

Chapter XII

~~BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF ALBANY~~

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTORY NOTE . . . . .	227
<b>PART I. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 1, PARAGRAPH 2, OF THE CHARTER</b>	
Note . . . . .	227
<b>PART II. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 2 OF THE CHARTER</b>	
A. Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter; Note . . . . .	227
**C. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter . . . . .	238
<del><b>PART III. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 24 OF THE CHARTER</b></del>	
Note . . . . .	238
<b>PART IV. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 25 OF THE CHARTER</b>	
Note . . . . .	238
<b>PART V. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER VIII OF THE CHARTER</b>	
Note . . . . .	239
<b>**PART VI. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER XII OF THE CHARTER .</b>	242
<del><b>**PART VII. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER XVI OF THE CHARTER .</b></del>	242
<b>**PART VIII. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER XVII OF THE CHARTER .</b>	242

## INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Chapter XII covers the consideration by the Security Council of Articles of the Charter not dealt with in the preceding chapters.<sup>1</sup>

### Part I

#### CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 1, PARAGRAPH 2, OF THE CHARTER

##### Article 1

"1. ...

"2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other

#### NOTE

Security Council referred<sup>2</sup> to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960<sup>3</sup> and reaffirmed<sup>4</sup>

period under review, there were no instances of conflict...  
the Charter. The principle of self-determination embodied in Article 1, paragraph 2, was however, implicitly invoked in Security Council resolutions 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966 and 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968 regarding the

...  
<sup>2</sup> Resolution 232 (1966), operative paragraph 4; resolution 253  
...  
of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples".

<sup>1</sup> For observations on the methods adopted in compilation of this chapter, see *Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council, 1945-1964*, vol. VIII, para. 1000.

<sup>4</sup> Resolution 232 (1966), preambular paragraph 1; resolution 253 (1968) preambular paragraph 1.

### Part II

#### CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 2 OF THE CHARTER

##### A. Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

#### NOTE

During the period under review, no resolutions were  
paragraph 4, was explicitly invoked. Principles derived  
obligations ensuing from those Charter principles engaged  
the attention of the Security Council. Of the six draft

resolutions<sup>6</sup> in which these principles were cited, three<sup>7</sup>

Suppl. for Gen. Ass. Dec. 1967, pp. 206, 207, S/8227, adopted without change as resolution 242 (1967); S/8253, 1381st meeting (PV),

(1966), S/8701 and Add. 1, 1472nd meeting (PV), p. 17.

<sup>7</sup> S/8227, S/8229 and S/8253.

were not pressed to the vote; one <sup>8</sup> failed of adoption; and, two <sup>9</sup> were adopted by the Security Council. In two <sup>10</sup> of the six instances, there was an explicit reference to Article 2 of the Charter. In all instances except one which is treated below,<sup>11</sup> no constitutional issue was raised in the relevant Council debate that could be considered to have a bearing on the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 4. In five instances reference was made to the principle of the prohibition of the threat of use of force in international relations against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State<sup>12</sup> and the principle

of the independence of every State.<sup>13</sup> In three <sup>14</sup> of these five instances, as well as in another instance,<sup>15</sup> the principle of inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by military force or the validity of the concept of territorial integrity, armed

forces or other States occupied as a result of military conflict.<sup>17</sup> Objections were raised to the applicability of

that there was a distinction between demarcation lines which meant the maintenance of reciprocal territorial claims, and boundaries which implied their mutual and final renunciation.<sup>18-24</sup> There was no constitutional discussion thereon.

are dealt with in this section.

CASE 1.<sup>25</sup> THE PALESTINE QUESTION: In connexion with the joint draft resolution submitted by Jordan and co-

S/8761 and Add.1.

lar para. 2.

<sup>8</sup> S/8227, oper. para. 1 (ii); S/8229, oper. para. 1; resolution 242 (1967), oper. para. 1 (ii); S/8253, oper. para. 3 (a); S/8761 and Add.1, preamb. para. 2.

<sup>9</sup> S/8227, oper. para. 1 (iii); S/8229, oper. paras. 1 and 2 (a).

<sup>15</sup> Resolution 252 (1968), preamb. para. 6.

<sup>16</sup> See 1373rd-1382nd meetings, in connexion with the situation in the Middle East (I)

1288th meeting: Israel, paras. 129, 137; Syria, paras. 84-87, 89-90, 92, 98; USSR, paras. 198-200, 212;

1289th meeting: Iraq, paras. 4-5, 30; Jordan, paras. 33, 49, 58; 1291st meeting: France, paras. 35-41; United Kingdom, paras. 24-25, 27-29; United States, paras. 9-10, 13-14, 16;

21, 27-28, 30; Jordan, paras. 35, 39, 52; New Zealand, paras. 81-86;

1293rd meeting: China, paras. 63, 65; Netherlands, paras. 11, 19, 20; Nigeria, paras. 22-23; Uruguay, para. 47;

1294th meeting: Uganda, paras. 5, 10;

1295th meeting: Bulgaria, paras. 4, 11; Japan, para. 30, Jordan, para. 55; USSR, para. 68.

sponsored by Mali: voted upon and not adopted on 3 August 1966

[Note: During the discussion, it was maintained that reprisals or retaliatory measures of a military nature were contrary to the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, the Israel-Syrian General Armistice Agreement, and the resolutions of the Security Council condemning retaliatory measures which took the form of military action. Unilateral resort to military force, could not, whatever might have been the provocation, be

At the 1288th meeting on 25 July 1966, the representative of Syria <sup>26</sup> stated that the acts of aggression committed by Israel against the neighbouring Arab States directed against Syria, threatened by their repercussions

letter of 14 July 1966 <sup>26</sup> to the President of the Council in

in that letter that after the incident at Ainazari, planes of the Israel Air Force had been ordered to take strictly limited action regarded as appropriate under the circumstances. The action had been taken reluctantly after Israel had become convinced that all its efforts through

At the same meeting, the representative of the USSR referred to the provision in the Charter that all Members of the Organization must refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the

and again in April 1964 <sup>27</sup>—categorically condemned so-called reprisals

of 9 April 1964, the Security Council had condemned "reprisals as incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations"; the Council had to state

Charter.

At the 1289th meeting on 26 July 1966, the representative of Jordan stated that the Security Council was

Israel.

At the same meeting, the representative of the United States stated that his Government considered it deplorable that the Government of Israel had demanded that the

<sup>26</sup> S/7411, OR, 21st yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1966, pp. 28-30. See also in chapter VIII, p. 125, footnote 166.

<sup>27</sup> See resolution III (1956), operative paragraphs 2 and 3; resolution 111 (1962), operative paragraphs 2 and 3; resolution 188 (1964), operative paragraph 1.

applied by the Government of Israel in its relations with its neighbours was contrary to the Charter which stipulated that Members of the United Nations "shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force". That doctrine was also in contradiction with the

consideration there was not even any justification for claiming to apply the theory of retaliation, for the acts of unknown origin and the air attack undertaken against the entire border region of a neighbouring country were not comparable.

The representative of Jordan introduced,<sup>28</sup> on behalf of the delegations of Mali and Jordan, a draft resolution whereby the Security Council would, *inter alia* (1) note

Syrian Arab Republic, and that it took the grave form of an air attack where napalm bombs in particular were used; (2) condemn Israel's wanton attack of 14 July 1966

Security Council Resolution 2124 of 13 July 1966,

Charter of the United Nations; (3) reaffirm resolutions 111 (1956) and 171 (1962), and deplore the resumption by Israel of aggressive acts unequivocally condemned by

Council had already condemned military action in breach

(5) reiterate its call on Israel to comply with its obligations under the Charter in default of which the Council would have to consider what further measures should be invoked.

The representative of New Zealand noted, in relation to the aerial attack, the primacy of the injunction contained in the General Armistice Agreement, as in the resolutions of the Security Council, not to resort to

of the United Nations, all Member States were absolutely duty bound to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. Neither the Charter, nor the terms of the

of a people's war of liberation.

The representative of Argentina stated that armed retaliation should not become an accepted form of international conduct. He stressed the need for the parties involved to co-operate and make the fullest possible use of those United Nations bodies at their disposal.

At the 1292nd meeting on 1 August 1966, the representative of Uruguay expressed agreement with other members of the Council that the Middle East situation

<sup>28</sup> S/7437, OR, 21st yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1966, pp. 59-60; 1292nd meeting, paragraphs 33-40.

to help the peace in the Middle East, should be supported. It was obvious, however, that armed reprisals could not in any circumstances be recognized as a lawful instrument in international relations and that the illegal use of force constituted a violation of the positive international law created in San

were international organs empowered to intervene in the case of acts such as those which provoked the reaction of 14 July.

The representative of China stated that whatever might have been the provocation, the use of military means in the circumstances as a means of retaliation had to be looked upon by the Council with serious concern. The

Nations Charter.

At the 1294th meeting on 2 August 1966, the representative of Uganda noted that the Charter provided against his own hands except in self-defence. There were numerous

be no justification, moral or legal, for aerial bombings of a neighbouring territory in peace-time; all signatories to the United Nations Charter were under obligation to resort to armed invasion without recourse to the Security

At the 1295th meeting on 3 August 1966, the representative of Bulgaria stated that the attack launched on 14 July 1966, on the orders of the Government of Israel, against the border area of Syria constituted an aggravated, organized and premeditated act of aggression. It called for condemnation by the Security Council. Otherwise, the attitude of the Council might be interpreted as an invitation to further acts of aggression.

by Jordan and Mali was voted upon and was not adopted. The vote was 6 votes in favour, none against, with 9 abstentions.<sup>29</sup>

the joint draft resolution by the United Kingdom and the United States: not pressed to the vote on 4 Novem-

<sup>29</sup> 1295th meeting, para. 76.  
<sup>30</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1307th meeting: France, paras. 100-101; Israel,\* paras. 34, 37, 38, 51-53; New Zealand, para. 134; Syria,\* para. 66; United Kingdom, paras. 105-106.  
1308th meeting: Israel,\* paras. 185, 192-195; Netherlands, para. 48-53; Uruguay, para. 84-90, 103-106.  
1309th meeting: Uganda, para. 113;  
1312th meeting: Japan, para. 17;  
1317th meeting: Syria,\* para. 16;  
1319th meeting: Bulgaria, para. 5; Syria,\* para. 101.

ber 1966; and with the draft resolution jointly submitted by Argentina, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria and Uganda: voted upon and failed of adoption on 4 November 1966

[Note: During the discussion, it was maintained that Syria was responsible for acts of violence perpetrated by ~~armed forces, guerrilla and other activities from Syrian territory~~

violence against Israel was contrary to Syria's general paragraph 4, its specific commitments under the 1949 Armistice Agreement, and the provisions contained in the General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) of 21 Decem-

Palestine and for the activities of Palestinian organization and over which it had no authority.]

At the 1307th meeting on 14/15 October 1966, the representative of Israel,\* having referred to statements ~~made by several members of the Security Council~~

did not regard itself as responsible for the activities of guerilla groups could not be sustained and that the obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State was "absolute" and "unreserved", stated that this obligation applied to Syria in its relations to Israel.

cil, and stated that the Syrian Government rejected the Israel contention that the activities of the El-Assefa organization had been planned, organized, equipped or ~~directed by Syria as that Syria was the source of the El Assefa and other organizations' activities~~; the Syrian Government refuted Israel's attribution that the Council.

The representative of the United Kingdom, having

territory, referred to a general principle that for a Govern-

it had to be the duty of any Government to prevent or oppose by all means at its disposal the use of its territory for the mounting of any activity the aim of which was

of the Charter, undertaken the obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of other States. Even more

Article III, paragraph 5, of the General Armistice Agreement<sup>32</sup> between Syria and Israel which provided that: "No warlike act or act of hostility shall be conducted from territory under the jurisdiction of the Parties to this

territory under control of that Party." He noted also that another general guideline could be found in General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX),<sup>33</sup> which, among other things, contained the provision that no State should organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the régime of another State, or

Agreements, and the provisions of resolution 2131 (XX), each other's territory, to abstain from the threat or use of force and from giving support to any terrorist activities.

Subsequently, at the 1310th meeting on 28 Octo-

Kingdom and the United States,<sup>34</sup> under which the Secu-

of Syria to fulfil its obligations by taking all measures to prevent the use of its territory as a base of operation for acts constituting a violation of the General Armistice Agreement, and call for strict adherence to Article III

ment providing that no warlike act or act of hostility shall be conducted from the territory of one of the parties against other parties.

At the 1316th meeting on 3 November 1966, a draft resolution, jointly sponsored by Argentina, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria and Uganda, was introduced by the representative of Uganda.<sup>35</sup> Under its terms, the Security Council would, among other

measures for preventing incidents that constituted a violation of the General Armistice Agreement.

At the 1319th meeting on 4 November 1966, the six-Power draft resolution was voted upon and failed of ~~adoption. The result of the vote was 11 in favour, 4 against, with one abstention, one of the negative votes~~

two-Power draft resolution did not press it to the vote.<sup>37</sup>

CASE 3.<sup>38</sup> THE PALESTINE QUESTION: In connexion with

Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the

<sup>32</sup> S/1568, OR, 21st yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1966, pp. 58-59; 1310th meeting: para. 5.

<sup>33</sup> S/7575/Rev.1, OR, 21st yr. Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1966, p. 69; 1316th meeting: para. 24.

28-29, 34; United Kingdom, paras. 79-80, 82; United States, paras. 89-91, 97; Secretary-General, paras. 6-12;

1321st meeting: France, paras. 3, 4; Jordan, para. 31; USSR, paras. 11, 15, 19, 22.

1323rd meeting: China, paras. 15-18; Israel,\* para. 51; Jordan, para. 59; Netherlands, paras. 5-9;

1324th meeting: Israel,\* paras. 90-92; Jordan, paras. 30-31; Lebanon, paras. 25, 29.

[Note: During the discussion, it was maintained that against Jordan on 13 November 1966, constituted a unilateral exercise of force and as such could not be condoned by the Security Council; nor could it be justified by the incidents which had preceded it. It was

provisions of the Charter and of the various Security Council that peaceful means be utilized to settle such hand, it was contended that the fundamental cause of Arab-Israel tension lay in threats against the territorial integrity and political independence of Israel by the neighbouring States in standing violation of the United

took place.] At the 1320th meeting on 16 November 1966, the Secretary-General made an oral report to the Security Council in which he stated that the Israeli attack had been supported by tanks, armoured vehicles, heavy weapons

informed the Security Council of the incident of 13 November which, in his view, constituted a deliberate act of aggression by Israel against Jordan.

the United Nations Charter and the Armistice Agreements, Arab Governments proclaimed that they did not accept the political independence or territorial integrity

Jordan had failed to fulfil its obligation to prevent any armed forces from crossing the border into Israel. An Israeli army vehicle on a regular patrol had been blown up by a mine in the border area adjacent to Jordan and it was evident that the perpetrators had come from and returned to certain villages on the Jordan side of the border. Furthermore, the Government of Israel had had reason to believe that this incident was the first in a "fresh series of attacks" planned to take place in the locality; it had decided to carry out a limited local action

carried out by a mobile task force, including tanks, had been undertaken most reluctantly, and only as a last resort after a long period of forbearance.

there was no justification whatsoever for the calculated, admitted and wholly disproportionate act of military reprisal committed by Israel against Jordan on 13 November

incidents, the Israel attack could not be condoned, for it was a fully planned attack mounted by infantry and armoured forces and supported by aircraft. The Israel

large-scale border military action, the nature and the consequences of which had far surpassed the cumulative total of the previous acts of terrorism conducted against the frontiers of Israel, could not be justified, explained away or excused by the incidents which had preceded it and in which the Government of Jordan had not been implicated. The policy of retaliation was in violation

Council that peaceful means be utilized to settle such

At the 1321st meeting on 16 November 1966, the representative of France stated that all reprisal operations and so-called punitive actions were always out of proportion to the incidents which might have given rise to

action which constituted a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of the General Armistice Agreement by incidents which, while not of comparable gravity

The representative of the USSR stated that by making

and political independence of any State. Recalling Security Council resolutions 111 (1956) of 19 January 1956, 171 (1962) of 9 April 1962 and 188 (1964) of 9 April 1964, he maintained that Israel's new aggression against Jordan

Charter but also many resolutions of the Security Council, which had repeatedly pointed out in specific terms that the use of so-called military reprisals was completely

provisionary international law, and with the elementary standards of their foreign policy.

At the 1322nd meeting on 16 November 1966, the representative of Argentina stated that reprisals, especially armed reprisals, were acts in violation of the norms of international law and the United Nations Charter which allowed the use of force only in cases of legitimate self-defence or in fulfilment of collective measures called

disproportionate to the reason which, according to Israel, had provoked it.

The representative of New Zealand maintained that the act was different from and disproportionate to even the lengthy series of terrorist acts which had preceded it.

the Charter and stated that there was a clear difference between a mere act of reprisal and the exercise of the right of self-defence. The events of which Jordan com

plained were unlawful acts of aggression falling within the scope of Article VIII of the Charter, and were prohibited by positive public international law.

At the same meeting, the representative of Nigeria introduced a draft resolution 40 on behalf of Mali and Nigeria which included the following provisions:

"The Security Council,

"Having noted the information provided by the Secretary-General concerning this military action in

Observing that this incident constituted a large-scale and carefully planned military action in the

of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel

"Recalling the repeated resolutions of the Security Council calling for the cessation of violent incidents across the demarcation line, and not overlooking past incidents of this nature;

"2. Censures Israel for this large-scale military action in violation of the United Nations Charter and of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan;

repeated, the Security Council will have to consider

At the same meeting, the draft resolution submitted by Mali and Nigeria was voted upon and adopted by 14 votes to none with 1 abstention.

CASE 4.<sup>42</sup> SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST (II): In connexion with the joint draft resolution submitted by

14 S/2769 adopted without change of resolution 228 (1966)

<sup>41</sup> 1328th meeting: para. 35; resolution 228 (1966).

<sup>42</sup> For texts of the relevant statements, see: 1401st meeting (PV): Israel,\* pp. 23-25, 27, 32-35; Jordan,\* pp. 6, 13-16;

1402nd meeting (PV): USSR,\* pp. 13-16; France,\* pp. 17-18; United Kingdom,\* pp. 19-21; Hungary,\* pp. 22-23; Canada,\* pp. 24-25; Denmark,\* pp. 26-27; Morocco,\* p. 67; Pakistan, pp. 18-20, 21; USSR,\* pp. 26, 27, 22-25; United States,\* pp. 28-29;

1403rd meeting (PV): Brazil,\* p. 10; Canada,\* pp. 19-20; China,\* p. 26; Paraguay, p. 22; United Arab Republic,\* pp. 7, 12-13; United Kingdom, p. 3;

1404th meeting (PV): Jordan,\* pp. 7, 13-15; Israel,\* pp. 29-30, Syria,\* pp. 17, 26;

1405th meeting (PV): Iraq,\* pp. 27, 28-30, 31; Israel,\* pp. 48-50; Morocco,\* p. 57; 1406th meeting (PV): Israel,\* pp. 3-5, 7; Jordan,\* p. 22;

1407th meeting (PV): Denmark, pp. 29-30; France, p. 46; Hungary, pp. 42, 43-45; Iran,\* pp. 47-51; Israel,\* pp. 63-65, 67; Jordan,\* pp. 68-70;

Security Council;<sup>43</sup> and with the draft resolution submitted by the President of the Security Council

[Vote: During the discussion, it was maintained that, while they were not to be condoned, the so-called acts of terrorism were the consequence of military occupation and could not be equated with Israel's military action which was out of proportion with the events alleged to

representative of Jordan, having recalled that the Government of Jordan had informed the Security Council<sup>44</sup> of a mass armed attack being contemplated by Israel against

1968. Recalling the provisions of Security Council reso-

1968. Recalling the provisions of Security Council reso-

acts, the representative of Jordan\* asked the Security Council to respond to the violation by Israel of the Charter and the above-cited Council resolution by applying sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

The representative of Israel\* stated that he had informed<sup>45</sup> the Security Council of the hostile acts being perpetrated from Jordanian territory and directed against Israel, which had reached a climax within recent weeks and which had been openly recognized in and supported

Israel also quoted passages from a statement by the Prime Minister of Israel which asserted that Israel

dangers, and that it would continue to abide by the cease-fire. The Prime Minister also stated that Jordan should also respect the cease-fire agreement and noted that the cease-fire obliged not only the abstention from any military activities by regular armies, but also

of those States which had agreed to the cease-fire.

the representative of the United States observed that the rule which should guide the parties in all these situations was contained in Security Council resolution 56 (1948) of 19 August 1948 in which it had been

means at its disposal to prevent action violating the truce

or who were in territory under its control; further, no

<sup>43</sup> S/8498, OR, 23rd yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1968, p. 288. See 1407th meeting (PV): Pakistan, pp. 31, 32, 33-35.

<sup>44</sup> See S/8478, O.R. 23rd yr. Suppl. for Jan.-March 1968, pp. 274-275.

<sup>45</sup> S/8470 and S/8475, O.R. 23rd yr. Suppl. for Jan.-March 1968.



party was permitted to violate the truce on the ground that it was undertaking reprisals or retaliation against the other party. These principles were applicable to the

and Jordan had pledged to observe.

from all acts of aggression in the name of retaliatory action. Noting that the pretext for the Israel action had been to attack the so-called terrorist bases in Jordan he stated that the so-called terrorist activities among the population of the territories occupied by Israel subsequent to the hostilities of June 1967, were but a manifestation

had regarded the doctrine of the right of reprisals as for immediate withdrawal of Israel forces from all occupied territories.

The representative of France stated that the fact that the Israel operation was pictured as a reprisal in no way

which had given the order for it. Noting that the idea of reprisals had been condemned by the United Nations and the Charter, he pointed out that his Government had repeatedly stressed that the so-called acts of terrorism

and had repeatedly called for the evacuation of occupied

speak or necessary measures for the security of the territory and population under the jurisdiction of Israel because jurisdiction established by occupation could not be recognized. The Security Council was duty-bound to

of the Israel forces and had to call for the withdrawal of those forces from the territories they occupied.

The representative of the USSR contended that the

and perpetrated act of military provocation which was vast in scale and part of the military aggressions by Israel. The persistence by Israel in occupying the Arab territories constituted in itself continued aggression against the Arab countries and a violation of the United Nations Charter and Security Council resolutions. Recent steps

in the policy of Israel, designed for open annexation of the territories of Arab States for the purpose of consolidating the results of aggression, which was in flagrant violation of the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter.

The representative of the USSR, noting that Israel was attempting to justify its aggression and its flagrant violation of the Security Council decisions by allegations that the attack on Jordan was a reprisal measure, recalled that the Security Council had on four occasions—in January 1956, in April 1962, in April 1964, and in November 1966—in the most categorical fashion condemned

military nature. The Security Council should therefore

condemn the new act of armed aggression on the part of Israel against Jordan in the most categorical fashion.

The representative of Hungary, noting that the Security

Israel against Jordan, held that Israel depicted the self-defence of the population of the occupied Arab territories

invaders was lawful and in full conformity with the Charter. The representative of Israel, in his statement, had claimed the right to wage preventive wars which the Charter expressly forbade.

The representative of the United Arab Republic \* maintained that Israel had once again resorted to military

force Arab population in the territories occupied by it

invoked as a pretext for the unwarranted aggression on Jordan the so-called terrorist activities emanating from that country, it was the continued occupation by Israel

in the Middle East. Since Israel had perpetrated another gross violation of the cease-fire resolutions which could not be justified under the provisions of the Charter which clearly prohibited and condemned not only the actual

confronted with a premeditated act of large-scale military

previous Security Council decisions. He referred to the Security Council resolution 228 (1966) of November 1966 by which the Council had censured Israel for its action and had emphasized to Israel that if actions of military

to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter. Israel had repeated such an act and it was up to the Security Council to discharge its responsi-

of military reprisals.

The representative of China expressed the view that no Government, even under extreme provocation, was justified in taking the law into its own hands. The mass attack launched by Israel in the name of retaliation called

United Nations, both Israel and Jordan had committed themselves to the principles of the Charter which called upon all Member States to settle their differences by peaceful means and to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any State.

At the 1405th meeting on 22 March 1968, the representative of Iraq \* stated that Israel action of 21 March 1968 was not a spontaneous reaction to provocation but a carefully prepared military operation with specific and clear-cut objectives. Even if it were considered an act of

under the Charter and under various resolutions adopted by the Security Council.

At the 1407th meeting on 24 March 1968, the President

draft resolution <sup>47</sup> the text of which read, *inter alia*, as follows:

"The Security Council,

"...

"Observing that the military action by the armed forces of Israel on the territory of Jordan was of a large-scale and carefully planned nature;

"...

"... be

"2. Condemns the military action launched by Israel in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions;

and declares that such actions of military

would have to consider further and more effective repetition of such acts;

"..."

The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously <sup>48</sup>

CASE 5. THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST (II): in connexion with the letter dated 5 August 1968 <sup>50</sup> from the representative of Jordan and the letter dated 5 August 1968 <sup>51</sup> from the representative of Israel; and with a draft resolution based upon the consensus among the members of the Security Council: voted

[Note: In the course of the discussion, it was maintained that all violent incidents, including those of

violation of the Charter and resolutions of the Security Council.]

At the 1434th meeting on 5 August 1968, the representative of Jordan,\* having recalled that the Security Council had many times emphasized to Israel that actions

incumbent upon the Security Council to take more effective measures as envisaged in Chapter VII of the

<sup>47</sup> Adopted without change as resolution 248 (1968)

pp. 28-30, 37, 42; Jordan,\* pp. 12, 22, 23-25; USSR, pp. 66, 71; United Kingdom, pp. 77-80; United States, p. 72;

UAR,\* pp. 7, 8-10, 12; 1436th meeting (PV): Hungary, p. 61; Iraq,\* pp. 52, 53-55, 56; Senegal, pp. 63-65, 66;

<sup>50</sup> S/8721, O.R., 23rd yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1968, p. 113; see also chapter VIII, p. 158.

<sup>51</sup> S/8724, O.R., 23rd yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1968, pp. 115-116.

Charter in response to continued acts of aggression by Israel.

The representative of Israel\* stated that warfare against Israel from Jordanian territory was being conducted by two methods: terror raids and armed attacks from military positions directed primarily against civilians and civilian localities. Jordan had thus become the principal base for continued Arab aggression against

aircraft had taken action against, and destroyed, the terror bases in Jordan from which these attacks against Israel emanated.

At the 1435th meeting on 6 August 1968, the representative of the United Arab Republic\* stated that a

otherwise was a case of aggression to which the Security Council should devote its attention. Recalling the provisions of resolution

that time Jordan had twice resorted to its policy of retaliation and massive reprisals, the representative of the United Arab Republic held that the Security Council should consider adopting "further and more effective measures as envisaged in the Charter to ensure the repetition of such acts .

The representative of Pakistan held that to equate the small, sporadic and spontaneous acts of resistance of the people of territories occupied by Israel with the planned and large-scale military actions of the armed forces of Israel would be to ignore the disparity of magnitude and

the perpetrator of an aggression equal to that of the victim of that aggression, i.e. it would amount in effect

had to determine once and for all that the activities of the so-called infiltrators could not be equated with those of the armed forces of Israel. Noting that the Council had condemned acts of military reprisal as flagrant violations of the United Nations Charter and the cease-

the repetition of such acts. The representative of Hungary held that the so-called terror raids and sabotage actions were direct consequences of occupation, that there could not be aggression on behalf of the indigenous population against the occupying

country and that even resistance against occupation by the indigenous population could not be equated with aggression.

The representative of Senegal interpreted the right of self-defence as a right which a State could, in order to defend and protect itself, respond, immediately and in the same location where the aggression

tionate means in keeping with those that were used by the aggressor. The incidents of 4 June and 4 August 1968

had not launched any attack against Israel.

At the 1437th meeting on 9 August 1968, the representative of China observed that the attack launched by

Israel on 4 August 1968 had assumed a magnitude

addressed to the President of the Security Council

in the nature of retaliatory action must be recorded as

failed of adoption on 22/23 August 1968

the censure of the Security Council.

that the armed intervention against, and occupation of,

16 August 1968, the President announced that, as a result of consultations, a draft resolution had emerged reflecting the views of the members of the Security Council on the course to be adopted by that organ on

Treaty, without the knowledge and against the will of the Government of that country, constituted an act of use of force in violation of, *inter alia*, Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter and could not be justified under

The Security Council,

"...

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

to the socialist system in Czechoslovakia and the attendant threat to the collective security of all socialist countries, the Governments of the five socialist States had acted, in response to an appeal from the "lawful legitimate authorities" in Czechoslovakia, in accordance with the right of States to self-defence, individually and

"...

"G..."

on Jordanian territory were of a large-scale and carefully planned nature in violation of resolution 248 (1968)

the Charter of the United Nations according to which self-defence, separate and collective, could not be interpreted as interference; further, the measures taken by the socialist countries were not directed against the political independence or the territorial integrity of

cannot be tolerated and that the Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such

same date addressed to the President of the Security Council<sup>54</sup> in which he had conveyed the objections of

"3. Considers that unprovoked and repeated mili-

units of the socialist countries had entered the territory

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

ments for assistance, including assistance in the form of armed forces, in view of the threat created by foreign and domestic reaction to the socialist social order and the constitutional State system of Czechoslovakia. The Governments concerned had decided to meet the request for assistance in accordance with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter and with the relevant provisions of the United

it was put to the vote and adopted unanimously."

reaction with the letter dated 21 August 1968 from the representatives of Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, the United Kingdom and the United States

threat to security was eliminated and the lawful authorities found that the presence of those units was no longer necessary; attempts to present the actions of the Soviet

<sup>54</sup> Oral draft resolution, adopted without change as resolution 256 (1968).

could not alter their peaceful intentions or diminish the right of the socialist countries to individual and collective self-defence. The countries of Czechoslovakia were entitled to request the assistance of the socialist States and the Soviet

vakia,\* pp. 67, 68-70, 71, 72, 73-75, 76; Denmark, pp. 31, 92, 93-95; France, pp. 89-90, 91; Paraguay, p. 52; USSR, pp. 2, 3-5, 6-10, 16, 32, 36, 41, 42, 48-50, 101, 107, 112, 116, 117; United

obligations, and the Soviet Government called upon all States to observe the principles of respect for sovereignty and independence and of the inalienability of direct or

1443rd meeting (PV): Algeria, p. 156; Czechoslovakia,\* pp. 6, 8-10; Poland, p. 27; Senegal, pp. 11, 12; USSR, pp. 98-100;

<sup>55</sup> S/8758, O.R., 23rd yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1968, pp. 126-127.

1445th meeting (PV): Czechoslovakia,\* pp. 96, 101, 107, 108-110; Pakistan, p. 112; President (Brazil), pp. 122, 123;

<sup>57</sup> For treatment of the discussion relevant to the adoption of the agenda, see this Supplement, under chapter II, 3. See also chapter VIII, pp. 171, 172.

<sup>56</sup> S/8758, O.R., 23rd yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1968, p. 136.

The representative of the United States held that the foreign armies had without warning invaded a Member State of the United Nations and that the Security Council had a responsibility to seize itself of this question, to condemn this gross violation of the Charter and to call on the Soviet Union and its allies for immediate with-

drawal of their troops from Czechoslovakia. He proposed a Security Council resolution 2131 (XX).

The representative of the USSR quoted the text of an appeal to allied States from the "lawful legitimate authorities in Czechoslovakia—a group of members of the Central Committee of the Government and the National

containing a Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention of Their Independence and Sovereignty, stated that the intervention by forces of the USSR and some of its allies in the affairs of Czechoslovakia was completely contrary to the above mentioned Charter principles.

from Czechoslovakia as soon as the existing threat to socialism in that country and the threat to the security of the socialist countries were eliminated, to emphasize that the measures taken were not directed against any Czechoslovakia or any other country and that they were

Union and certain of their allies that the situation could only be rectified if they desisted immediately from intervention by means of armed force and withdraw all their

collective self-defence and the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

At the 1442nd meeting on 22 August 1968, the repre-

forces in Czechoslovakia stood condemned by the United Nations Charter, maintained that the Security Council must call upon the USSR to withdraw the Warsaw Pact forces from Czechoslovakia and to respect the sovereignty of an independent Member nation of the United Nations.

lution 2131 (XX).

The representative of Denmark introduced, on behalf of the delegations of Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, the United Kingdom and the United States, a draft resolution<sup>58</sup> under which:

The representative of Denmark observed that the inva-

*"The Security Council*

undertaken, without the knowledge and without the

clearly a matter which was international in character.

The representative of the USSR, having noted that the appeal of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to the socialist States had been motivated by the threat to the socialist system on the part of counter-revolutionary forces in alliance with external forces hostile to socialism, contended that the decision of the socialist countries to give assistance to Czechoslovakia was consonant with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter which allowed States to take collective and individual measures of self-

group of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, troops of the Soviet Union

their country without the knowledge and against the wishes of the Czechoslovak Government,

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

After the adoption of the agenda, the representative of Czechoslovakia\* read several messages from the Minister of Foreign Affairs containing the texts of declarations by various constitutional authorities in Czechoslovakia which stated that, on 20 August 1968, the troops

against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State,

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

Czechoslovakia without the knowledge or consent of the constitutional organs of the State and requested immediate withdrawal of the armed forces of the five States of the Warsaw Treaty and respect for the State sovereignty of Czechoslovakia.

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

"2. *Condemns* the armed intervention of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other members of the Warsaw Pact in the internal affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and calls upon them to

The representative of Denmark, referring to the assertion that the USSR and its allies had intervened in

that the declarations contained in the statement of the representative of Czechoslovakia were to the contrary.

<sup>58</sup> S/8761 and Add.1, 1442nd meeting (PV), p. 17. The name of Senegal was added to the names of the sponsors of the draft

no action of violence or reprisal that could result in further suffering or loss of life, forthwith to withdraw their forces, and to cease all other forms of intervention in Czechoslovakia's internal affairs;

"...".

The representative of the United States stated that

2 against, and 3 abstentions, one negative vote being that of a permanent member.<sup>59</sup>

At the 1444th meeting on 23 August 1968, the representative of Yugoslavia \* communicated to the Security Council the text of a statement issued by his Government on 22 August 1968 concerning the situation in Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, which had taken place without

from the threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

The representative of Brazil referring to the oblig-

constituted a gross violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent country, as well as a direct denial of generally recognized principles of

Nations, the obligations under the Charter prevailed, and one of those obligations was the respect for the freedom, territorial integrity and sovereignty of all States. The action taken by the Warsaw Pact Powers not only went beyond the Charter but clearly violated it.

At the 1443rd meeting on 22 August 1968, the representative of Czechoslovakia, having stated that the

referring to the principle of non intervention in the internal affairs of other States, the representative noted that similar or identical interpretation of the provisions of the Charter regarding the right to collective or so-called legitimate self-defence had in the past been used as a pretext for foreign interventions in the internal affairs of other countries and had given rise to justified

that the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the foreign termination of the occupation, the withdrawal of all occupation forces from the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the full restitution of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia.

of Czechoslovakia, requested immediate withdrawal of all occupation troops and condemned the policy of use of force.

At the 1445th meeting on 24 August 1968, the representative of Czechoslovakia stated that the armed intervention in Czechoslovakia was an act of use of force

request or demand of the Government of Czechoslovakia to the knowledge of the Czechoslovak Government and

framework of separate and collective security could not juridically be considered interference in the domestic

could self-defence, separate and collective, be interpreted as an act of interference. The acts of the socialist countries were not directed against the political independence or the territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia and, therefore, did not fall within the purview of the prohibitions

or for the fulfilment of obligations arising from the joint had not been a danger of military aggression from abroad at the time of the occupation. Furthermore, arguments about the alleged danger of counter-revolution were juridically not valid. The foreign troops, even if they came from friendly countries, should leave Czechoslovakia without delay and the sovereignty of that country should

were to act.

The eight Power draft resolution was voted upon and failed of adoption. There were 10 votes in favour,

Subsequently, the President of the Security Council adjourned the meeting.

<sup>59</sup> 1443rd meeting (PV), pp. 163-165.

**B. Article 2, paragraph 6, of the Charter**

"The Organization shall ensure that states which are not Members of the United Nations act in accordance with these Principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security."

**NOTE**

In the proceedings of the Security Council during the period under review, there were only incidental references

sions, the Security Council adopted resolutions in which

<sup>60</sup> For relevant statements, see, in connexion with the situation in Viet Nam

1332nd meeting: Argentina, para. 39; 1333rd meeting: Japan, para. 46; United States, para. 23; 1337th meeting: United States, para. 21

reference was made to the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 6,<sup>61</sup> although no constitutional issue arose in the relevant debates.

<sup>61</sup> See, in connexion with the situation in Southern Rhodesia,

resolution 232 (1966), operative paragraph 7, and resolution 253 (1968) preamb. para. 1 oper. para. 14.

### \*\*C. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter

## Part III

### Article 24

"1. In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under

"2. In discharging these duties the Security Council shall act in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law. The powers entrusted to the Council by the Charter and the principles of international law are laid down in Chapters VI, VII, VIII and XII.

"3. The Security Council shall submit annual and, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly for its consideration."

#### NOTE

During the period under review, Article 24 has not

been invoked in the Security Council. That Article has not been invoked in the admission of any questions affecting international peace and security which the Security Council considered, during that period.

On one occasion,<sup>62</sup> however, Article 24 has been invoked in a draft resolution submitted to, but not pressed for a

<sup>62</sup> In connexion with the situation in the Middle East (I), see

## Part IV

### CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 25 OF THE CHARTER

#### Article 25

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

#### NOTE

During the period under review, two resolutions<sup>63</sup> of the Charter was explicitly invoked. While references by the Council under those resolutions, no constitutional

discussions concerning the provisions of Article 25 had occurred.

Of the draft resolutions submitted to the Security Council which were either not pressed to the vote or voted upon and not adopted, three contained explicit

<sup>63</sup> See, in connexion with the situation in Southern Rhodesia, resolution 232 (1966), of 16 December 1966, oper. para. 6; and resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, preamb. para. 5 and oper. paras. 11, 12.

<sup>64</sup> See, in connexion with the situation in Southern Rhodesia, preamb. para. 6; S/8554, *OR*, 23rd yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1968*, pp. 133-136, oper. para. 7; in connexion with the question of South West Africa, S/8429, *OR*, 23rd yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1968*, pp. 198-199, oper. para. 4.

references to Article 25, and five #5 including the three mentioned above, contained proposals which might be deemed to have an implicit bearing on that Article.

<sup>66</sup> See, in connexion with the situation in Southern Rhodesia, S/7285/Add.1, OR, 21st yr., Suppl. for April-June 1966, pp. 82-83, preamb. para. 2; S/8545, OR, 23rd yr., Suppl. for April-June 1968, para. 1, oper. para. 6; in connexion with the Palestine question,

S/7437, OR, 21st yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1966, pp. 59-60, oper. paras. 1, 3, 5 [see Case 1 under Article 2 (4) in the present study], paras. 4, 5, oper. paras. 1, 3.

**Part V**

**CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER VIII OF THE CHARTER**

**Article 52**

"1. Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional agencies

of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.

"2. The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement either on the initiative of the States concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

"4. This Article in no way impairs the application of Articles 34 and 35."

**Article 53**

"1. The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council, with the exception of measures against

Article 107 or in regional arrangements directed against renewal or aggressive policy on the part of any such state, until such time as the Organization may, on request of the Governments concerned, be charged with the responsibility for

2. The term enemy state as used in paragraph 1 of this Article applies to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of

**Article 54**

"The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities

**NOTE**

In consequence of the obligations placed by the Charter

on the Council, but have not been included in the provisional agenda:

Council has been drawn during the period from 1966 to 1968 to the following communications, which have been circulated by the Secretary-General to the represen-

- (i) Dated 7 December 1966: transmitting the text of a resolution adopted by the Assembly of the Organization of African Unity

- Heads of State and Government, at its third ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 5 to 9 November 1966, concerning Southern Rhodesia.<sup>66</sup>
- (ii) Dated 14 December 1966: transmitting the text of a resolution adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government at its third ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 5 to 9 November 1966, concerning the Republic of South Africa.<sup>67</sup>
- (iii) Dated 14 December 1966: transmitting the text of a resolution adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government at its third ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 5 to 9 November 1966, concerning the principal military leaders of the Constitutionalist movement.<sup>76</sup>
- (iv) Dated 14 December 1966: transmitting the text of a resolution adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government at its third ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 5 to 9 November 1966, concerning South West Africa.<sup>69</sup>
- (i) Dated 7 January 1966: transmitting the text of a report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the President of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation concerning the events which have occurred in the Dominican Republic since 14 February 1966.<sup>74</sup>
- (ii) Dated 8 January 1966: transmitting the text of a cable from the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the President of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation, on the events which have occurred in the Dominican Republic since 14 February 1966.<sup>75</sup>
- (iii) Dated 13 January 1966: transmitting the text of a cable of 12 January from the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the President of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation, concerning the occupation by the Inter-American Force of the plant and studios of Radio-Televisión Santo Domingo.<sup>72</sup>
- (iv) Dated 18 January 1966: transmitting the text of a cable dated 15 January from the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the President of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation on the situation in the Dominican Republic.<sup>73</sup>
- (v) Dated 25 January 1966: transmitting the text of a cable of 24 January from the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the President of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation, on the events which have occurred in the Dominican Republic since 14 February 1966.<sup>77</sup>
- (vi) Dated 9 February 1966: transmitting the text of a report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the President of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation, on the events which have occurred in the Dominican Republic since 14 February 1966.<sup>78</sup>
- (vii) Dated 15 February 1966: transmitting a copy of a cable of 14 February from the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the President of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation, concerning the events which have occurred in the Dominican Republic since 14 February 1966.<sup>79</sup>
- (viii) Dated 17 February 1966: transmitting the text of a report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the President of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation, on the events which have occurred in the Dominican Republic since 14 February 1966.<sup>80</sup>
- (ix) Dated 17 February 1966: transmitting the text of a report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the President of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation, on the events which have occurred in the Dominican Republic since 14 February 1966.<sup>81</sup>
- (x) Dated 18 March 1966: transmitting the text of a report dated 14 March of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation to the President of the Meeting, on the situation in the Dominican Republic since 14 March.<sup>80</sup>
- (xi) Dated 25 March 1966: transmitting the text of a report dated 23 March of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation to the President of the Meeting, on the situation in the Dominican Republic since 14 March.<sup>80</sup>
- (xii) Dated 13 April 1966: transmitting the text of a cable dated 12 April from the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the Chairman of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation, concerning the situation in the Dominican Republic since 23 March.<sup>81</sup>
- (xiii) Dated 13 May 1966: transmitting the text of a resolution adopted by the Tenth Meeting of Consultation concerning the attendance by outstanding persons from various countries of the hemisphere to witness and observe the

<sup>66</sup> S/7614, *OR, 21st yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1966*, pp. 159-160.

<sup>67</sup> S/7637, *ibid.*, pp. 184-186.

<sup>68</sup> S/7638, *ibid.*, pp. 186-187.

<sup>69</sup> S/7639, *ibid.*, pp. 187-189.

<sup>70</sup> S/7650, *ibid.*, pp. 190-191.

<sup>71</sup> S/7651, *ibid.*, pp. 191-192.

<sup>72</sup> S/7084, *ibid.*, pp. 83-84.

<sup>73</sup> S/7089, *ibid.*, pp. 88-89.

<sup>74</sup> S/7100 and Corr. 1, *ibid.*, pp. 101-102.

<sup>75</sup> S/7133, *ibid.*, pp. 128-130.

<sup>76</sup> S/7148, *ibid.*, pp. 150-154.

<sup>77</sup> S/7163, *ibid.*, pp. 167-175.

<sup>78</sup> S/7211, *ibid.*, pp. 200-201.

<sup>79</sup> S/7227, *ibid.*, pp. 279-282.

<sup>80</sup> S/7254, *OR, 21st yr., Suppl. for April-June 1966*, pp. 38-41.



elections scheduled for 1 June in the Dominican Republic.<sup>82</sup>

(xiv) Dated 27 May 1966: transmitting the text of

the Dominican Republic since the date of the last report on 12 April.<sup>83</sup>

(xv) Dated 31 May 1966: transmitting the text of a cable of 26 May from the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the Chairman of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation on the situation in the Dominican Republic since the date of the last report on 20 May.<sup>84</sup>

(xvi) Dated 1 June 1966: transmitting the text of a cable of 1 June from the *Ad Hoc Committee* to the Chairman of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation concerning the situation in the Dominican Republic since the date of the last report on 26 May.<sup>85</sup>

(xvii) Dated 6 June 1966: transmitting the text of a cable dated 2 June from the Rapporteur of the

Group of Observers of the Elections in the

dominant concerning the conduct of the elections

(xviii) Dated 6 June 1966: transmitting the text of a cable dated 2 June from the *Ad Hoc Committee* to the Chairman of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation concerning the general elections

(xix) Dated 10 July 1966: transmitting the text of

Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs concerning the withdrawal of

(xx) Dated 29 June 1966: transmitting the text of

Consultation announcing the first withdrawals of the Inter-American Peace Force from the Dominican Republic.<sup>86</sup>

(xxi) Dated 12 August 1966: transmitting the text of a resolution adopted by the Council of the Organization of American States concerning the situation between Haiti and the Dominican

text of the report from the *Ad Hoc Committee* to the President of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation concerning the withdrawal of

by its mission.<sup>87</sup>

(xxiii) Dated 29 November 1966: transmitting volume I of the report entitled "The First Afro-Asian-Latin American Peoples' Solidar-

mental Conference of Havana)", with its conclusions and annexes.<sup>88</sup>

(xxiv) Dated 1 December 1966: transmitting the text of the resolution adopted by the Council of the Organization of American States on 28 November 1966 concerning the afore-

(xxv) Dated 8 December 1966: transmitting volume II of the aforementioned report.<sup>89</sup>

(xxvi) Dated 5 June 1967: transmitting the text of a resolution adopted by the Council of the Organization of American States on 5 June 1967, concerning the Twelfth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs to consider a Venezuelan complaint against Cuba.<sup>90</sup>

(xxvii) Dated 10 July 1967: transmitting the text of

Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs

venezuelan complaint against Cuba.<sup>91</sup>

(xxviii) Dated 13 July 1967: transmitting the text of the resolution adopted at the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs

Committee to consider a Venezuelan complaint against Cuba.<sup>92</sup>

Peoples' Solidarity Conference.<sup>93</sup>

(xxix) Dated 26 September 1967: transmitting the

concerning a Venezuelan complaint against

to disputes or situations

#### D. Communications from other States concerning matters before regional organizations

(i) Dated 7 February 1966: Argentina, Bolivia,

can Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, concerning the "First Solidarity Conference of the

held in Havana on 3 January.<sup>94</sup>

(ii) Dated 10 February 1966: Cuba transmitting a letter from the Prime Minister of Cuba in

<sup>82</sup> S/7303, *ibid.*, p. 93.

<sup>83</sup> S/7324, *OR*, 21st yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1966*, pp. 111-115.

<sup>84</sup> S/7332, *ibid.*, pp. 124-125.

<sup>85</sup> S/7335, *ibid.*, pp. 128-129.

<sup>86</sup> S/7342, *ibid.*, pp. 145-146.

<sup>87</sup> S/7390, *ibid.*, pp. 238-239.

<sup>88</sup> S/7459, *OR*, 21st yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1966*, pp. 82-83.

<sup>89</sup> S/7502, *ibid.*, pp. 130-132.

<sup>90</sup> S/7606, *OR*, 21st yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1966*, p. 106.

<sup>91</sup> S/7606, *ibid.*, pp. 106-108.

<sup>92</sup> S/7606, *ibid.*, p. 106.

<sup>93</sup> S/8063, *OR*, 22nd yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1967*, pp. 94-95.

<sup>94</sup> S/8170, ditto.

<sup>95</sup> S/7123, *OR*, 21st yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1966*, pp. 119-120.

