 3 abstentions, and was not adopted since one of the negative votes was that of a permanent member.

The Council then proceeded to vote on the United Arab Republic resolution, which was rejected by 3 votes in favour and none against, with 3 abstentions.

The President appealed to all parties to the dispute to abstain from any action that might aggravate the situation. As President, he stated that he would convene the Council if circumstances made it necessary to do so.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 7 July 1961.

49. TELEGRAM DATED 20 JULY 1961 ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC OF TUNISIA

LETTER DATED 20 JULY 1961 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF TUNISIA ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 20 July 1961 (S/4861), Tunisia requested a meeting of the Security Council as a matter of extreme urgency for the purpose of considering the complaint of Tunisia against France "for acts of aggression infringing the sovereignty and security of Tunisia and threatening international peace and security".

In a further communication (S/4862) of the same date, Tunisia reiterated the request and submitted an explanatory memorandum which stated, inter alia, that: "since the afternoon of 19 July, the town and the Governorate of Bizerta have been under attacks by the French navy and air force. Furthermore, 800 French paratroopers have been dropped over Bizerta, thus violating Tunisia's airspace despite the categorical prohibition of the Tunisian Government. Moreover, during the night of 19 to 20 July, French armoured units which had been inside the Bizerta base took up positions outside that base".

On 20 July 1961, the representative of France requested (S/4864) the circulation of the text of two notes, dated 18 and 20 July 1961 respectively, which had been delivered to the Office of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Tunisia. In the first note, the French Government noted that the measures announced by the President of the Republic of Tunisia were designed not to restore normal conditions, but, on the contrary, to increase tension. Action of this nature would, moreover, serve only to delay conversations concerning the Bizerta base, which were provided for in the exchange of letters of 17 June 1958 and which the French Government still wished to see opened. In the second note, the French Government warned the Tunisian Government against the attempt it had announced to cripple the Bizerta base by means of popular demonstrations and force. At the same time it stated that it was compelled to take all necessary steps to ensure the inviolability of the installations and freedom of communication between them.

On 21 July, the Council included the Tunisian complaint in its agenda. The representative of Tunisia took part in the discussion, which continued from the 961st meeting that day to the 966th meeting on 29 July.

On 22 July 1961, the Secretary-General stated that in view of the obligations imposed under Article 99 of the Charter, he considered it his duty in the circumstances to make an urgent appeal to the Council to consider, without delay, taking an intermediary decision pending the further consideration of the item and conclusion of the debate. Such a decision should not prejudge the final outcome of the deliberations of the Council, as it should, in his view, only request of the two sides concerned an immediate cessation, through a cease-fire, of all hostile action. Naturally, this demand should be combined with a demand for an immediate return to the status quo ante, as otherwise the cease-fire would be likely to prove too unstable to satisfy the urgent needs of the moment.

Expressing support for the recommendation which had been made to the Council by the Secretary-General, Liberia submitted a draft resolution (S/4880) which would: (1) call for an immediate cease-fire and a return of all armed forces to their original position; (2) decide to continue the debate.

At the same meeting, the Council adopted this draft resolution by 10 votes, with one member not participating in the voting (resolution 164 of 22 July 1961).

On 22 July, Liberia and the United Arab Republic submitted a draft resolution (S/4870) which would: (1) call for an immediate cease-fire; (2) further call for the immediate withdrawal of those French forces which had been introduced into the base at Bizerta, and for the return to their original position of those which had transgressed beyond the limits of that base, since 19 July 1961; (3) further call upon both parties to enter into immediate negotiations aimed at the speedy evacuation of the French forces from Tunisia.

The United Kingdom and the United States submitted a draft resolution (S/4879) under which the Council would: (1) call upon the parties to effect an immediate cease-fire and a speedy return of all forces to their previous positions; (2) call upon all concerned to refrain from any action which might lead to a further deterioration of the situation; (3) urge the parties, in accordance with the Charter, to negotiate promptly a peaceful settlement of their differences; and (4) decide to keep the situation under urgent review in the interests of peace and security.

The draft resolution submitted by Liberia and the United Arab Republic was rejected by 4 votes to none, with 7 abstentions. The draft resolution submitted

by the United Kingdom and the United States was rejected by 6 votes in favour, none against, with 5 abstentions.

Further communications concerning the matter were addressed to the President of the Council by the representatives of France and Tunisia, including an appeal from the President of Tunisia for a direct and personal exchange of views between him and the Secretary-General.

On 25 July, the Secretary-General stated that the request imposed upon him the clear duty to place himself at the disposal of the President of the Republic for a personal exchange of views, which he hoped might help to lead towards peace.

On 28 July, the representative of France informed the President of the Council that the cease-fire at Bizerta and in the Sahara had been established and was being observed. In those circumstances, the French delegation did not consider it necessary to associate itself with any discussions which might take place in the Security Council.

When the discussion of the question was resumed by the Council on 28 July at the request of Tunisia, the representatives of Libya and Senegal were invited to participate in the deliberations of the Council.

On 26 July, the United Arab Republic submitted, with Ceylon and Liberia, a draft resolution (S/4903) under which the Council would: (1) express its serious concern over the fact that France had not complied fully with resolution 154 of 22 July and that the situation continued to represent a serious threat to international peace and security; and (2) invite France to comply immediately with all the provisions of the interim resolution.

Under a second draft resolution (S/4904) submitted the same day by the same three Powers, the Council would invite France immediately to enter into negotiations with Tunisia with a view to the rapid evacuation of French forces from Tunisia.

Turkey introduced a draft resolution (S/4900) by which the Council would: (1) express its concern that resolution 154 had not been fully carried out; (2) call for immediate and full implementation of that resolution; and (3) urge the early opening of negotiations for a peaceful resolution of differences, including a definitive settlement of the question of Bizerta, having due regard for Tunisian sovereignty. On 29 July, Turkey withdrew the final paragraph so that a vote might be taken on paragraphs 1 and 2.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics proposed that in operative paragraph 1 of the Turkish draft resolution, after the words "has not been fully carried out", there be added the words "by France", and that, in operative paragraph 2 after the words "implementation of that resolution", there similarly be added the words "by France".

At the 966th meeting (29 July), the Council proceeded to vote on the various proposals before it: the three-Power draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, Liberia and the United Arab Republic (S/4903) was rejected by 4 votes in favour to none against, and 6 abstentions, France not participating in the vote. The second three-Power draft resolution (S/4904) was rejected by 4 votes in favour, none against and 6 abstentions. The oral amendments to the Turkish draft resolution proposed by the representative of the USSR were rejected by 4 votes in favour, none against and 6 abstentions. The draft resolution as a whole was rejected by 6 votes in favour, none against and 4 abstentions.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 29 July 1961.

50. LETTER DATED 21 NOVEMBER 1961 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF CUBA ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 21 November 1961, Cuba requested (S/4992) a meeting of the Security Council to consider its charges that the United States was carrying out a plan of armed intervention in the Dominican Republic in violation of that country's sovereignty and of the Charter of the United Nations.

The Security Council discussed the question at the 980th, 981st and 983rd meetings held on 22, 24 and 26 November. The representatives of Cuba and the Dominican Republic were invited to participate in the Council's debate.

At the conclusion of the debate, the President stated that the item would remain on the Council's agenda for further discussion if required.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 26 November 1961.

51. LETTER DATED 18 DECEMBER 1961 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF PORTUGAL ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Between 8 and 16 December 1961, the President of the Security Council received a series of communications from Portugal and India relating to the situation in the area of the territories of Goa, Damao and Diu. In that connexion also, an appeal had been addressed to the two Governments by the Acting Secretary-General on 14 December, to which both parties had replied on 16 December.

On 18 December, in a further letter (S/5030) to the President of the Council, Portugal charged that India had launched a full-scale armed attack on the Portuguese territories of Goa, Damao and Diu. As a result of that attack much damage and many casualties had already taken place. In those circumstances Portugal was obliged to request the Security Council to convene immediately in order to put a stop to the aggression of India and to order an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal forthwith of all Indian troops from the Portuguese territories.

On the same day, the Security Council decided, by a vote of 7 to 2, with 2 abstentions, to include the question in its agenda, and discussed it at the 967th and 988th meetings held on the same day.

Two draft resolutions were submitted. Under the terms of the first draft resolution (S/5032), co-sponsored by Ceylon, Liberia and the United Arab Republic, the Security Council would decide to reject the Portuguese complaint of aggression against India and would call upon Portugal to terminate hostile action and to co-operate with India in the liquidation of its colonial possessions in India.

Under the second draft resolution (S/5033), submitted by France, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States, the Security Council would: (1) call for an immediate cessation of hostilities; (2) call upon the Government of India to withdraw its forces immediately to positions prevailing before 17 December 1961; (3) urge the parties to work out a permanent solution of their differences by peaceful means in accordance with the principles embodied in the Charter; and (4) request the Secretary-General to provide such assistance as might be appropriate.

At the 988th meeting (18 December 1961) the three-Power draft resolution (S/5032) was put to the vote, and was not adopted, having received 4 votes in

favour and 7 against. The four-Power draft resolution (S/5033) received 7 votes in favour and 4 against and was not adopted because one of the negative votes was cast by a permanent member of the Security Council.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 18 December 1961.

52. LETTER DATED 22 OCTOBER 1962 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF
THE SECURITY COUNCIL

LETTER DATED 22 OCTOBER 1962 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF CUBA ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

LETTER DATED 23 OCTOBER 1962 FROM THE DEPUTY PERMANENT
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 23 October, the Security Council met urgently to consider the crisis which had arisen in the Caribbean. The meeting was requested by the United States and Cuba, in separate letters of 22 October (S/5181 and S/5185) and by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in a letter of 23 October (S/5186).

The United States letter requested the Council to deal with the dangerous threat to the peace and security of the world caused by the secret establishment in Cuba by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of launching bases and the installation of long-range ballistic missiles capable of carrying thermonuclear warheads to most of North and South America. It stated that, upon satisfying itself as to the deliberately provocative steps which had been taken, the United States Government had called for a Meeting of Consultation of the Organization of American States (OAS) and was initiating, among other measures, a strict quarantine of Cuba to interdict the carriage of offensive weapons to that country.

The Cuban letter requested the Council to consider the act of war unilaterally committed by the Government of the United States in ordering the naval blockade of Cuba. It charged that the United States action was in disregard of the international organizations, particularly of the Security Council.

The USSR letter asked the Council to examine the question of "Violation of the Charter of the United Nations and threat to the peace on the part of the United

States of America". In a statement attached to the letter, the Soviet Government charged that the United States was taking a step towards the unleashing of a thermonuclear war and was violating international law and the United Nations Charter by arrogating to itself the right to attack foreign vessels on the high seas. It emphasized that Soviet assistance to Cuba was exclusively designed to improve Cuba's defensive capacity and was necessitated by the continuous acts of provocation of the United States.

At the 1022nd meeting (23 October 1962) the Security Council decided to consider the three letters simultaneously and invited the representative of Cuba to participate in the debate. It discussed the matter at the 1022nd to 1025th meetings held from 23 to 25 October.

Three draft resolutions were submitted to the Council in connexion with this question. A United States draft resolution (S/5182) proposed that the Security Council should call, under Article 40 of the Charter, for the immediate dismantling and withdrawal from Cuba of all missiles and other offensive weapons; authorize the Acting Secretary-General to dispatch to Cuba a United Nations observer corps to assure and report on compliance with the resolution; call for the termination of the quarantine of Cuba upon the United Nations certification of compliance with the provision for dismantling and withdrawal and recommend that the United States and the USSR should confer promptly on measures to remove the existing threat to peace, and report thereon to the Security Council.

A USSR draft resolution (S/5187) proposed that the Security Council should condemn the actions of the United States Government aimed at violating the United Nations Charter and increasing the threat of war; insist that the United States Government revoke its decision to inspect ships of other States bound for Cuba; request the United States to cease any interference whatsoever in the internal affairs of Cuba and of other States; and call upon the United States, Cuba and the USSR to establish contact and enter into negotiations with the aim of normalizing the situation and thus removing the threat of war.

A joint draft resolution (S/5190) was submitted by Ghana and the United Arab Republic under which the Council would: request the Acting Secretary-General promptly to confer with the parties directly concerned on the immediate steps to be taken to remove the existing threat to world peace, and to normalize the situation in the Caribbean; call upon the parties concerned to comply forthwith

with the resolution and provide every assistance to the Acting Secretary-General in performing his task; request the Acting Secretary-General to report to the Council on the implementation of the first provision; and call upon the parties concerned to refrain from any action which might directly or indirectly further aggravate the situation.

At the 1024th meeting on 24 October, the Acting Secretary-General informed the Security Council that, at the request of a large number of Member States, he had sent identical messages to the President of the United States and to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, urging the parties concerned to get together with a view to resolving the crisis peacefully and normalizing the situation in the Caribbean.

President Kennedy, in his reply of 25 October, stated that the threat had been created by the secret introduction of offensive weapons into Cuba, and that the answer lay in the removal of those weapons. The President indicated that Ambassador Stevenson was ready to discuss the matter promptly with the Acting Secretary-General in order to determine whether satisfactory arrangements could be made. Premier Khrushchev, in his reply of 26 October, welcomed the Secretary-General's initiative and expressed agreement with the proposal made by the Acting Secretary-General, which met the interests of peace. At the 1025th meeting (25 October), the representatives of the United States and the USSR informed the Council of these replies.

The representatives of the United Arab Republic, Ghana and Chile welcomed the favourable response from both sides to the appeal by the Acting Secretary-General and observed that the time was propitious for the parties to get together and begin negotiations with the assistance of the Acting Secretary-General.

On a motion by the United Arab Republic, supported by Ghana, the Council adjourned sine die.

On 7 January 1963, in a joint letter to the Secretary-General (S/5027), the First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR and the Permanent Representative of the United States expressed their appreciation of the Secretary-General's efforts in assisting the two Governments to avert the serious threat to the peace which had recently arisen in the Caribbean area. They further stated that, in view of the degree of understanding which had been reached between them, the two Governments believed that it was not necessary for the item to occupy further the attention of the Security Council at that time.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 25 October 1962.

53. COMPLAINTS BY SENEGAL OF VIOLATIONS OF ITS AIR SPACE AND TERRITORY

On 10 April 1963, Senegal informed the Security Council (S/5279/Corr.1) of its complaint that on 8 April four Portuguese aircraft had violated Senegalese air space and had dropped four grenades on the village of Bougniack. In its letter Senegal also charged that in December 1961 its territory and air space had been violated by Portugal on three occasions. In view of those repeated incidents, Senegal requested that a meeting of the Security Council be convened to discuss the matter.

On the same day, Portugal stated (S/5281) that a careful investigation by its Government had shown clearly that the charge of violation of Senegalese territory was without the slightest foundation. On the date in question, no Portuguese military aircraft had overflown any area around the border of Senegal. With regard to Senegal's charges concerning alleged earlier violations, Portugal had already replied to them in its letter of 10 January 1962 (S/5055).

The Security Council included the item in its agenda at its 1027th meeting (17 April 1963), and invited the representatives of Senegal and Portugal to participate, without vote, in its consideration. On 18 April, the Council also agreed to accede to the requests of the representatives of the Congo (Brazzaville) and Gabon, to participate in the discussion at the appropriate time. The Council considered the item at the 1027th to 1032nd meetings from 17 to 24 April 1963.

On 25 April, Morocco and Ghana introduced a draft resolution (S/5292) whereby the Security Council would deplore any incursion by Portuguese military forces into Senegalese territory as well as the incident which occurred at Bougniack on 8 April; request the Government of Portugal, in accordance with its declared intentions, to take whatever action might be necessary to prevent any violation of Senegal's sovereignty and territorial integrity; and request the Secretary-General to keep the development of the situation under review.

At its 1032nd meeting, the Security Council adopted the draft resolution unanimously (resolution 176 of 24 April 1963).

On 7 May 1965, the representative of Senegal declared, in a letter to the President of the Security Council (S/6333) that Portuguese authorities had repeatedly violated Senegalese air space and territory on a growing scale and had set Senegalese villages and crops on fire. He charged that, since the adoption of Security Council resolution 178 of 24 April 1963, thirteen territorial violations had been noted by the Government of Senegal, some of which had been brought to the attention of the Security Council in February 1965. In view of those acts of the Portuguese authorities, Senegal requested that a meeting of the Security Council be convened to ask Portugal again to cease its violation of Senegalese territory.

The Security Council included the item in its agenda at its 1205th meeting (12 May 1965) and invited the representatives of Senegal and Portugal to participate, without vote, in its consideration. On 18 May, the Council also agreed to accede to the request of the representative of the Congo (Brazzaville) to participate in the discussion. The Council considered the item at five meetings held between 12 and 19 May.

At the 1210th meeting (18 May), the Ivory Coast, Jordan and Malaysia introduced a draft resolution (S/6566/Rev.1) whereby the Security Council would deeply deplore any incursions by Portuguese military forces into Senegalese territory, reaffirm resolution 178 of 24 April 1963, request the Government of Portugal once again to take all effective and necessary action to prevent any violation of Senegal's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and request the Secretary-General to follow the development of the situation.

At the 1212th meeting, the Security Council unanimously adopted the draft resolution (resolution 204 of 19 May 1965).

54. TELEGRAM DATED 5 MAY 1963 FROM THE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF
THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 5 May 1963, Haiti requested (S/5502) a meeting of the Security Council to examine as a matter of urgency the grave situation created by repeated threats of aggression and acts of interference on the part of the Dominican Republic against Haiti, which constituted a danger to international peace and security.

Prior to the request by Haiti, the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States (OAS) had informed (S/5301, S/5304 and S/5307) the Security Council, under Article 54 of the United Nations Charter, of action taken by the Council of the OAS in connexion with the controversy which had arisen between the Dominican Republic and Haiti, including a decision of 28 April to establish a committee of five members to study on the spot the events denounced by the Dominican Republic, and to request the Governments of the Dominican Republic and Haiti to co-operate with the committee and to refrain from any act which might result in a breach of international peace.

The Council included the item in its agenda at its 1035th meeting (8 May 1963) and invited the representatives of the Dominican Republic and Haiti to participate, without vote, in the discussion.

At the 1036th meeting (9 May), the President of the Council drew attention to the text of a resolution adopted by the Council of the OAS on 8 May providing for further study of the Dominican-Haitian situation by the Committee of Five and for an increase, if necessary, in the membership of the Committee.

In further statements made by Haiti and the Dominican Republic, the former, while maintaining its right to resort to the Security Council, said that it would agree to a decision of the Council to await the results of the peace mission of the OAS, provided the Security Council remained seized of the question.

The President of the Council, taking note of the views expressed, adjourned the meeting on the understanding that the question would remain on the Council's agenda.

On 30 August 1963, Haiti requested (S/5411) a meeting of the Security Council to reconsider the Haitian-Dominican question on the ground that new acts of hostility on the part of the Dominican Republic against Haiti threatened international peace and security. However, on 3 September, Haiti withdrew that request (S/5413), but indicated that its decision did not relieve the United Nations of responsibility in the matter of Haiti's complaint.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 9 May 1963.

55. REPORTS BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING DEVELOPMENTS RELATING TO YEMEN

On 29 April 1965, the Secretary-General reported to the Security Council (S/5298) that since the fall of 1962 he had been consulting regularly with the representatives of the Governments of Yemen, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Republic concerning certain aspects of the situation in Yemen of external origin, with a view to making his offices available to the parties for such assistance as might be desired towards ensuring against any developments in that situation which might threaten the peace of the area. As a result of separate fact-finding missions carried out on his behalf by Mr. Bunche, and by Mr. Ellsworth Bunker of the United States of America, he had received from each of the three Governments concerned, in separate communications, formal confirmation of their acceptance of identical terms of disengagement in Yemen.

The Government of Saudi Arabia would terminate all support and aid to the Royalists of Yemen and would prohibit the use of Saudi Arabian territory by Royalist leaders for the purpose of carrying on the struggle in Yemen. Simultaneously with the suspension of aid from Saudi Arabia to the Royalists, the United Arab Republic undertook to begin withdrawal from Yemen of the troops sent on request of the new Government, the withdrawal to be phased and to take place as soon as possible. A demilitarized zone was to be established to a distance of twenty kilometres on each side of the Saudi Arabian-Yemen border, and impartial observers were to be stationed there to check on the observance of the terms of disengagement. They would also certify the suspension of activities in support of the Royalists from Saudi Arabian territory and the outward movement of the United Arab Republic forces and equipment from the airports and seaports of Yemen. General von Horn was to visit the three countries concerned to consult on terms relating to the nature and functioning of United Nations observers in implementation of the terms of disengagement.

In a further report (S/5521) submitted on 27 May, the Secretary-General concluded, on the basis of information provided by General von Horn, that United Nations observers in the area were vitally necessary and should be dispatched with the least possible delay. The personnel required would not exceed 200 and it was estimated that the observation function would not be required for more than four

months. On 7 June, the Secretary-General informed the Council that Saudi Arabia had agreed to accept "a proportionate share" of the costs of the operation, while the United Arab Republic agreed in principle to provide assistance in an amount equivalent to \$200,000 for a period of two months, which would be roughly half of the cost of the operation over that period. It was not precluded, of course, that an appeal to the Government of the United Arab Republic for additional assistance could be made at the end of two months, should it be found necessary to extend the operation beyond that period. There were therefore no financial implications for the United Nations in getting the Yemen Observation Mission established and the operation under way, or for its maintenance for an initial period of two months.

On 10 June, at the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, (S/5326) the Security Council was convened to consider the reports of the Secretary-General. In making the request, the representative of the USSR stated that the reports contained certain proposals concerning possible measures for the maintenance of international peace and security, on which, under the Charter, decisions were taken by the Security Council. The Council discussed the question at the 1037th to 1039th meetings on 10 and 11 June 1963.

A joint draft resolution (S/5330) was submitted by Ghana and Morocco, under the terms of which the Security Council would note with satisfaction the initiative of the Secretary-General and the acceptance by the parties directly concerned of disengagement, as well as the agreement of the Governments of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Republic to defray the expenses over a period of two months of a United Nations observation function. It would urge the parties concerned to observe the terms of disengagement, and would request the Secretary-General to establish the observation operation and to report to the Security Council on the implementation of this decision.

At the 1039th meeting, the draft resolution was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 179 of 11 June 1963). Subsequently, with the concurrence of the parties concerned the mandate of the United Nations Yemen Observation Mission was extended periodically by the Secretary-General after consultation with the members of the Security Council.

In a report (S/5927) on 2 September 1964, the Secretary-General said that in the light of circumstances and in accordance with the expressed wishes of the parties concerned, he had decided to terminate the activities of the United Nations Yemen Observation Mission on 4 September.

On 11 September the Secretary-General reported (S/5959) to the Council that his decision to terminate the activities of the Mission on 4 September had now been put into effect and that the Mission ended its activities on that date.

56. QUESTION CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN TERRITORIES UNDER PORTUGUESE ADMINISTRATION: LETTER DATED 11 JULY 1963 ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THIRTY-TWO MEMBER STATES.

On 11 July 1963, thirty-two African countries requested (S/5374) an early meeting of the Council to consider the situation in the Territories under Portuguese domination. In support of their request, the African representatives declared that Portugal's persistent refusal to comply with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions had brought about a serious threat to international peace and security.

The Security Council also had before it a report of 19 July and a resolution (S/5356) which had been adopted on 4 April 1963 by the Special Committee on the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

The Security Council included the question in its agenda at the 1040th meeting (22 July) and invited the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Tunisia, Liberia and Sierra Leone, the Finance Minister of Madagascar and the Foreign Minister of Portugal to take part in the discussion.

The question was discussed at the 1040th to 1049th meetings from 25 to 31 July. On 26 July, a draft resolution (S/5372) was submitted by Ghana, Morocco and the Philippines, whereby the Security Council would decide that Portugal's claim that territories under its administration were integral parts of metropolitan Portugal was contrary to the Charter; condemn Portugal's violations of the Charter and its refusal to implement United Nations resolutions; demand that Portugal implement five steps recommended by the Assembly on 14 December 1962, which would culminate in the granting of independence to the Portuguese Territories; call upon all States to prevent the sale and supply of military equipment to the Portuguese Government for the continuance of its repressive measures; and request the Secretary-General to ensure the implementation of the resolution and to report to the Council by 30 September 1963.

On 30 July, Venezuela submitted amendments (S/5379) to the three-Power draft resolution, which were accepted by the sponsors at the following meeting. They provided, inter alia, for replacing the terms "condemns" by "deprecates", "is seriously endangering" by "is seriously disturbing", and "decides" by "requests", and they also changed the date "30 September 1963" to "31 October 1963".

At the 1049th meeting, the Security Council adopted the draft resolution as amended by 8 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 180 of 31 July 1963).

At the request of twenty-nine African Member States (S/5460), the Security Council convened on 6 December 1963 to consider the report of the Secretary-General (S/5448 and Add.1-3) pursuant to the resolution adopted by the Council on 31 July.

The question was discussed at the 1079th to 1083rd meetings from 6 to 11 December. On 10 December 1963, Ghana introduced a draft resolution (S/5480) sponsored by Ghana, Morocco and the Philippines. By that draft resolution, the Council, among other things, would express regret that the contacts initiated by the Secretary-General between the representatives of the African States and Portugal had not achieved the desired results; call upon all States to comply with resolution 180 of 31 July 1963; deprecate the non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with that resolution; reaffirm the interpretation of self-determination as laid down in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV); express the belief that action by the Government of Portugal to grant amnesty to all persons imprisoned or exiled for advocating self-determination in the Territories would be an evidence of its good faith; and request the Secretary-General to continue his efforts and report to the Council by 1 June 1964.

At its 1083rd meeting, the Council voted separately on operative paragraph 5, whereby the Council would deprecate the non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with resolution 180 of 31 July, and adopted the paragraph by 7 votes to none, with 4 abstentions. It then proceeded to vote on the draft resolution as a whole and adopted it by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 153 of 11 December 1963).

On 29 May 1964, the Secretary-General reported to the Security Council (S/5727) that up to that date he had not received any information from the Government of Portugal concerning any steps it had taken to implement the resolutions of the Council. The Secretary-General was in consultation with the Government of Portugal and the representatives of the African States regarding the

possibility of the talks between them being continued, but was not yet in a position to report any positive developments.

The Security Council resumed consideration of the item at its 1250th meeting on 4 November 1965 on the basis of letters dated 23 July 1965 from the representatives of thirty-two Member States (S/6585) and 15 October 1965 from the representatives of Liberia, Madagascar, Sierra Leone and Tunisia (S/6791), both addressed to the President of the Security Council.

The President, with the consent of the Council, invited the representatives of Liberia, Tunisia, Madagascar, Sierra Leone and Portugal to participate in the discussion. Discussion was continued at the 1266th to 1268th meetings on 22 and 23 November.

At the 1266th meeting, a joint draft resolution was submitted by the Ivory Coast, Jordan, Liberia, Malaysia, Sierra Leone and Tunisia (S/6953/Rev.1) and at the 1267th meeting the President informed the Council that Madagascar had requested that it be added to the list of sponsors (S/6953/Add.1).

At the 1268th meeting, the representative of Uruguay presented amendments (S/5965) to the joint draft resolution which as orally revised by him provided for (1) the substitution of the words "seriously disturbs" for the word "endangers" in the first operative paragraph, and (2) the deletion of two operative paragraphs, calling upon all States to comply with paragraph 6 of resolution 180 of 31 July 1963 and to take all necessary measures to prevent the sale and shipment of equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunitions in Portugal and the Territories under Portuguese administration. In their place the amendment provided for a new operative paragraph under which the Council would request all States to refrain forthwith from offering the Portuguese Government any assistance which would enable it to continue its repression of the people of the Territories under its administration, and take all the necessary measures to prevent the sale and supply of arms and military equipment to the Portuguese Government for this purpose, including the sale and shipment of equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition to be used in the Territories under Portuguese administration.

At the same meeting, the Security Council voted separately on the two amendments by Uruguay. The first amendment was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention, and the second by 3 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Uruguay a separate vote was also taken on an operative paragraph of the joint draft resolution which called upon all States to take all the necessary measures either separately or collectively to boycott all Portuguese imports and exports. It was rejected by 4 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The Security Council then voted on the joint draft resolution as amended by the inclusion of the amendments of Uruguay and with the deletion of an operative paragraph. The seven-Power draft resolution was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 4 abstentions (resolution 218 of 23 November 1965). Under its operative part, the Security Council (1) affirmed that the situation resulting from the policies of Portugal both as regards the African population of its colonies and the neighbouring States seriously disturbed international peace and security; (2) deplored the failure of the Government of Portugal to comply with previous resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly and to recognize the right of the peoples under its administration to self-determination and independence; (3) reaffirmed the interpretation of the principle of self-determination as laid down in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and in Security Council resolution 135 (1963); (4) called upon Portugal to give immediate effect to the principle of self-determination as referred to in paragraph 3 above in the Territories under its administration; (5) reaffirmed its urgent demand to Portugal for: (a) the immediate recognition of the right of the peoples of the Territories under its administration to self-determination and independence; (b) the immediate cessation of all acts of repression and the withdrawal of all military and other forces at present employed for that purpose; (c) the promulgation of an unconditional political amnesty and the establishment of conditions that would allow the free functioning of political parties; (d) negotiations, on the basis of the recognition of the right of self-determination, with the authorized representatives of the political parties within and outside the Territories with a view to the transfer of power to political institutions freely elected and representative of the peoples, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV); (e) the granting of independence immediately thereafter to all the Territories under its administration in accordance with the aspirations of the peoples; (6) requested all States to refrain forthwith from offering the Portuguese Government any assistance which would enable it to continue

its repression of the people of the Territories under its administration, and take all the necessary measures to prevent the sale and supply of arms and military equipment to the Portuguese Government for this purpose, including the sale and shipment of equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition to be used in the Territories under Portuguese administration; (7) requested all States to inform the Secretary-General on whatever measures were undertaken towards implementation of paragraph 6 of the present resolution; and (8) requested the Secretary-General to ensure the implementation of the provisions of this resolution, to provide such assistance as he might deem necessary and to report to the Security Council not later than 30 June 1966.

57. THE QUESTION OF RACE CONFLICT IN SOUTH AFRICA RESULTING FROM THE POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA: LETTER DATED 11 JULY 1963 ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THIRTY-TWO MEMBER STATES

In a letter dated 11 July 1963 (S/5348), the representatives of thirty-two African States requested an early meeting of the Council to consider what they described as the explosive situation in the Republic of South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid pursued by the Government of South Africa and its systematic refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions on the question.

The Security Council discussed the matter at the 1050th to 1056th meetings held between 31 July and 7 August 1963.

The Security Council also had before it two reports (S/5310 and S/5353) submitted by the Special Committee on the policies of apartheid of the Republic of South Africa on 6 May and 17 July 1963.

Liberia, Tunisia, Sierra Leone and Madagascar, which had been designated by the Conference of Independent African States, held at Addis Ababa in May 1963, to speak on behalf of all the States members of the Organisation of African Unity, were invited to participate. The Republic of South Africa, also invited by the Security Council to participate in the debate, informed the Council on 31 July (S/5351) that it had decided not to participate in the Council's discussion of matters which it considered to be solely within the domestic jurisdiction of a Member State.

A draft resolution (S/5384 and Corr.1) was submitted by Ghana, Morocco and the Philippines under the operative paragraphs of which the Council would: (1) strongly deprecate the policies of South Africa in its perpetuation of racial discrimination as being inconsistent with the principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations and contrary to its obligations as a Member State; (2) call upon the Government of South Africa to abandon its policies of apartheid and discrimination as called for in Security Council resolution 134 of 1 April 1960, and to liberate all persons imprisoned, interned or subjected to other restrictions for having opposed the policy of apartheid; (3) call upon all States to boycott all South African goods and to refrain from exporting to South Africa strategic materials of direct military value; (4) call upon all States to cease forthwith the sale and shipment of arms, ammunition of all types and military vehicles to South Africa; and (5) request the Secretary-General to keep the situation in South Africa under observation and to report to the Security Council by 30 October 1963.

At its 1056th meeting, the Security Council voted on the draft resolution. Paragraph 3 was voted upon separately receiving 5 votes to none with 6 abstentions, and failed to be adopted. The remainder of the draft resolution was adopted by 9 votes in favour, none against, with 2 abstentions (resolution 181 of 7 August 1963).

The third report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (S/5426 and Add.1-2) was submitted on 13 September 1963. On 11 October 1963, the Secretary-General, in pursuance of resolution 181, submitted a report (S/5438 and Add.1-6) to the Council which contained replies by South Africa and other States to his request for information on the implementation of the resolution.

On 25 October, thirty-two African and Asian States requested (S/5444 and Add.1) the Security Council to consider urgently the Secretary-General's report of 11 October. They pointed out that the reaction of the South African Government to Security Council resolution 181 of 7 August had been completely negative and that the situation in the country had been exacerbated by recent developments there.

The Council discussed the item at the 1073rd to 1078th meetings held between 27 November and 4 December.

On 3 December, Norway submitted a draft resolution (S/5469) by which the Council, inter alia, would: (1) appeal to all States to comply with resolution 181 of 7 August; (2) urgently request the Government of the Republic of South Africa

to cease forthwith its continued imposition of discriminatory and repressive measures which were a violation of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; (3) condemn the non-compliance of the Government of the Republic of South Africa with appeals contained in the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions; (4) again call upon the Government of South Africa to release all persons imprisoned, interned or subjected to other restriction for their opposition to apartheid; (5) call upon all States to cease forthwith the sale and shipment of equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition in the Republic; (6) request the Secretary-General to establish under his direction a group of recognized experts to examine methods of resolving the present situation in South Africa through full, peaceful and orderly application of human rights and fundamental freedoms to all inhabitants, regardless of race, colour or creed, and to consider what part the United Nations might play in the achievement of that end; (7) invite the Government of South Africa to avail itself of the assistance of the group in order to bring about the desired peaceful transformation; and (8) request the Secretary-General to continue to keep the situation under observation and to report to the Security Council not later than 1 June 1964 on the implementation of the resolution.

At the 1078th meeting, the Norwegian draft resolution was adopted unanimously (resolution 182 of 4 December 1963).

On 20 April 1964, the Secretary-General circulated his report (S/5658 and Corr.1 and Add.1-5) to the Security Council on the implementation of resolution 182 of 4 December 1963. It contained the text of a reply dated 5 February from the Government of South Africa, describing the Security Council resolution of 4 December as an "unparalleled attempt at deliberate interference" in the internal affairs of the Republic of South Africa, and stating that any form of co-operation with the group of experts was out of the question. It also contained the report of the group. Later, the Secretary-General transmitted replies (S/5658/Add.1-5) from Member States on the implementation of the above-mentioned resolution.

On 30 April 1964, fifty-eight delegations requested the Security Council (S/5674) to resume consideration of the serious situation existing in South Africa in the light of the report presented by the Secretary-General and the new developments in South Africa, particularly the imposition of death sentences on a number of African political leaders.

On 8 June, the Security Council met to resume consideration of the question, which it discussed at the 1127th to 1135th meetings held between 8 and 18 June. It had before it two further reports by the Special Committee dated 23 March 1964 (S/5621) and 25 May 1964 (S/5717).

At the opening meeting, Morocco introduced a draft resolution (S/5752) sponsored jointly with the Ivory Coast which, as subsequently revised by its sponsors, provided that the Security Council should: urge the South African Government to renounce the execution of the persons sentenced to death for acts resulting from their opposition to the policies of apartheid, to end forthwith the trial in progress under the arbitrary laws of apartheid, and to grant amnesty to all persons already in prison, interned or subjected to other restrictions, particularly to the defendants in the Rivonia trial; invite all the States to exert their influence so as to induce the South African Government to comply with the resolution; and invite the Secretary-General to follow closely the implementation of the resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.

At the 1128th meeting, the draft resolution, as revised, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 4 abstentions (resolution 190 of 9 June 1964).

On 16 June, Norway submitted a draft resolution, co-sponsored by Bolivia (S/5769). Under its operative part, the Security Council would, inter alia: condemn the apartheid policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa; reiterate its appeal for the release of all persons imprisoned, interned or subjected to other restrictions for having opposed apartheid; appeal to the South African Government to renounce the execution of any person sentenced to death for opposition to apartheid, and to grant amnesty to all detained or on trial for such opposition. The Council would also note the recommendations and conclusions in the report of the group of experts, endorse and subscribe in particular to its main conclusion that "all the people of South Africa should be brought into consultation and should thus be able to decide the future of their country at the national level": request the Secretary-General to consider what assistance the United Nations might offer to facilitate such consultations; and invite South Africa to accept that main conclusion of the group of experts, and to submit to the Secretary-General its views with respect to such consultation by 30 November 1964. Further, the Council would decide to establish an expert committee of all its members to undertake a technical and practical

study and report to the Council as to the feasibility, effectiveness and implications of measures which could, as appropriate, be taken by the Council under the Charter; and would authorize the expert committee to request all United Nations Members to submit their views on such measures to it not later than 30 November. The Committee would complete its report not later than three months thereafter. The Council would also invite the Secretary-General, in consultation with appropriate specialized agencies, to establish an education and training programme for the purpose of arranging for education and training abroad for South Africans. Finally, the Council would reaffirm its call upon all States to cease the sale and shipment to South Africa of arms, ammunition, military vehicles and equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition in South Africa, and would request all Member States to take such steps as they deemed appropriate to persuade the Government of South Africa to comply with the resolution.

At the 1135th meeting, the Council adopted the joint draft resolution by 8 votes to none, with 3 abstentions (resolution 191 of 18 June 1964).

In a reply (S/5817) dated 13 July to the Secretary-General's letter transmitting resolution 190 of 9 June 1964, the representative of South Africa stated that his Government regarded the resolution as constituting intervention by the United Nations in the judicial processes of a Member State and, therefore, as completely illegal.

On 25 August the Secretary-General submitted his report (S/5915) on the implementation of Council resolution 190 of 9 June 1964. He recalled the reply of the South African Government in its letter of 13 July and transmitted the replies received from thirty-five other States in connexion with the implementation of the resolution.

On 30 November, the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa submitted a report (S/6075) to the General Assembly and the Security Council in which it reviewed the main developments relating to the racial policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa since its report of 13 September 1963, and made a number of recommendations.

On 27 February 1965, the Expert Committee composed of the 1964 members of the Security Council and established in pursuance of the Council resolution 191 of 18 June 1964 submitted to the Council a report (S/6210) on the feasibility, effectiveness, and implications of measures which could, as appropriate, be taken by the Security Council under the United Nations Charter.

On 16 June and 10 August respectively, the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa submitted two further reports to the Council (S/6453 and S/6605). On 2 August, thirty-two African States requested the convening of the Security Council (S/6584) to resume its consideration of the question in the light of the reports submitted by the Expert Committee of the Security Council and the Special Committee. On 15 October, the Council received a request from Liberia, Madagascar, Sierra Leone and Tunisia for participation in the Council's discussion of the question (S/6791). However, on 22 November, they requested the President of the Council to defer consideration of the question to a later date in view of the serious situation then prevailing in Southern Rhodesia and its implications with regard to the question of apartheid (S/6964).

(See related item 40 above.)

58. QUESTION CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA;
LETTERS DATED 2 AND 30 AUGUST 1963 ADDRESSED TO THE
PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL ON BEHALF OF THE
REPRESENTATIVES OF THIRTY-TWO MEMBER STATES

By a letter of 2 August 1963 (S/5532) the representatives of Ghana, Guinea, Morocco and the United Arab Republic requested the Council to consider the situation in Southern Rhodesia. A memorandum submitted with the letter stated that it was clear that the United Kingdom Government currently possessed every authority necessary to effect the reforms which the United Nations had requested. If the United Kingdom Government handed over, unconditionally, military and air force units and indeed all the attributes of sovereignty, save its nominal recognition, to the Government of Southern Rhodesia as at present constituted, then serious danger to world peace would ensue.

The Council also had before it a report and a resolution (S/5337) adopted on the question of Southern Rhodesia on 20 June 1963 by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

On 30 August, the Chargé d'Affaires of the Congo (Brazzaville), in a letter (S/5409) on behalf of twenty-eight African States, pledged those States' support for the four-Power letter of 2 August.

The Security Council included this question in its agenda on 9 September and invited representatives of Mali, Tanganyika, Uganda and the United Arab Republic to participate in the discussion of the question. The question was discussed at the 1064th to 1069th meetings from 9 to 15 September.

On 11 September, a draft resolution (S/5425/Rev.1) was submitted by Ghana, Morocco and the Philippines. Under it the Council would: invite the United Kingdom Government not to transfer to its colony of Southern Rhodesia as at present governed any powers or attributes of sovereignty until the establishment of a government fully representative of all the inhabitants of the colony; further invite the United Kingdom Government not to transfer to its colony of Southern Rhodesia the armed forces and aircraft as envisaged by the Central African Conference, 1963; invite the Government of the United Kingdom to implement the General Assembly resolutions on the question of Southern Rhodesia, in particular General Assembly resolutions 1747 (XVI) of 23 June 1962 and 1760 (XVII) of 31 October 1962; and request the General Assembly to continue its examination of the question of Southern Rhodesia with a view to securing a just and lasting settlement.

The Council proceeded to vote on 13 September, when 8 votes were cast in favour of the draft, 1 against, with 2 abstentions. The draft resolution was not adopted since the negative vote had been cast by a permanent member of the Council.

A report (S/5854) of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was forwarded to the Security Council on 23 July 1964. A supplement (S/5854/Add.1) to that report was forwarded to the Council on 22 December.

On 21 April 1965, the representatives of thirty-five African States requested (S/6294 and Add.1), the convening of an urgent meeting of the Council to examine the very serious situation existing in Southern Rhodesia. In the attached memorandum it was stated that, despite the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, the efforts of the Special Committee and the Secretary-General and the repeated appeals made by the African Heads of State and Government, the United Kingdom had done nothing to apply the principles of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to its colony of Southern Rhodesia. Their Governments were profoundly disturbed at the continuing deterioration of the situation in the Territory, resulting in particular from the intensification of the repressive measures directed against the African nationalist leaders. The recent decision to hold elections on the basis of the Constitution of 1961 was a challenge to the United Nations and to the Organization of African Unity. The threats of the so-called Prime Minister of the Territory to proclaim independence without regard for the opinion of the African inhabitants were creating a dangerous situation which constituted a threat to international peace and security. In the circumstances, and in view of the passivity of the United Kingdom Government, an urgent meeting of the Council must be held with a view to taking the measures required to put an end to the dangerous trend of the situation.

The Council discussed this question in the course of the 1194th, 1195th, 1197th, 1199th, 1201st and 1202nd meetings between 30 April and 6 May. In accordance with their requests, the Council invited the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Algeria and Senegal to participate in the discussion.

On 5 May, the Ivory Coast, Jordan and Malaysia submitted a draft resolution (S/6329/Rev.1) whereby, inter alia, the Council would: (1) take note of the United Kingdom Government's statement of 27 October 1964; (2) note and approve the opinion of the majority of the population of Southern Rhodesia that the United Kingdom should convene a constitutional conference; (3) request the United Kingdom Government and the Member States not to accept a unilateral declaration of independence for Southern Rhodesia by the minority Government; (4) request the United Kingdom to take all necessary action to prevent such a declaration; (5) request the United Kingdom Government not to transfer to

Southern Rhodesia, as at present governed, any of the powers or attributes of sovereignty, but to promote its attainment of independence by a democratic system of government in accordance with the aspirations of the majority of the population; (6) further request the United Kingdom Government to enter into consultations with all concerned with a view to convening a conference of all political parties in order to adopt new constitutional provisions acceptable to the majority of the people of Rhodesia, so that the earliest possible date might be set for independence; and (7) decide to keep the question of Southern Rhodesia on its agenda.

Amendments (S/6332/Rev.1) were submitted to the draft resolution by the USSR, whereby operative paragraphs 3 and 4 would be replaced by a request to the United Kingdom to cancel the elections set for 7 May on the basis of the 1961 Constitution and paragraph 5 would be modified to the effect that the United Kingdom would be requested to take the necessary measures for the immediate granting of independence to Southern Rhodesia.

At the 1202nd meeting on 6 May, the Security Council rejected the USSR amendments by 2 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions. It then adopted the joint draft resolution by 7 votes in favour, with 4 abstentions (resolution 202 of 6 May 1965).

The Security Council resumed consideration of the item at its 1257th meeting on 12 November 1965 on the basis of letters dated 11 November from the representative of the United Kingdom (S/687), 10 and 11 November from the President of the General Assembly (S/6897 and S/6908), 11 November from the representatives of thirty-five Member States (S/6902) and 11 November from the representatives of twenty-two Member States (S/6903), all addressed to the President of the Security Council.

At the 1257th meeting, the President, with the consent of the Council, invited the representatives of Algeria, India, Pakistan, Ghana, Zambia, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Mali, Tanzania and Nigeria, and at the 1258th and 1259th meetings, the representatives of Guinea and Ethiopia, pursuant to their requests, to participate without vote in the discussion.

In accordance with the proposal of Jordan at the 1257th meeting, the Council invited the Governments of Portugal and the Republic of South Africa to be represented at the meetings of the Council on the question.

At the 1258th meeting Jordan introduced a draft resolution (S/6921/Rev.1) which was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 216 of 12 November 1965). In that resolution the Security Council (1) decided to condemn the unilateral declaration of independence made by a racist minority in Southern Rhodesia; and (2) decided to call upon all States not to recognize the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and to refrain from rendering any assistance to that illegal régime.

At the 1259th and 1260th meetings (13 November) the United Kingdom and the Ivory Coast submitted draft resolutions (S/6928 and S/6929). Under the operative paragraphs of the United Kingdom draft resolution (S/6928), the Security Council would: (1) refuse to recognize the unilateral declaration of independence by the former régime in Southern Rhodesia as having any legal validity; (2) reiterate its call to all States to refuse to recognize the illegal and unconstitutional régime in Southern Rhodesia; (3) call upon all States to refrain from any action which could give aid and comfort to that régime, and in particular to refrain from supplying arms, equipment, or war material to it; and (4) call upon all States to lend all necessary assistance and support to the United Kingdom Government in making effective the measures taken by that Government, including the financial and economic measures, to bring the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia to an end.

Under the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution submitted by the Ivory Coast (S/6929), the Security Council would: (1) determine that the situation resulting from the declaration of independence by the racist minority settler régime constituted a threat to international peace and security; (2) declare illegal the seizure of power by the racist minority settler régime in Southern Rhodesia; (3) call upon the United Kingdom and all other States to take immediate steps to protect the lives of the 4 million Africans and other inhabitants of the territory who oppose this rebellion; (4) further call upon the United Kingdom Government, in addition to the measures it had proposed to take with regard to the situation in Southern Rhodesia, to suspend the 1961 Constitution; (5) call upon all States not to recognize the racist minority settler régime and to withdraw recognition of any State recognizing that régime; (6) demand that the rebellion by the racist minority settler régime be immediately

crushed and law and order established in that African territory; (7) demand further that majority rule be established in the territory on the principle of "one man, one vote"; (8) call upon all States to enforce on the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia a complete interruption of economic relations, including an embargo on supplies of oil and petroleum products, and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication and severance of diplomatic and consular relations, in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter; (9) decide to take all the enforcement measures provided for under Articles 42 and 43 of the Charter against the racist minority settler régime; and (10) authorize the Secretary-General to ensure the immediate implementation of this resolution and to report as soon as possible.

The Security Council continued its consideration of the item at the 1261st to 1265th meetings on 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20 November 1965.

In addition to the twelve representatives previously invited, the representatives of Mauritania, the Gambia, Jamaica, Somalia and the Sudan were invited by the President at the 1261st and 1263rd meetings, with the consent of the Council, pursuant to their requests, to participate in the discussion.

The Governments of the Republic of South Africa and Portugal, in letters dated 15 November (S/6935 and S/6938) addressed to the Secretary-General, expressed their regret at not being in a position to accept the invitation of the Council to be represented at the discussion of the item for reasons explained in their respective letters.

At the 1264th meeting, the representative of Uruguay introduced a joint draft resolution co-sponsored by Bolivia and Uruguay (S/6955). The Council agreed that it should be given priority over the draft resolutions submitted by the United Kingdom (S/6923) and the Ivory Coast (S/6929).

At the 1265th meeting, the President informed the Council that Bolivia and Uruguay had modified operative paragraph 1 of their draft resolution (S/6955). In the subsequent vote, the joint draft resolution was adopted by 10 votes in favour with 1 abstention (resolution 217 of 20 November 1965). Under the operative part of the resolution the Security Council: (1) determined that the situation resulting from the proclamation of independence by the illegal authorities in Southern Rhodesia was extremely grave, that the Government of the United Kingdom

should put an end to it and that its continuance in time constituted a threat to international peace and security; (2) reaffirmed its resolution 216 of 12 November 1965 and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960; (3) condemned the usurpation of power by a racist settler minority in Southern Rhodesia and regarded the declaration of independence by it as having no legal validity; (4) called upon the United Kingdom Government to quell this rebellion of the racist minority; (5) further called upon the United Kingdom Government to take all other appropriate measures which would prove effective in eliminating the authority of the usurpers and in bringing the minority régime in Southern Rhodesia to an immediate end; (6) called upon all States not to recognize this illegal authority and not to entertain any diplomatic or other relations with this illegal authority; (7) called upon the United Kingdom Government, as the working of the Constitution of 1961 had broken down, to take immediate measures in order to allow the people of Southern Rhodesia to determine their own future consistent with the objectives of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV); (8) called upon all States to refrain from any action which would assist and encourage the illegal régime and, in particular, to desist from providing it with arms, equipment and military material, and to do their utmost in order to break all economic relations with Southern Rhodesia, including an embargo on oil and petroleum products; (9) called upon the United Kingdom Government to enforce urgently and with vigour all the measures it had announced, as well as those mentioned in paragraph 8 above; (10) called upon the Organization of African Unity to do all in its power to assist in the implementation of this resolution, in conformity with Chapter VIII of the Charter; and (11) decided to keep the question under review in order to examine what other measures it might deem necessary to take.

In a letter dated 7 April 1966 (S/7235) the United Kingdom requested the President of the Security Council to convene an emergency meeting of the Council that afternoon to consider the situation arising from the arrival in Beira of an oil tanker which might result in substantial supplies of oil reaching Rhodesia in contravention of the oil embargo imposed by his Government in accordance with the Council's resolution 217 of 20 November 1965.

In the light of that request, the Security Council resumed its consideration of the question at the 1276th and 1277th meetings on 9 April 1966.

At the 1276th meeting, the representatives of Sierra Leone and Algeria, and at the 1277th meeting the representative of Kenya, were invited by the President, with the consent of the Council, to participate in the discussion. At the 1277th meeting, the representative of Greece was also invited, upon his request, to make a statement.

At the 1276th meeting, the United Kingdom submitted a draft resolution (S/7236/Rev.1) under which the Council, inter alia, gravely concerned at reports that substantial supplies of oil might reach Rhodesia, would: (1) determine that the resulting situation constituted a threat to the peace; (2) call upon the Portuguese Government not to permit oil to be pumped through the pipeline from Beira to Rhodesia; (3) call upon the Portuguese Government not to receive at Beira oil destined for Rhodesia; (4) call upon all States to ensure the diversion of any of their vessels reasonably believed to be carrying oil destined for Rhodesia which might be en route for Beira; and (5) call upon the Government of the United Kingdom to prevent by the use of force if necessary the arrival at Beira of vessels reasonably believed to be carrying oil destined for Rhodesia, and empower the United Kingdom to arrest and detain the tanker known as the Joanna V upon her departure from Beira in the event her oil cargo was discharged there.

At the same meeting Uganda introduced joint amendments (S/7243) by Mali, Nigeria and Uganda to the United Kingdom draft resolution. The amendments would insert two new paragraphs after the first preambular paragraph: "Noting that economic measures have failed to produce the desired political results" and "Deeply concerned at the reports that oil has been reaching Rhodesia"; in operative paragraph 1, delete the words "the resulting situation" and insert "the situation prevailing in Southern Rhodesia" and after the word "peace" add "and security"; insert the following paragraph after operative paragraph 3: "Calls upon the Government of South Africa to take all measures necessary to prevent the supply of oil to Southern Rhodesia"; delete operative paragraph 5 and replace it by the following paragraphs: "Calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom to prevent by all means including the use of force, the transportation into Southern Rhodesia of oil or other merchandise and empowers the United Kingdom to take measures necessary for the immediate implementation of this resolution"; "Calls upon all

States to apply measures for the complete interruption of economic relations and of communications with the settler minority régime and any other means in conformity with Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter"; and "Calls upon the United Kingdom Government to employ all measures including the use of armed force to bring down the settler minority régime in Rhodesia and to implement forthwith resolution 1514 (XV) of the General Assembly".

At the 1277th meeting the Council voted on the joint amendments (S/7243) and the United Kingdom draft resolution (S/7236/Rev.1).

The amendments to the preamble, to operative paragraph 1 and for the insertion of a new paragraph after operative paragraph 3, received 7 votes in favour, none against, with 8 abstentions and were not adopted since they had not received the required majority.

The amendments to replace operative paragraph 5 and to add two new operative paragraphs at the end of the draft resolution also failed of adoption, receiving 6 votes in favour, none against, with 9 abstentions.

The United Kingdom draft resolution was then adopted by 10 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 221 of 9 April 1966).

The Security Council considered the question further at its 1279th through 1285th meetings, held between 17 and 23 May 1966, on the basis of a request made in a letter to the President of the Council dated 10 May 1966 (S/7285 and Add.2) from thirty-two Member States. Pursuant to their requests, the representatives of India, Pakistan, Zambia, Senegal, Algeria and Sierra Leone were invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion.

Before the Council was a draft resolution submitted on 11 May by Mali, Nigeria and Uganda (S/7285/Add.1), under the operative part of which the Council would:

- (1) determine that the situation in Southern Rhodesia continued to constitute a threat to international peace and security;
- (2) call upon all States to apply measures with a view to the complete severance of economic relations and communications with Southern Rhodesia in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter;
- (3) invite the Portuguese and South African Governments, in particular, to take forthwith the necessary measures under Article 41 of the Charter to sever economic relations and communications with Southern Rhodesia;
- (4) call upon all States, and particularly the Portuguese and South African Governments, to take all

necessary measures to prevent the supply of oil and petroleum products to Southern Rhodesia; (5) call upon the United Kingdom to take the measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter in order, by the use of air, sea or land forces, to prevent any supplies, including oil and petroleum products, from reaching Southern Rhodesia; (6) reaffirm the inalienable rights of the people of Southern Rhodesia to freedom and independence in accordance with the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), and recognize the legitimacy of their struggle to secure the enjoyment of their rights as set forth in the Charter; (7) call upon the United Kingdom to hold consultations with the leaders of African political parties with a view to the establishment of a régime consistent with the aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe; (8) draw the attention of the United Kingdom to the harmful consequences which the present negotiations might entail for the establishment of a régime based on universal suffrage; and (9) call upon the United Kingdom Government to take all necessary measures, including the use of force, to abolish the racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and to ensure the immediate application of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

At the 1285th meeting (23 May) the draft resolution received 6 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions, and was not adopted having failed to obtain the required majority.

59. LETTER DATED 26 DECEMBER 1963 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF CYPRUS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 26 December 1963, Cyprus requested (S/5488) an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider a complaint against Turkey for alleged acts of aggression and intervention in the internal affairs of Cyprus.

Under the Constitution of Cyprus, which had been incorporated into the Treaty of Guarantee signed in 1959 by Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom and accepted by representatives of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities, a legal distinction was preserved between the two communities in order to maintain a balance between their rights and interests. The Treaty of Guarantee further empowered the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey to intervene jointly or separately to preserve the state of affairs under the Constitution. In December 1963, the

President of Cyprus proposed thirteen amendments to the Constitution. These were immediately rejected by Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership as altering the balance between the two communities. Thereafter the situation deteriorated rapidly and fighting broke out between armed groups of Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

At the Council's 1085th meeting (27 December), the item was included in the agenda and the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey were invited to participate without vote in the discussion. At the same meeting, Turkey denied the charges made by Cyprus and stated that on 21-22 December the Greek Cypriots had begun a campaign to annihilate the Turkish Cypriot population of the island and had tried to nullify the rights of the Turkish Cypriots established under the Constitution.

After further discussion, the meeting of the Council was adjourned.

On 13 January 1964, the Secretary-General informed the Council (S/5514) that the Government of Cyprus, in conjunction with the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey, had requested him to appoint a Personal Representative to observe the situation. On 17 January, he informed the Council (S/5516) that he had decided to designate Lieutenant General P.S. Gyani as his Personal Representative to observe the progress of the joint peace-keeping operation undertaken in Cyprus by the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey, for an initial period extending to the end of February 1964.

On 15 February, the United Kingdom requested (S/5543) an early meeting of the Security Council to take appropriate steps to ensure that the dangerous situation in Cyprus could be resolved with full regard to the rights and responsibilities of both Cypriot communities, as well as those of the Government of Cyprus and of the signatories to the Treaty of Guarantee.

On the same day, Cyprus urgently requested (S/5545) an emergency meeting of the Security Council to consider the increasing threat from war preparations and declarations of the Turkish Government, which had made the danger of the invasion of Cyprus obvious and imminent.

The Council considered the matter at its 1094th to 1102nd meetings from 17 February to 4 March 1964.

At the 1098th meeting (23 February), the Council decided to invite Mr. Kauf Benktash, President of the Turkish Communal Chamber, to make a statement before the Council, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.

On 2 March, Bolivia, Brazil, the Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway submitted a draft resolution (S/5571), the operative part of which provided that the Council would, inter alia: call upon all Member States to refrain from any action or threat of action likely to worsen the situation in the sovereign Republic of Cyprus, or to endanger international peace; ask the Government of Cyprus, which had the responsibility for the maintenance and restoration of law and order, to take all additional measures necessary to stop violence and bloodshed in Cyprus; call upon the communities in Cyprus and their leaders to act with the utmost restraint; recommend the creation, with the consent of the Government of Cyprus, of a United Nations peace-keeping force in Cyprus, the composition and size of the force to be established by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Governments of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom, the commander of the force to be appointed by the Secretary-General and report to him, and the Secretary-General, who should keep the Governments providing the force fully informed, to report periodically to the Security Council on its operation; recommend that the function of the force should be to use its best efforts to prevent a recurrence of fighting and, as necessary, to contribute to the maintenance and restoration of law and order and a return to normal conditions; recommend that the stationing of the force should be for a period of three months, all costs pertaining to it being met, in a manner to be agreed upon by them, by the Governments providing the contingents and by the Government of Cyprus; the Secretary-General might also accept voluntary contributions for that purpose; and recommend further that the Secretary-General designate, in agreement with the four Governments, a mediator, who should use his best endeavours with the representatives of the communities and the four Governments, for the purpose of promoting a peaceful solution and an agreed settlement of the problem confronting Cyprus, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, having in mind the well-being of the people of Cyprus as a whole and the preservation of international peace and security; the mediator to report periodically to the Secretary-General on his efforts.

At the 1102nd meeting (4 March), the five-Power draft resolution was put to the vote. Paragraph 4 was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 5 abstentions, and the draft resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously (resolution 186 of 4 March 1964).

In a report (S/5569) submitted on 29 February, the Secretary-General informed the Council that in the light of the views expressed by the Governments of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom, and of the discussions in the Council, he intended to extend General Gyani's mission after 29 February for an additional month, that period being subject to such changes as might become necessary.

In a report (S/5593 and Add.1) submitted to the Security Council on 12 March, the Secretary-General stated that he intended to establish the Force at an initial strength of about 7,000.

On 13 March, Turkey informed the Secretary-General (S/5596) that on 12 March his Government had sent a note to Archbishop Makarios in a last attempt to stop the massacre of the Turkish Cypriots and establish law and order on the island. If the requests contained in the note were not complied with, Turkey had decided, under article 4 of the Treaty of Guarantee, to take appropriate action. The Turkish force to be sent to the island would operate until the United Nations Peace-Keeping Force could effectively perform its function there. The Secretary-General was requested, in accordance with Article 54 of the Charter, to inform the Security Council of the situation and to expedite the dispatch of the United Nations Peace-Keeping Force to the island.

On 13 March, Cyprus requested (S/5598) an immediate emergency meeting of the Council, stating that there was a clear threat of imminent invasion of Cyprus by Turkish forces.

At the 1103rd meeting (13 March), the Secretary-General stated that the United Nations Peace-Keeping Force would be established without further delay and that elements of it would soon be deployed in Cyprus.

Bolivia, Brazil, the Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway submitted a draft resolution (S/5601), the operative part of which provided that the Council would: reaffirm its call upon all Member States, in conformity with their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, to refrain from any action or threat of action likely to worsen the situation in the sovereign Republic of Cyprus or to endanger international peace; and request the Secretary-General to press on with his efforts to implement Security Council resolution 186 of 4 March 1964 and request Member States to co-operate with the Secretary-General to that end.

At the same meeting, the Security Council unanimously adopted the five-Power draft resolution (resolution 187 of 13 March 1964).

On 25 March, the Secretary-General informed the Council (S/5593/Add.3) that, with the agreement of the Governments of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom, he had on that date designated Mr. Sakari S. Tuomioja as the United Nations Mediator in Cyprus.

On 29 April, the Secretary-General reported (S/5671 and Corr.1) to the Security Council on the operation of the Force during the preceding month.

On 15 June, the Secretary-General submitted a report (S/5764 and Corr.1 and 2) on the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the period from 26 April to 8 June. The report was considered by the Security Council at its 1136th to 1139th meetings from 18 to 20 June.

A draft resolution (S/5776/Rev.2) was submitted by Bolivia, Brazil, the Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway, under the operative part of which the Council would: reaffirm resolutions 186 and 187 of 4 and 13 March 1964; call upon all Member States to comply with them; take note of the report of the Secretary-General; and extend the mandate of the Force for an additional period of three months, ending 26 September 1964. At the 1139th meeting the draft resolution was adopted unanimously (resolution 192 of 20 June 1964).

On 8 August, Turkey requested (S/5859) an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider "the serious situation created in Cyprus by the renewed and continuing attempts of the Greek Cypriots to subdue by force of arms the Turkish community in Cyprus in order to perpetuate the usurpation of the Government by the Greek community". The same day, Cyprus requested (S/5861) an immediate meeting of the Security Council "in view of the deliberate and unprovoked air armed attacks against the unarmed civilians of Cyprus carried out by airplanes of the Turkish air force".

At the 1143rd meeting (9 August), the President, on behalf of the Council, appealed to the Government of Turkey to cease instantly the bombardment and the use of military force of any kind against Cyprus, and to the Government of Cyprus to direct the armed forces under its control to cease firing immediately.

The United States and the United Kingdom submitted a draft resolution (S/5866) whereby the Security Council would: call for an immediate cease-fire

by all concerned; call upon all concerned to co-operate fully with the Commander of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus in the restoration of peace and security; and call upon all States to refrain from any action that might exacerbate the situation or contribute to the broadening of hostilities.

This text was revised (S/5866/Rev.1) so that in the first operative paragraph the Council would reaffirm the appeal of the President just addressed to the Governments of Turkey and Cyprus while the other operative paragraphs remained unchanged.

At the 1145rd meeting the revised draft resolution was adopted by 9 votes in favour and none against, with 2 abstentions (resolution 193 of 9 August 1964).

In a statement issued on 10 August (S/5879), the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Governments of Cyprus and Turkey had responded positively and without condition to the President's appeal for a cease-fire in Cyprus. The same day, Cyprus requested (S/5872) an immediate meeting of the Security Council in order to consider developments of extreme urgency in Cyprus and to prevent any further aggravation of the situation.

After further discussion by the Council at the resumed 1143rd meeting (11 August), the President summed up the views of the members as follows: "After hearing the report of the Secretary-General and the statements of the representatives of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and members of the Security Council, the Council notes with satisfaction that the cease-fire is being observed throughout Cyprus; requests the parties to comply with resolution 193 of 9 August 1964 in its entirety, asks all Governments to stop all flights over the territory of Cyprus in violation of its sovereignty, requests the Commander of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus to supervise the cease-fire and to reinforce its units in the zones which were the sphere of the recent military operations so as to ensure the safety of the inhabitants and requests all concerned to co-operate with and to assist the Commander of the Force in achieving this purpose."

When the Security Council took up the discussion of the Secretary-General's second report (S/5950 and Corr.1 and Add.1-2) at its 1151st meeting (15 September), the Secretary-General informed the members that he had appointed Mr. Galo Plaza as the new Mediator on Cyprus following the sudden death of Ambassador Sakari Tuomioja in Geneva.

On 25 September, Bolivia, Brazil, the Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway submitted a joint draft resolution (S/5986) whereby the Security Council would: reaffirm its previous resolutions on the question, and the consensus expressed by the President at its meeting on 11 August 1964; call upon all Member States to comply with the above-mentioned resolutions; extend the period in which the United Nations Peace-keeping Force would be stationed in Cyprus for another three months, ending 26 December 1964, in conformity with the terms of resolution 186 of 4 March; and request the Secretary-General to keep the Council informed regarding the compliance of the parties concerned with the provisions of the resolution.

At the 1150th meeting, the Security Council adopted the draft resolution unanimously (resolution 194 of 25 September 1964).

On 12 December, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council his third report (S/6102 and Corr.1 and 2) on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, covering the period 10 September to 12 December 1964.

At the 1180th meeting (18 December) Bolivia, Brazil, the Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway submitted a draft resolution whereby the Security Council would: reaffirm its previous resolutions and the consensus expressed by the President on 11 August 1964; call upon all Member States to comply with the above-mentioned resolutions; take note of the report by the Secretary-General; and extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus, established under resolution 186 of 4 March, for an additional period of three months ending 26 March 1965. The draft resolution was then adopted unanimously by the Security Council (resolution 198 of 18 December 1964).

On 11 March 1965, the Secretary-General submitted his fourth report (S/6228 and Corr.1 and Add.1) to the Council on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus for the period 13 December 1964 to 10 March 1965. It was considered at the 1191st to 1193rd meetings (17-19 March).

On 19 March, Bolivia, the Ivory Coast, Jordan, Malaysia and Uruguay submitted a draft resolution (S/6247) whereby the Security Council, after reiterating the terms of its previous resolutions and calling upon the parties concerned to act with the utmost restraint and to co-operate fully with the Force, would extend the stationing of the United Nations Force in Cyprus for an additional period of three months, ending 26 June 1965.

At its 1193rd meeting, the Security Council adopted the draft resolution unanimously (resolution 201 of 19 March 1965).

On 26 March 1965, Mr. Galo Plaza, the United Nations Mediator on Cyprus, submitted to the Secretary-General a report on his activities since 28 September 1964.

Following their receipt of the Mediator's report, the Governments of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership submitted their observations on it to the Secretary-General (S/6275/Add.1, S/6280, S/6267, S/6279).

On 10 June, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council his fifth report (S/6426) on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, for the period 11 March to 10 June 1965.

The Council took this up at the 1224th meeting (16 June), when Bolivia, the Ivory Coast, Jordan, Malaysia, the Netherlands and Uruguay submitted a draft resolution (S/6440) whereby the Security Council, after reiterating the terms of its previous resolutions, would extend the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force for an additional period of six months, ending 26 December 1965.

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was unanimously adopted (resolution 206 of 16 June 1965).

In letters dated 30 and 31 July 1965, Turkey (S/6571) and Cyprus (S/6581) requested an early meeting of the Security Council. The Council included both requests in its agenda and considered the item at the 1234th to 1236th meetings on 3, 5 and 10 August 1965.

The Council also had before it two reports of the Secretary-General on recent developments in Cyprus (S/6569 and Add.1, S/6586).

On 10 August, Malaysia introduced a joint draft resolution (S/6603) sponsored by Bolivia, the Ivory Coast, Jordan, Malaysia, the Netherlands and Uruguay, under which the Security Council, inter alia, noting the report of the Secretary-General of 29 July (S/6569) that recent developments in Cyprus had increased tension in the island, would reaffirm resolution 186 of 4 March 1964 and call upon all parties, in conformity with that resolution, to avoid any action which was likely to worsen the situation.

The joint draft resolution was put to the vote at the same meeting and was adopted unanimously (resolution 207 of 10 August 1965).

In a letter dated 4 November (S/6877), Turkey requested an immediate meeting of the Council in order to consider what it described as the dangerous situation created by the Greek Cypriots in Famagusta city. The Council also had before it a report by the Secretary-General on recent developments in the Famagusta area and action by UNFICYP concerning the situation (S/6881).

The Council considered the item at its 1252nd meeting on 5 November.

After the debate the President of the Council made a statement appealing to all parties concerned for moderation and co-operation in the implementation of the Council's resolutions and to refrain from any act which might aggravate the situation in Cyprus.

At its 1270th meeting on 17 December 1965, the Security Council resumed its consideration of the item on the basis of two further reports by the Secretary-General (S/6954 and S/7001).

In the course of the discussion, a joint draft resolution (S/7024) was submitted by Bolivia, the Ivory Coast, Jordan, Malaysia, the Netherlands and Uruguay. After Jordan and the Ivory Coast had suggested modifications to operative paragraph 3, under which the Council would "call upon the parties directly concerned to make an earnest, persistent and intensified effort to achieve a peaceful settlement of the problems of Cyprus", the co-sponsors of the draft resolution agreed to the deletion of that paragraph.

The Council unanimously adopted the joint draft resolution as modified (resolution 219 of 17 December 1965). Under its operative part the Council, after reaffirming its previous resolutions and the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting, decided to extend once again the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force for an additional period of three months, ending 26 March 1966.

On 10 March 1966, the Secretary-General submitted his seventh report (S/7191) to the Council on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus for the period 9 December 1965 to 10 March 1966.

The Council considered the report at its 1274th and 1275th meetings (15 and 16 March).

On 16 March, the Council unanimously adopted a draft resolution (S/7205) co-sponsored by Argentina, Japan, Mali, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria,

Uganda and Uruguay. Under its operative part the Council reaffirmed its resolutions 186 of 4 March, 187 of 13 March, 192 of 20 June, 193 of 9 August, 194 of 25 September and 198 of 18 December 1964, the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting on 11 August 1964, and resolutions 201 of 19 March, 206 of 15 June, 207 of 10 August and 219 of 17 December 1965; urged the parties concerned to act with the utmost restraint and to make determined efforts with a view to achieving the objectives of the Security Council, and extended once more the stationing of the United Nations Force in Cyprus established under Security Council resolution 186 of 4 March 1964 for a period of three months ending 26 June 1966, in the firm hope that by the end of this period substantial progress towards a solution would have been achieved (resolution 220 of 16 March 1966).

On 10 June 1966, the Secretary-General submitted his eighth report (S/7350 and Add.1) on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus for the period 11 March to 10 June 1966.

The Council considered the report at its 1286th meeting (16 June), and unanimously adopted a draft resolution (S/7358) sponsored by Argentina, Japan, Jordan, Mali, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria and Uganda. Under its provisions the Council reaffirmed its previous resolutions and the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting; urged the parties concerned to act with the utmost restraint and to make determined efforts with a view to achieving the objectives of the Security Council; and extended the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force for a period of six months ending 26 December 1966, in the firm hope that by the end of that period substantial progress towards a solution would have been achieved so as to render possible a withdrawal or a substantial reduction of the Force (resolution 222 of 16 June 1966).

60. LETTER DATED 10 JANUARY 1964 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF PANAMA ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 10 January 1964, Panama requested the Security Council (S/5509) to consider a grave situation which had arisen between Panama and the United States in connexion with the Panama Canal. Panama charged that the situation had been brought about by the repeated threats and acts of aggression of the United States which infringed the territorial sovereignty of Panama and constituted a serious danger to international peace and security.

On the same date, the Assistant Secretary-General of the Organization of American States (OAS) informed the Security Council (S/5511) that at the joint request of the Governments of Panama and the United States, and with their consent, the Inter-American Peace Committee of the OAS had decided to travel to Panama to investigate the situation and to recommend measures for the settlement of the dispute.

The Council included the item in its agenda at the 1086th meeting (10-11 January) and invited the representative of Panama to participate in the discussion.

Brazil proposed that the President of the Security Council be authorized to appeal to the Governments of Panama and the United States to bring to an immediate end the exchange of fire and the bloodshed, and to request that they impose the utmost restraint on the military forces under their command and the civilian population under their control.

The Brazilian proposal was accepted by the representatives of Panama and the United States, and was supported by the majority of the members of the Council, on the understanding, however, that the question remained on the agenda of the Council.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 11 January 1964.

61. LETTER DATED 1 APRIL 1964 FROM THE DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF YEMEN, CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A.I., ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 1 April 1964, Yemen requested (S/5635) an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the "situation resulting from the British continuous acts of aggression against the peaceful Yemeni citizens" culminating in an attack on 28 March in which, Yemen declared, twenty-five persons had been killed and several more injured. Yemen further charged that the United Kingdom had committed more than forty acts of aggression against Yemeni towns and villages since the establishment of the Yemen Arab Republic.

The Security Council had also received three letters (S/5618, S/5628 and S/5632) dated 20, 28 and 30 March 1964, in which the United Kingdom charged Yemen with violations of the air space of the South Arabian Federation in the area south and west of Harib and with air attacks with machine-guns and incendiary bombs on Bedouin in the territory of the Federation. In spite of warnings and protests, those violations had continued. Accordingly, after an attack on 27 March against a fort occupied by Federal Guard troops near Jabal Bulaig, British aircraft had been ordered to counter-attack on the following day, after dropping a warning message first, upon a Yemeni military post just inside the Yemeni frontier about a mile from the township of Harib. The United Kingdom had taken that action strictly in exercise of its rights of defence against attacks on the Federation.

The Security Council included the item in its agenda at its 1106th meeting (2 April) and invited the representative of the Yemen Arab Republic to participate. The Council also acceded to the requests of Iraq, the United Arab Republic and Syria to participate in the discussion. It discussed the matter at the 1106th to 1111th meetings held between 2 and 9 April 1964.

On 8 April, the Ivory Coast and Morocco introduced a draft resolution (S/5649), under the operative paragraphs of which the Security Council would: condemn reprisals as incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations; deplore the British military action at Harib on 28 March 1964; deplore all attacks and incidents which had occurred in the area; call upon the Yemen Arab Republic and the United Kingdom to exercise the maximum restraint in order to avoid further incidents and to restore peace in the area; and request the Secretary-General to use his good offices to try to settle outstanding issues in agreement with the two parties.

At the 1111th meeting, the draft resolution was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 188 of 9 April 1964). /...

62. COMPLAINT CONCERNING ACTS OF AGGRESSION AGAINST THE
TERRITORY AND CIVILIAN POPULATION OF CAMBODIA

On 16 April 1964, Cambodia transmitted to the Security Council (S/5666) a set of documents relating to alleged acts of aggression by the armed forces of the United States and the Republic of Viet-Nam against the territory and population of Cambodia. On 13 May, Cambodia transmitted a further complaint (S/5697) alleging "repeated acts of aggression by United States-South Viet-Nameese forces", and requested an early meeting of the Security Council in accordance with Article 33 of the Charter.

On 26 May, the Special Representative of the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam transmitted a memorandum (S/5724) from his Government in reply to the charges of Cambodia.

At the 1118th meeting (19 May) the Security Council decided to include the item in its agenda. The representative of Cambodia was invited, without objection, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The Council also decided, by 9 votes to 2, to invite the representative of the Republic of Viet-Nam to participate without vote in the discussion. The Council considered the matter at the 1118th to 1122nd and 1124th to 1125th meetings held between 19 May and 4 June 1964.

On 3 June, Morocco submitted a draft resolution (S/5735), co-sponsored by the Ivory Coast, whereby the Security Council, inter alia taking note of the apologies and regrets tendered to the Royal Government of Cambodia in regard to the frontier incidents and the loss of life they had entailed, would: deplore the incidents caused by the penetration of units of the Army of the Republic of Viet-Nam into Cambodian territory; request that just and fair compensation should be offered to the Royal Government of Cambodia; invite those responsible to take all appropriate measures to prevent any further violation of the Cambodian frontier; request all States and authorities and in particular the participants of the Geneva Conference to recognize and respect Cambodia's neutrality and territorial integrity; and decide to send three members of the Council to the two countries and to the places where the most recent incidents had occurred in order to consider such measures as might prevent any recurrence of such incidents. The draft resolution further provided that the three members would report to the Council within forty-five days.

On 4 June, the Security Council proceeded to vote on the draft resolution. The last paragraph was voted upon separately and was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions. The draft resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously (resolution 189 of 4 June 1964).

On 5 June, the President of the Council named Brazil, the Ivory Coast and Morocco to carry out the mission.

The report (S/5832 and Corr.1) of the Council Mission was submitted on 27 July 1964. Communications concerning this report were submitted by the Republic of Viet-Nam (S/5921), Cambodia (S/5952) and the United States (S/5955).

63. LETTER DATED 4 AUGUST 1964 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE UNITED STATES ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE
SECURITY COUNCIL

On 4 August 1964, the United States requested (S/5849) an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider what it described as the serious situation created by deliberate attacks of the Hanoi regime on United States naval vessels in international waters.

The Security Council considered the matter at the 1140th and 1141st meetings held on 5 and 7 August.

At the 1141st meeting, the President reported agreement that, in its further consideration of the question, the Council would welcome such information as the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam desired to make available to it, either through participation in the discussion or in some other manner. The Council would likewise receive such information as the Republic of Viet-Nam might desire to make available to it.

Following the meetings of the Council, communications were received from the Governments of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam (S/5888 and S/5907) and of the Republic of Viet-Nam (S/5892 and S/5906) in response to the Council's invitation that they submit information to it regarding the question.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 7 August 1964.

64. LETTER DATED 3 SEPTEMBER 1964 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF MALAYSIA ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 3 September 1964, Malaysia requested (S/5930) an urgent meeting of the Security Council, under Article 39 of the Charter, charging that during the midnight hours of 2 September, an Indonesian aircraft had flown over South Malaya dropping a large group of heavily armed paratroopers estimated to be in the neighbourhood of thirty.

At the 1144th meeting (9 September), the Security Council decided without objection to include the item in its agenda and invited the representatives of Malaysia, Indonesia and, subsequently, the Philippines to participate without vote in the discussion. The Council considered the item at the 1144th, 1145th, 1148th, 1150th and 1152nd meetings held between 9 and 17 September.

On 15 September, the representative of Norway submitted a draft resolution (S/5973) whereby the Security Council would: regret all the incidents which had occurred in the whole region; deplore the incident of 2 September 1964 which formed the basis of the complaint; request the parties concerned to make every effort to avoid the recurrence of such incidents; call upon them to refrain from all threat or use of force and to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of each other, and thus to create an atmosphere conducive to the continuation of their talks; and recommend to the Governments concerned thereupon to resume their talks on the basis of the joint communiqué issued by the Heads of Government following the meeting which took place in Tokyo on 20 June 1964. The reconciliation commission provided for in that joint communiqué, once established, should keep the Security Council informed concerning the development of the situation.

At the 1152nd meeting (17 September), the Security Council proceeded to vote on the Norwegian draft resolution. The draft resolution received 9 votes in favour and 2 against, and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 17 September 1964.

65. LETTER DATED 5 SEPTEMBER 1964 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF GREECE ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL, AND LETTER DATED 8 SEPTEMBER 1964 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF GREECE ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL
66. LETTER DATED 6 SEPTEMBER 1964 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF TURKEY ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 5 September 1964, the representative of Greece charged (S/5934) that a series of increasingly hostile steps taken recently by the Turkish Government had culminated in the expulsion of Greek residents of Istanbul which had taken on the character of mass deportation. In view of the dangerous situation brought about by actions already taken by Turkey and in order to forestall further actions of similar nature, he requested the President to convene the Security Council at the earliest possible date. On 8 September, Greece drew attention (S/5941) to a statement by the Turkish Prime Minister on 4 September in the National Assembly, which, it said, lent added urgency to its request for a meeting.

On 6 September (S/5935), Turkey requested the President to call an urgent meeting of the Security Council "to discuss and take appropriate measures to forestall the immediate danger to international peace and security arising from the provocative military actions and the attitude of the Greek Government against the Government of Turkey". After setting out specific complaints of troop concentrations, invasion of Cyprus, treaty violation and collusion with the authorities in Cyprus and charging the Prime Minister of Greece with belligerent statements threatening all-out war, the communication stated that Turkey would call upon the Council to send a fact-finding mission to the area without delay.

At its 1146th meeting (11 September), the Security Council decided, without objection, to include the two items (65 and 66 above) in its agenda, and invited the representatives of Greece and Turkey to participate, without vote, in its discussion. Debate was continued at the 1147th meeting on the same day, when the representative of Cyprus was similarly invited, at his request, to participate in the discussion. As no other speakers wished to take the floor at the close of the meeting, the President announced that the time of the next meeting on the question would be determined after consultations between the President and the members of the Council.

67. LETTER DATED 1 DECEMBER 1964, ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF AFGHANISTAN, ALGERIA, BURUNDI, CAMBODIA, CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC, CONGO (BRAZZAVILLE), DAHOMEY, ETHIOPIA, GHANA, GUINEA, INDONESIA, KENYA, MALAWI, MALI, MAURITANIA, SOMALIA, SUDAN, TANZANIA, UGANDA, UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC, YUGOSLAVIA AND ZAMBIA

68. LETTER DATED 9 DECMEBER 1964 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 21 November 1964, Belgium and the United States (S/6055 and S/6056) and, two days later, Italy (S/6058) called the attention of the Security Council to the danger threatening the foreign residents of Stanleyville, among whom more than 1,000 persons belonging to nineteen nationalities were being held as hostages by the rebel authorities. On 24 November, Belgium and the United States (S/6063 and S/6062) notified the Council that their appeals to the rebel authorities to release the hostages had met with a refusal to guarantee the safety to the civilians in Stanleyville; consequently, they had found it necessary to undertake a rescue operation. Belgian para-commandos carried by United States aircraft had been parachuted for that purpose, a few hours earlier, into the Stanleyville area. The Democratic Republic of the Congo informed the Council (S/6060) that it had authorized the rescue operation, and the United Kingdom reported that it had granted to the Belgian and United States Governments, at their request, the use of facilities on Ascension Island.

On 1 December, Belgium and the United States announced (S/6075) that the rescue mission, after having effected the release of as many hostages as possible, had departed from the Congo on 29 November 1964.

By a letter dated 1 December 1964 (S/6076 and Add.1-5), twenty-two Member States requested the Security Council to consider urgently the situation created in the Democratic Republic of the Congo by the military operations launched in Stanleyville and elsewhere by the Governments of Belgium and the United States with the concurrence of the United Kingdom. They considered that those operations constituted an intervention in African affairs, a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and a threat to the peace and security of the African continent.

In a message dated 9 December (S/6096), the Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo requested the urgent convening of the Council to examine

the flagrant intervention in Congolese domestic affairs by various countries which were assisting the rebel movement in the Congo. He referred in this connexion to Algeria, the Sudan, Ghana, the United Arab Republic, the Chinese communist régime and the USSR.

At its 1170th meeting on 9 December, the Council decided by a vote of 7 in favour to 4 against to include in the agenda both the complaint of the twenty-two Powers and that of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The representatives of the Sudan, Guinea, Ghana, Belgium, the Congo (Brazzaville), Algeria, Mali, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nigeria, the United Arab Republic, and later, Burundi, Kenya, the Central African Republic and the United Republic of Tanzania asked to participate in the discussion and were invited to do so without the right to vote.

The Council devoted its 1170th to 1178th, 1181st, and 1183rd to 1189th meetings from 9 December to 30 December, to the debate on this question.

On 28 December, the Ivory Coast and Morocco submitted a draft resolution (S/6125/Rev.1) which would have the Council: (1) request all States to refrain or desist from intervening in the domestic affairs of the Congo; (2) appeal for a cease-fire in the Congo in accordance with the Organization of African Unity resolution dated 10 September 1964; (3) consider, in accordance with that same resolution, that the mercenaries should as a matter of urgency be withdrawn from the Congo; (4) encourage the OAU to pursue its efforts to help the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to achieve national reconciliation in accordance with its resolution of 10 September; (5) request all States to assist the OAU in the attainment of these objectives; and (6) request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to follow the implementation of the present resolution, to follow the situation in the Congo, and to report to the Security Council at the appropriate time.

On 29 December, Guinea submitted an amendment (S/6128) to paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, whereby the Council would request the OAU, in accordance with Article 54 of the Charter, to keep the Security Council fully informed of any action it might take under the resolution.

The sponsors decided to include this amendment in the draft resolution, not as a replacement for paragraph 6 but as an addition to be inserted after paragraph 5. They further agreed to delete the words, "to follow the implementation of the present resolution" in the original paragraph 6.

At its 1189th meeting, the Council adopted the draft resolution by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 199 of 30 December 1964).

No further request for discussion of this item has been received and it has not been discussed by the Security Council since 30 December 1964.

(See related item 43 above.)

69. - LETTER DATED 1 MAY 1965 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF
THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS ADDRESSED TO THE
PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 29 April 1965, the United States informed the Security Council (S/6310) that on 28 April the President of the United States had ordered United States troops ashore in the Dominican Republic in order to protect American citizens there and escort them to safety. The President had acted after being informed by the military authorities in the Dominican Republic that American lives were in danger, that their safety could no longer be guaranteed and that the assistance of United States military personnel was required. The United States had also requested the Council of the Organization of American States to consider the situation in the Dominican Republic.

On 1 May the USSR requested (S/6316) an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the question of armed interference by the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic.

On the same day, the Security Council was informed (S/6319) that the Tenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics had decided on that day to establish a commission composed of representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala and Panama, and had instructed it to proceed immediately to the city of Santo Domingo to bring about the restoration of peace and normality and to offer its good offices to the various factions there with a view to bringing about a cease-fire and the orderly evacuation of persons.

At its 1196th meeting (3 May 1965), the Security Council included the item in its agenda without objection. At his request, the representative of Cuba was invited to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the 1198th meeting (4 May), the USSR submitted a draft resolution (S/6328) whereby the Security Council would condemn the armed intervention by the United States in the domestic affairs of the Dominican Republic as a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations and demand the immediate withdrawal of the armed forces of the United States from the territory of the Dominican Republic.

On 6 May, the Security Council was informed (S/6333/Rev.1) that the Tenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the American Republics had adopted on that day a resolution which established an Inter-American Force for the purpose of helping restore normal conditions in the Dominican Republic and establishing an atmosphere of peace and conciliation that would permit the functioning of democratic institutions in that country.

At the 1204th meeting (11 May), Uruguay submitted a draft resolution (S/6346) whereby the Security Council, after taking note of several communications from the OAS and having regard to certain provisions of the United Nations Charter and the charter of the OAS, would (1) express deep concern at recent developments in the Dominican Republic (2) reaffirm the right of its people freely to exercise, without coercion of any kind, their sovereign right of self-determination; (3) urgently appeal to all contending factions in the Dominican Republic to cease hostilities and make every possible effort to achieve a peaceful and democratic settlement of their differences; (4) invite the Secretary-General to follow events closely and take such measures as he might deem appropriate for the purpose of reporting to the Council on all aspects of the situation; (5) invite the OAS to keep the Council promptly and fully informed of its action with respect to the situation existing in the Dominican Republic; and (6) invite the OAS to co-operate with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in the implementation of the resolution.

At the 1208th meeting (14 May), Jordan, Malaysia and the Ivory Coast submitted a draft resolution (S/6355) calling for a strict cease-fire, inviting the Secretary-General to send, as an urgent measure, a representative to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of reporting to the Council on the present situation, and calling upon all concerned in the Dominican Republic to co-operate with the representative of the Secretary-General in the carrying out of that task.

At the same meeting, the three-Power draft resolution was adopted unanimously (resolution 203 of 14 May 1965).

Following reports by the Secretary-General on the grave situation in Santo Domingo (S/5358, S/6365, S/6369), the President of the Council, at the 1212th meeting (19 May) with the agreement of the Council, made a statement in which he requested the Secretary-General, in connexion with resolution 203 (1965) and in accordance with the unanimous desire of the members of the Council, to convey to his Representative in Santo Domingo the Security Council's desire that his urgent efforts should be devoted to securing an immediate suspension of hostilities so that the humanitarian work of the Red Cross in searching for the dead and wounded might be facilitated.

The Council also heard statements at its 1212th meeting (19 May), under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure and in accordance with its decision on 14 May, by Mr. Rubén Brache, who represented the "Constitutional Government", and Mr. Guaroa Velázquez, who represented the "Government of National Reconstruction" of the Dominican Republic.

On 21 May, the Secretary-General reported (S/6371/Add.1) that he had received further information from his Representative in the Dominican Republic to the effect that the negotiations with the leaders of the two factions for suspension of hostilities had been successfully concluded in pursuance of the message of the President of the Security Council of 19 May 1965. An agreement had been reached for the suspension of hostilities for twenty-four hours to begin on Friday 21 May, at 1200 hours local time.

At the 1214th meeting (21 May), the United States introduced a draft resolution (S/6373) whereby the Security Council would: (1) note with satisfaction the temporary suspension of hostilities agreed to for humanitarian purposes; (2) call for observance of a strict cessation of hostilities; (3) note that the Tenth Meeting of Consultation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States had appointed its Secretary General to represent it in the Dominican Republic and had entrusted him with carrying out the objectives established by the OAS; (4) urge the OAS to intensify its efforts to establish the basis for the functioning of democratic institutions in the Dominican Republic and in particular to assure observance of the cease-fire agreed upon in the Act

/...

of Santo Domingo; and (5) request the Secretary-General's Representative, in carrying out the responsibilities assigned to him by the Security Council, to co-ordinate with the Secretary General of the OAS in the light of the OAS resolution of 20 May 1965. (This draft resolution was withdrawn on 24 May.)

Also on 21 May, Uruguay submitted a revised text of the draft resolution it had tabled on 11 May (S/6346/Rev.1), which added to paragraph 1 the words "and the growing deterioration of the situation"; replaced paragraph 3 by a new text calling for immediate compliance with the cease-fire ordered by the Council in resolution 203 (1965), and replaced paragraph 4 by a new text calling upon all States to refrain from supplying the contending factions, directly or indirectly, with facilities or military assistance of any kind and to refrain from any measure which might prevent the restoration of normal living conditions in the country. In a new paragraph the Secretary-General was invited to continue to watch closely the events in the Dominican Republic.

On 21 May, the Security Council voted on the draft resolution submitted on 4 May by the USSR (S/6328). The preamble received 2 votes in favour and 5 against, with 4 abstentions; paragraph 1 received 1 vote in favour and 6 against, with 4 abstentions; and paragraph 2 received 2 votes in favour and 6 against, with 3 abstentions. The draft resolution was therefore not adopted.

Also at the 1214th meeting (21 May), the USSR submitted revised amendments (S/6352/Rev.2) to the revised draft resolution of Uruguay. They provided for (1) the deletion of the first and third preambular paragraphs and the insertion of a new paragraph reading "Having considered the question of the armed intervention of the United States of America in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic"; (2) the addition to operative paragraph 1 of a condemnation of the armed intervention of the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic as a gross violation of the Charter; (3) the deletion of operative paragraphs 6 and 7; and (4) the insertion of an operative paragraph demanding that the United States immediately withdraw its armed forces from the territory of the Dominican Republic.

At the 1216th meeting (22 May), the Council voted on the revised draft resolution of Uruguay and the USSR amendments thereto. The USSR amendments were rejected in separate votes. The draft resolution of Uruguay was voted upon as a whole, and was also rejected, receiving 5 votes in favour and 1 against, with 5 abstentions.

The United Kingdom then introduced a draft resolution (S/6375) whereby the Council would call for a continued and complete cessation of hostilities; and call upon all concerned to intensify their efforts to that end and to do nothing to prejudice the achievement of that immediate and urgent aim.

France also submitted a draft resolution (S/6376) whereby the Council would request that the suspension of hostilities in Santo Domingo be transformed into a permanent cease fire, and invite the Secretary-General to submit a report to it on the implementation of the resolution.

The representative of the United Kingdom indicated that he would not object to precedence being given to the French draft resolution. The Council then (1217th meeting) adopted the French draft resolution by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 205 of 22 May 1965).

Following circulation of further communications from the OAS dated 22 and 24 May (S/6374, S/6377/Rev.1 and S/6381), as well as of reports by the Secretary-General of 23 and 24 May (S/6378 and S/6380), discussion continued at the 1218th and 1219th meetings on 24 and 25 May.

On 25 May, the President of the Council, noting that a de facto cessation of hostilities continued to prevail in Santo Domingo and that the Secretary-General had informed him that there had been no new developments concerning its observance since his last report, and also that information submitted by his Representative on the spot would be made available to the members of the Council, suggested that the Council should adjourn on the understanding that he could call it into immediate session if necessary.

Between 25 May and 19 June, the Secretary-General submitted six additional reports (S/6386, S/6408, S/6420, S/6432 and S/6447 and Add.1) to the Council.

On 2 June the OAS advised the Council (S/6401) that the Tenth Meeting of Consultation had decided to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee composed of Brazil, El Salvador and the United States, to proceed with the work of the previous Committee and offer its good offices to all the parties with a view to creating an atmosphere of peace and conciliation that would permit the functioning of democratic institutions in the Dominican Republic.

The Security Council continued its consideration of the question at the 1220th to 1223rd meetings held between 3 and 11 June, the 1225th to 1228th meetings, held between 16 and 21 June. At the 1227th meeting on 18 June, the President gave a summary outlining points of agreement which emerged from the discussion.

The Security Council continued its consideration of the item at its 1229th to 1231st meetings, held between 20 and 22 July, and at its 1232nd and 1233rd meetings (26 July).

At the three latter meetings the Council had before it a report by the Secretary-General on the situation in the Dominican Republic covering the period 19 June to 15 July (S/6530) and his report concerning a breach of the cease-fire (S/6542), the report of the OAS criminologists (S/6522), a preliminary report of the OAS on the human rights situation in the country and several other communications from the OAS and the "Constitutional Government" of the Dominican Republic.

At the 1233rd meeting (26 July) the President made a statement summarizing the views expressed by the members of the Council in the recent discussions. The information received and the reports of the Secretary-General of 16 and 21 July (S/6530 and S/6542) testified to the fact that despite the Council's resolutions 203 and 205 of 14 and 22 May, violations of its call for a strict cease-fire had taken place. There had been brought to the Council's attention acts of repression against the civilian population and other violations of human rights, as well as data on the deterioration of the economic situation in the Dominican Republic. Members of the Council in their statements had condemned gross violations of human rights in the Dominican Republic, had expressed the desire that such violations should cease, and had again indicated the need for the strict observance of the cease-fire in accordance with the resolutions of the Council. At the same time it had become apparent that the members of the Council considered it necessary that it continue to watch closely the situation in the Dominican Republic and that therefore the Secretary-General, in accordance with the previous decision of the Council, would continue to submit reports on the situation.

After further statements, the President stated that the Council would be called upon again at the request of any member of the Council or whenever the President deemed it necessary.

/...

70. LETTER DATED 31 JANUARY 1966 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 31 January 1966, the United States requested (S/7105) that an urgent meeting of the Council be called promptly to consider the situation in Viet-Nam.

On the same day, it submitted a draft resolution on the question (S/7106), under the operative part of which the Council would: (1) call for immediate discussions without preconditions, at a place and date to be determined, among the appropriate interested Governments to arrange a conference looking towards the application of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in South-East Asia; (2) recommend that the first order of business of such a conference be arrangements for a cessation of hostilities under effective supervision; (3) offer to assist in achieving the purposes of this resolution by all appropriate means, including the provision of arbitrators or mediators; (4) call on all concerned to co-operate fully in the implementation of this resolution; and (5) request the Secretary-General to assist as appropriate in the implementation of this resolution.

The Council considered the request of the United States at its 1271st to 1273rd meetings (1 and 2 February). After a procedural debate, the Council on 2 February decided to inscribe the item on its agenda by a vote of 9 in favour, 2 against, with 4 abstentions.

Following the adoption of the agenda, the President of the Council suggested that informal and private consultations be held in order to decide on the most effective and appropriate way of conducting the debate in the future. There was no objection to his suggestion and the Council adjourned until a time to be decided later.

On 26 February, the President of the Council transmitted to the Secretary-General the text of a letter of the same date addressed to the members of the Security Council regarding the informal and private consultations which he had held (S/7168). In letters dated 26 February (S/7173), 1 March (S/7175), 2 March (S/7175/Rev.1) and 3 March (S/7174), the representatives of France, USSR, Mali and Bulgaria respectively commented upon the letter of the President.

