



**REPORT  
OF THE  
SECURITY COUNCIL**

---

**16 June 1974 – 15 June 1975**

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OFFICIAL RECORDS: THIRTIETH SESSION  
SUPPLEMENT No. 2 (A/10002)**

**UNITED NATIONS**



**REPORT  
OF THE  
SECURITY COUNCIL**

---

**16 June 1974 – 15 June 1975**

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**OFFICIAL RECORDS: THIRTIETH SESSION**

**SUPPLEMENT No. 2 (A/10002)**

**UNITED NATIONS**

New York, 1975

## NOTE

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

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION .....	1

### *Part I*

#### **Questions considered by the Security Council under its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security**

##### *Chapter*

1. THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS .....	2
A. Events of 15-25 July 1974 and consideration by the Council .....	2
B. Developments between 25 and 30 July 1974 .....	6
C. The Geneva Declaration and consideration by the Council .....	8
D. Further reports of the Secretary-General and communications received between 26 July and 26 August 1974 .....	10
E. Renewed hostilities of 12 to 20 August 1974 and consideration by the Council .....	11
F. Further reports of the Secretary-General and communications to the Council from 1 September to 31 December 1974 .....	16
G. Report of the Secretary-General on UNFICYP and the renewal of its mandate in December 1974 .....	17
H. Developments between 1 January and 31 March 1975 .....	19
I. Developments between 1 April and 15 June 1975 .....	23
2. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND SOUTH AFRICA .....	25
A. Communications to the Security Council and request for a meeting .....	25
B. Consideration at the 1796th to 1798th, 1800th to 1804th and 1806th to 1808th meetings (18, 21, 22, 24, 25 and 28-30 October 1974) .....	25
3. THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST .....	27
A. Reports of the Secretary-General, consideration by the Security Council and communications received .....	27
B. Communications concerning other matters relating to the situation in the Middle East .....	38
4. THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA .....	40
A. Communications to the Security Council and request for a meeting .....	40
B. Consideration at the 1811th and 1812th meetings (17 December 1974) ..	41
C. Communications to the Security Council received between December 1974 and June 1975 .....	42
D. Consideration at the 1823rd to 1829th meetings (30 May-6 June 1975)	42

### *Part II*

#### **Other matters considered by the Security Council**

5. ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS .....	45
A. Application of Grenada .....	45
B. Application of Guinea-Bissau .....	45

## CONTENTS (*continued*)

### *Part III*

#### The Military Staff Committee

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
6. WORK OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE .....	46

### *Part IV*

#### **Matters brought to the attention of the Security Council but not discussed in the Council during the period covered**

7. REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA .....	47
8. REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF RACE CONFLICT IN SOUTH AFRICA RESULTING FROM THE POLICIES OF <i>Apartheid</i> OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA .....	48
9. COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN TERRITORIES UNDER PORTUGUESE ADMINISTRATION .....	49
10. COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA .....	49
11. COMMUNICATION CONCERNING DEVELOPMENTS IN WESTERN SAHARA .....	50
12. COMMUNICATIONS FROM GREECE AND TURKEY CONCERNING DEVELOPMENTS IN THE AREA OF THE AEGEAN SEA .....	51
13. COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE COMPLAINT BY IRAQ CONCERNING INCIDENTS ON ITS FRONTIER WITH IRAN .....	51
14. COMMUNICATION CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF VIET-NAM .....	52
15. COMMUNICATION CONCERNING THE INDIA-PAKISTAN QUESTION .....	53
16. REPORT ON THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS .....	53
17. COMMUNICATION FROM THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CONCERNING AN INCIDENT IN THE GULF OF SIAM .....	53
18. COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING BILATERAL RELATIONS BETWEEN MEMBER STATES .....	53
19. COMMUNICATION CONCERNING THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY .....	55
20. COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTING RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TWENTY-NINTH SESSION .....	56
A. Resolution 3280 (XXIX) on co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity .....	56
B. Resolution 3282 (XXIX) on strengthening the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security .....	56
C. Resolution 3283 (XXIX) on the peaceful settlement of international disputes .....	56
D. Resolution 3314 (XXIX) on the definition of aggression .....	56
E. Resolution 3333 (XXIX) on the question of Korea .....	56
21. THE FORMAT OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL .....	57

## CONTENTS (*continued*)

### APPENDICES

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Membership of the Security Council during the years 1974 and 1975 . . . . .	58
II. Representatives and deputy, alternate and acting representatives accredited to the Security Council . . . . .	58
III. Presidents of the Security Council . . . . .	59
IV. Meetings of the Security Council during the period from 16 June 1974 to 15 June 1975 . . . . .	59
V. Resolutions adopted by the Security Council during the period from 16 June 1974 to 15 June 1975 . . . . .	63
VI. Meetings of subsidiary bodies of the Security Council during the period from 16 June 1974 to 15 June 1975 . . . . .	63
VII. Representatives, Chairmen and Principal Secretaries of the Military Staff Committee . . . . .	64
VIII. List of matters of which the Security Council is seized . . . . .	66

## INTRODUCTION

1. The present report<sup>1</sup> is submitted to the General Assembly by the Security Council in accordance with Article 24, paragraph 3, and Article 15, paragraph 1, of the Charter.

2. As in previous years, the report is not intended as a substitute for the records of the Security Council, which constitute the only comprehensive and authoritative account of its deliberations, but as a guide to the activities of the Security Council during the period covered. It should be noted, in this connexion, that the Council decided in December 1974<sup>2</sup> to make its report

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the thirtieth annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly. These reports are circulated as Supplement No. 2 to the *Official Records* of each regular session of the General Assembly.

<sup>2</sup> See chap. 21.

shorter and more concise, without, however, changing its basic structure, and that the present report was prepared accordingly.

3. With respect to the membership of the Security Council during the period covered, it will be recalled that the General Assembly, at its 2266th plenary meeting on 17 October 1974, elected Guyana, Italy, Japan, Sweden and the United Republic of Tanzania as non-permanent members of the Security Council to fill the vacancies resulting from the expiration, on 31 December 1974, of the terms of office of Australia, Austria, Indonesia, Kenya and Peru.

4. The period covered in the present report is from 16 June 1974 to 15 June 1975. The Council held 54 meetings during that period.

## Part I

# QUESTIONS CONSIDERED BY THE SECURITY COUNCIL UNDER ITS RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

### Chapter 1

## THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS

### A. Events of 15-25 July 1974 and consideration by the Council

#### 1. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL AND REQUESTS FOR A MEETING

5. In view of the seriousness of the matter in relation to international peace and security and in view of the United Nations involvement in Cyprus, the Secretary-General, on 16 July 1974, addressed a letter (S/11334) to the President of the Security Council, requesting him to convene the Security Council in order that he might report to it on the information he had received through his Special Representative in Cyprus and the Commander of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP).

6. In a letter also dated 16 July (S/11335) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Cyprus requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council on the critical situation in Cyprus, which he said had been created on that date as a consequence of outside intervention, with grave and threatening implications for the Republic of Cyprus and for international peace and security in the area. He called for appropriate measures to be taken to protect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus.

7. On 16 July, the Secretary-General circulated the text of identical telegrams (S/11336) which he had addressed on 15 July to the Prime Ministers of Greece and Turkey, expressing his deep concern at developments on that date in Cyprus and appealing to those Governments which were closely connected with Cyprus to exercise maximum restraint and to avoid any action which might give rise to further violence.

8. By a message dated 16 July (S/11337), the Prime Minister of Greece replied to the Secretary-General's telegram, expressing Greece's agreement that the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Cyprus should be maintained and respected by all parties concerned. It was the firm belief of the Greek Government that the Cyprus problem should be solved peacefully through negotiations within the framework of the enlarged intercommunal talks.

9. In a message dated 17 July (S/11341), the Prime Minister of Turkey, in reply to the Secretary-General's telegram, stated that a grave situation had been created concerning the independence, territorial integrity and security of the State of Cyprus as a result of the armed coup which had taken place on the island.

Citing reports that Greece had been associated with or had even initiated that coup, he declared that such a situation in the island created another serious problem regarding the protection of the security, rights and interests of the Turkish community, in particular, as the person thus brought to power was renowned for his dedication to the cause of annexing the island to Greece (*enosis*). He urged that the United Nations immediately adopt certain initial measures to prevent further deterioration of the balance of forces and the illegal entry of military forces, weapons and ammunition into the island and to ensure that during the scheduled rotation on that date of the Greek contingent stationed on the island, the number and quantity of incoming and outgoing military forces, weapons and ammunition were in conformity with the 1960 Agreements. Moreover, in view of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, it was clear that recognition as "the Government of Cyprus" of the administration proclaimed on 16 July was not possible. Finally, he asserted that the only institution in Cyprus having a legitimate constitutional base remained the Turkish-Cypriot administration.

#### 2. CONSIDERATION AT THE 1779TH AND 1780TH MEETINGS (16 AND 19 JULY 1974)

10. At its 1779th meeting on 16 July, the Security Council adopted the following agenda without objection:

"The situation in Cyprus:

"(a) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11334);

"(b) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11335)."

11. The representatives of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

12. At the outset of the discussion, the Secretary-General, reporting to the Council on the information he had received, beginning early on the morning of 15 July, from his Special Representative in Cyprus and the Commander of UNFICYP, confirmed that a coup was being staged in Cyprus by the National Guard against President Makarios. He described the efforts undertaken by his Special Representative and by the Commander of UNFICYP to prevent the spread of violence. He recalled in that connexion that the

mandate of UNFICYP had been conceived in the context of the conflict between the two communities in Cyprus, and he pointed out that the recent events related to rivalries within one community. In contacts with the Secretary-General's Special Representative and the Force Commander at Paphos, Archbishop Makarios had requested that a Security Council meeting be held as soon as possible. UNFICYP had been authorized to extend protection to Archbishop Makarios on a humanitarian basis, but in the meantime he had left the island. The Secretary-General concluded by expressing the deepest concern that the latest events in Cyprus carried a serious threat to international peace and security in a much wider framework.

13. The representatives of Cyprus, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Turkey, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece and the United States of America made statements. The representative of Cyprus spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

14. At its 1780th meeting on 19 July, the representatives of Yugoslavia, Romania and India were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. Then the President stated that the Secretary-General had informed the Council, in the course of consultations among all its members, that he had received a telegram on 17 July from Nicosia informing him of the release of Mr. Zenon Rossides from his post as Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations. In a second telegram on 18 July, he had been informed of the designation of Mr. Loukis Papafilippou as the new Permanent Representative of Cyprus. The President went on to state that the Council had agreed to receive Archbishop Makarios in his capacity as President of Cyprus and to regard Mr. Rossides as representing Cyprus during the current debate.

15. The Council then heard a statement by the President of Cyprus in which he accused Greece of having instigated the coup and appealed to the Council to act to reinstate constitutional order and democratic rights in Cyprus. Further statements were made at the meeting by the representatives of Greece, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Romania, India, the USSR, China, the United States, the United Kingdom, Austria and Australia. The representatives of Cyprus, the USSR and Turkey spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

16. Before adjourning the meeting, the President of the Security Council drew attention to the following draft resolution (S/11346) that had been circulated during the course of the meeting:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having considered the report of the Secretary-General, at its 1779th meeting, about the recent developments in Cyprus,*

*"Having heard the statements made by the President of the Republic of Cyprus and the statements by the representatives of Cyprus, Turkey, Greece and other Member countries,*

*"Deeply deploring the outbreak of violence and the continuing bloodshed,*

*"Gravely concerned about the situation which carries a serious threat to international peace and security,*

*"Equally concerned about the threat to the constitutional structure established and guaranteed by international agreements,*

*"Recalling Security Council resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964 and subsequent resolutions of the Security Council on this matter,*

*"Conscious of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations,*

*"1. Calls upon all States to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus;*

*"2. Demands an immediate end to foreign military intervention in the Republic of Cyprus and requests the immediate withdrawal of the foreign military personnel in excess of those envisaged in international agreements, as requested by the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios, in his letter of 2 July 1974;*

*"3. Requests all States to exercise the utmost restraint and to refrain from any action which might further aggravate the situation;*

*"4. Requests the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council further informed about the developments."*

17. In a revised version of the draft resolution (S/11346/Rev.1), also circulated on 19 July, the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution were revised, as well as the second operative paragraph. The revised paragraphs read as follows:

*"Gravely concerned about the situation which may lead to a serious threat to international peace and security,*

*"Equally concerned about the necessity to restore the constitutional structure of the Republic of Cyprus, established and guaranteed by international agreements,*

*" . . .*

*"2. Demands an immediate end to foreign military intervention in the Republic of Cyprus that is in contravention of paragraph 1 and requests the withdrawal without delay from the Republic of the foreign military personnel in excess of those envisaged in international agreements, as requested by the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios, in his letter of 2 July 1974;"*

### 3. CONSIDERATION AT THE 1781ST MEETING (20 JULY 1974)

18. In a letter dated 20 July (S/11348) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Greece requested an urgent meeting of the Council in order to take appropriate steps with regard to the explosive situation created by the aggression of Turkish armed forces against Cyprus that was then in progress.

19. At its 1781st meeting on 20 July, the Council decided to add the following subitem (c) to its agenda:

*"(c) Letter dated 20 July 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11348)"*.

20. The representative of Mauritius was invited, at his request, in addition to those previously invited, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

21. At the outset of the meeting, the Secretary-General reported to the Council that in the early hours

of that morning the Turkish Ambassador in Nicosia had informed the Commander of UNFICYP that Turkish troops would very shortly intervene in Cyprus. Turkish military activity had begun in the air and by sea about one hour thereafter. The Secretary-General summarized the day's developments in Cyprus, as reported by his Special Representative and the Force Commander, both as regards the military situation and the efforts of his Special Representative and of UNFICYP to prevent the fighting between Turkish forces and the Cyprus National Guard from spreading into intercommunal fighting. The Secretary-General felt that in view of the developments, which were extremely serious for the maintenance of international peace and security, an enormous responsibility had fallen to the Security Council to put a halt to the fighting, to prevent further escalation and to find a way to begin to restore peace. He appealed to the parties immediately to put a halt to the battle and to co-operate with UNFICYP in its efforts to limit the fighting and to protect the civilian population.

22. The President stated that he had maintained continuous consultations with the Secretary-General and representatives of Member States so that the Council could discharge its primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security in the most appropriate manner. As a result of those contacts, it had been possible to circulate a draft resolution (S/11350), which he proposed to put to the vote at that stage. The draft resolution read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having considered the report of the Secretary-General, at its 1779th meeting, about the recent developments in Cyprus,*

*"Having heard the statement of the President of the Republic of Cyprus and the statements of the representatives of Cyprus, Turkey, Greece and other Member States,*

*"Having considered at its present meeting further developments in the island,*

*"Deeply deploring the outbreak of violence and the continuing bloodshed,*

*"Gravely concerned about the situation which has led to a serious threat to international peace and security, and which has created a most explosive situation in the whole Eastern Mediterranean area,*

*"Equally concerned about the necessity to restore the constitutional structure of the Republic of Cyprus, established and guaranteed by international agreements,*

*"Recalling its resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964 and its subsequent resolutions on this matter,*

*"Conscious of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations,*

*"1. Calls upon all States to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus;*

*"2. Calls upon all parties to the present fighting as a first step to cease all firing and requests all States to exercise the utmost restraint and to refrain from any action which might further aggravate the situation;*

*"3. Demands an immediate end to foreign military intervention in the Republic of Cyprus that is in contravention of the provisions of paragraph 1 above;*

*"4. Requests the withdrawal without delay from the Republic of Cyprus of foreign military personnel*

present otherwise than under the authority of international agreements, including those whose withdrawal was requested by the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios, in his letter of 2 July 1974;

*"5. Calls upon Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to enter into negotiations without delay for the restoration of peace in the area and constitutional government in Cyprus and to keep the Secretary-General informed;*

*"6. Calls upon all parties to co-operate fully with the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus to enable it to carry out its mandate;*

*"7. Decides to keep the situation under constant review and asks the Secretary-General to report as appropriate with a view to adopting further measures in order to ensure that peaceful conditions are restored as soon as possible."*

**Decision:** *At the 1781st meeting, on 20 July 1974, the draft resolution (S/11350) was adopted unanimously as resolution 353 (1974).*

23. Following the vote, statements in explanation of the vote were made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States, France, the USSR, Iraq, the United Republic of Cameroon, China, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Mauritania, Kenya, Austria, the Byelorussian SSR, Australia and the President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of Peru. Further statements were made by the representatives of the USSR, the United States, France, Mauritius, Cyprus, Greece and Turkey. The representatives of Cyprus and Turkey spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

#### 4. REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PARTIES ON 21 AND 22 JULY ON THE OBSERVATION OF RESOLUTION 353 (1974)

24. In a report dated 21 July (S/11353), the Secretary-General indicated that the fighting in Cyprus had intensified and that he had appealed to all concerned to bring hostilities to an immediate end and begin negotiations for a peaceful settlement, urging that pending the achievement of a cease-fire all measures be taken to avoid causing further suffering to the civilian population. Further reports on developments on 21 and 22 July (S/11353/Add.1 and 2) indicated that fighting continued throughout the island and that UNFICYP was attempting everywhere to save lives and secure local cease-fires.

25. An exchange of messages on 21 and 22 July (S/11356) between the Secretary-General and the Governments of Greece and Turkey contained an appeal by the Secretary-General for urgent and positive response to resolution 353 (1974) and the replies from the Permanent Representative of Greece (S/11354) concerning his Government's acceptance of that resolution and from the Prime Minister of Turkey indicating his Government's positive response to the appeal for a cease-fire in accordance with the resolution.

#### 5. CONSIDERATION AT THE 1782ND AND 1783RD MEETINGS (22 AND 23 JULY 1974)

26. At the 1782nd meeting on 22 July, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Governments of Greece and Turkey had agreed to a cease-fire, which was to take effect at 1600 hours that day in Cyprus. However, he had received reports that fighting was still

going on in breach of the cease-fire. He pointed out that UNFICYP had received many requests for assistance far beyond its capacity and that its strength was not sufficient to ensure effectively the maintenance of the cease-fire. It was therefore his intention to ask the troop-contributing countries to reinforce urgently their contingents already serving with the Force. In the absence of objection, the President expressed the Council's agreement that the Secretary-General should proceed to take those measures.

27. Statements were then made by the representatives of Greece, Turkey, Cyprus, the USSR, Australia, the United Kingdom, France, Austria and the United States. The representatives of Greece, Turkey and Cyprus spoke in exercise of the right of reply. The Secretary-General referred to the role of UNFICYP in preventing the recurrence of intercommunal strife and again stressed the need to reinforce UNFICYP.

28. In a letter of 23 July (S/11366), the representative of Greece, referring to the heavy shelling of the Greek Embassy in Nicosia, requested an immediate meeting of the Council to examine a most serious situation created by the continual Turkish violation of the cease-fire.

29. At the 1783rd meeting of the Council on 23 July, the President informed the Council that he had received two telegrams from the Permanent Representative of Greece concerning the shelling of the Embassy of Greece in Nicosia and asking him to help save the lives of the Embassy personnel. At the outset of the meeting, the Secretary-General reported to the Council on the contacts he had had with various Governments and representatives concerning the instability of the cease-fire and referred to the appeal (S/11368) that he had addressed to the Governments concerned for an end to violations of the cease-fire. UNFICYP had arranged a cease-fire at the Nicosia international airport, which had been declared a United Nations-controlled area and occupied by UNFICYP troops. He further reported that upon his urgent request, Denmark, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom had undertaken to provide reinforcements to their contingents to a total of approximately 1,400 men and that other Governments were giving urgent and favourable consideration to his appeal. The President then put to the vote a draft resolution (S/11369) that had been elaborated in the course of consultations among members of the Council. The draft resolution read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 353 (1974) of 20 July 1974,*

*"Demands that all parties to the present fighting comply immediately with the provisions of paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution 353 (1974) calling for an immediate cessation of all firing in the area and requesting all States to exercise the utmost restraint and to refrain from any action which might further aggravate the situation."*

**Decision:** *At the 1783rd meeting, on 23 July 1974, the draft resolution (S/11369) was adopted unanimously as resolution 354 (1974).*

30. Following the vote, statements in explanation of the vote were made by the representatives of the United States, France, the United Kingdom, the USSR and Austria. The representatives of Greece, Cyprus and Turkey also made statements.

## 6. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL RECEIVED BETWEEN 15 AND 25 JULY 1974

31. During the months of July and August, a number of communications were received reflecting the views of the Governments of Member States on the situation in Cyprus, as well as on other aspects of the problem.

32. On 12 July, the Secretary-General issued a further appeal (S/11339) to States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies for voluntary contributions for the financing of UNFICYP for the period from 16 June to 15 December 1974.

33. By a letter dated 18 July (S/11340), the representative of the USSR transmitted a statement issued by the Government of the USSR on 17 July in connexion with the situation in Cyprus and the continuing mutiny there organized by the Greek military and planned by certain NATO circles against the legitimate Government of the Republic of Cyprus. The Soviet Union supported and would continue to support the independent existence of Cyprus as a sovereign State. The Government of the USSR considered that all States which cherish the peace and freedom of peoples should raise their voice in defence of the legitimate Government of the Republic of Cyprus, headed by President Makarios, and in favour of the immediate cessation of foreign military interference in the internal affairs of Cyprus.

34. In a letter dated 18 July (S/11343), the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic protested actions committed by Greek soldiers against the Syrian Embassy and its personnel in Nicosia.

35. By a letter dated 19 July (S/11344), the representative of Zambia transmitted the text of a telegram from the Zambian Minister for Foreign Affairs expressing his Government's concern over the events leading to the violent overthrow of President Makarios. In condemning the coup, the Government of Zambia stressed that it would support whatever demands President Makarios might make when he addressed the Security Council.

36. The representative of Romania, by a letter dated 19 July (S/11347), transmitted a statement of the Romanian news agency concerning the events taking place in Cyprus, which expressed the resolute disapproval of Romanian public opinion of the coup d'état in flagrant interference in the internal affairs of Cyprus. Romania further expressed full support for the legal Government of President Makarios. By a letter dated 22 July (S/11357), the representative of Romania transmitted a further statement of his Government expressing profound anxiety about the military actions of Turkey in Cyprus and urging that all foreign troops on the island be withdrawn without delay and that the legal Government be re-established.

37. In a letter dated 22 July (S/11373), the representative of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen reported the decision of his Government to support Security Council resolution 353 (1974) and to recognize President Makarios as the elected President of the Republic of Cyprus.

38. By a letter dated 23 July (S/11367), the representative of the USSR transmitted a statement of his Government charging that the Greek military clique was continuing its acts of aggression against the inde-

pendence of the Cypriot State with the support of certain circles of NATO. The Soviet Government considered that the situation urgently demanded the adoption of speedy and effective measures to restore Cyprus to the position of an independent and sovereign State, to end foreign interference and to ensure the withdrawal of all foreign forces from the Republic of Cyprus.

39. By a letter dated 24 July (S/11371), the representative of Oman transmitted a statement of his Government expressing deep regret and anxiety over the situation in Cyprus and its confidence that the parties concerned would respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus.

40. By a letter dated 24 July (S/11379), the representative of Czechoslovakia transmitted a declaration of his Government condemning the intervention of the Greek Government into the internal affairs of Cyprus, calling for an immediate end to that intervention and expressing its solidarity with and support for the legitimate Government of President Makarios.

41. By a letter dated 25 July (S/11380), the representative of Yugoslavia transmitted the text of a statement by the Vice-President of the Federal Executive Council and the Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs to the Assembly of his country in which he said that the responsibility for the crisis in Cyprus was to be borne by the Greek Government and urged the implementation of Security Council resolution 353 (1974) in its entirety. He also reiterated the full support that Yugoslavia, jointly with other non-aligned countries, extended to Cyprus.

42. Between 17 and 24 July, a number of communications were also received from the representatives of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece concerning various aspects of the Cyprus question.

43. In a letter dated 17 July (S/11342), the representative of Turkey stated that any change in the representation of Cyprus following the coup in Cyprus was not valid. By a letter dated 20 July (S/11352), he transmitted two telegrams from the Vice-President of Cyprus, Mr. Rauf R. Denktash, expressing strong objection to the assignment by Mr. Nikos Sampson of a new representative to the United Nations in violation of the Constitution of Cyprus, and stressed that he did not recognize the Sampson administration. In a letter dated 20 July (S/11349), the Secretary-General informed the President of the Council that he had received a telegram from Mr. Loukis Papaphilippou, stating that he had been appointed Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations, and that, in reply, the Legal Counsel, on his behalf, had informed Mr. Papaphilippou of the Security Council's decision at its 1780th meeting to regard Mr. Rossides as representative of Cyprus in the current debate.

44. By a letter dated 20 July (S/11351), the Secretary-General transmitted a letter from the representative of Turkey stating that the Vice-President of Cyprus, Mr. Denktash, requested that he be invited to appear before the Council in person or through a representative.

45. In a letter dated 21 July (S/11358), the representative of Cyprus requested an emergency meeting of the Council because of the grave deterioration of the situation in Cyprus and the urgent need to protect life and human rights.

representative of Turkey transmitted a note addressed to the

46. By a letter dated 22 July (S/11364), the repre-

Permanent Mission of the United States in connexion with an incident at the Permanent Mission of Turkey in New York provoked by a group of Greeks.

47. In letters dated 21 and 23 July (S/11355 and S/11365), the representative of Turkey submitted charges of attacks against the Turkish Cypriot civilian population.

48. In letters dated 22, 23 and 24 July (S/11359, S/11361, S/11362 and S/11370), the representative of Greece submitted charges of landings in Cyprus of Turkish military personnel and equipment and of Turkish violations of the cease-fire.

49. In a letter dated 23 July (S/11366), the representative of Greece requested an immediate meeting of the Council to examine the situation created by continual Turkish violations of the cease-fire.

50. By a letter dated 24 July (S/11374), the representative of Turkey transmitted the text of an appeal addressed to the Turkish Cypriots by the Vice-President and the Acting President of Cyprus to refrain from any excess against the Greeks.

51. By a note dated 24 July (S/11377), the representative of Turkey transmitted the text of a message in which the Prime Minister of Turkey sent congratulations to Prime Minister Karamanlis of Greece on his assumption of his office.

#### 7. FURTHER REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL DATED 22 TO 24 JULY 1974 ON DEVELOPMENTS IN CYPRUS

52. In documents S/11353/Add.2-6, issued between 22 and 25 July, the Secretary-General continued to provide information on the observation of the cease-fire by UNFICYP, its efforts to secure local cease-fire arrangements when violations took place, the arrangements for a temporary take-over by UNFICYP of the Nicosia international airport, arrangements for a meeting between Acting President Clerides and Vice-President Denktash and the provision of humanitarian assistance to refugees and endangered civilians by UNFICYP in co-operation with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the Red Crescent Organization.

53. In a note dated 23 July (S/11368), the Secretary-General reproduced the text of his appeal to the Prime Ministers of Greece and Turkey and the Acting President of Cyprus, arising from his deep concern at the continuing serious violations of the cease-fire, that they instruct their military forces to refrain from further cease-fire violations. By a note of 24 July (S/11376), the representative of Turkey transmitted the reply of the Prime Minister of Turkey assuring the Secretary-General of his Government's intention not to derive new advantages from a troubled situation.

#### B. Developments between 25 and 30 July 1974

##### 1. CONSIDERATION AT THE 1784TH AND 1785TH MEETINGS (24 AND 27 JULY 1974)

54. On 24 July, the Council held its 1784th meeting in private and was informed by the Secretary-General of a letter received from the Foreign Minister of Turkey assuring him that, without prejudice to the contentions of the Turkish Government as to the legality of the United Nations presence at the Lefkose (Nicosia) airport, no attempt would be made to assume possession of the airport by the threat of force.

55. In a further report dated 25 July (S/11353/Add.7), the Secretary-General outlined the situation

in Cyprus and the pledges of military personnel to strengthen UNFICYP, and described the efforts of the Force to prevent the recurrence of fighting and to ensure observance of the cease-fire. He recalled that the original mandate of UNFICYP set out in resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964 had been approved in different circumstances but said that it was his understanding that, under resolution 353 (1974), the Force must use its best efforts to ensure that the cease-fire was maintained. Accordingly, all United Nations personnel with UNFICYP had been engaged in efforts to restore the cease-fire, ensure its observance and prevent incidents from escalating into a recurrence of full-scale fighting.

56. In a letter dated 26 July (S/11384), the representative of Cyprus requested an emergency meeting of the Council to consider the grave deterioration of the situation in Cyprus resulting from the continuing violations of the cease-fire by Turkey.

57. At the 1785th meeting on 27 July, the Secretary-General, reporting on recent developments, including continuing breaches of the cease-fire, recalled that the mandate of UNFICYP had been established in the context of preventing the recurrence of fighting between the communities in Cyprus. Now the question had been raised of interposing UNFICYP between the Turkish armed forces and the Cypriot National Guard. Accordingly, he had instructed his representative at the tripartite talks in Geneva under resolution 353 (1974) to discuss with the Foreign Ministers of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom the best way in which UNFICYP could actively assist in limiting further hostilities and cease-fire violations. Concerning the negotiations in Geneva between the three Foreign Ministers, he reported that intensive efforts were going on to find a basis for working towards a settlement and expressed the hope that the negotiations would achieve the goals set in Security Council resolution 353 (1974). Thereafter, the Council heard statements by the representatives of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey, India, the USSR, Austria, the United Kingdom, the United Republic of Cameroon, France, the United States and the Byelorussian SSR. The representative of Cyprus spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

## 2. CONSIDERATION AT THE 1786TH AND 1787TH MEETINGS (28 AND 29 JULY 1974)

58. In a letter dated 28 July (S/11389), the representative of the USSR requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the implementation of Council resolution 353 (1974). The letter stated that that resolution was not being implemented and, consequently, a tense situation threatening international peace and security continued to exist in Cyprus.

59. At its 1786th meeting on 28 July, the Council, without objection, included the following subitem (d) in its agenda:

“(d) Letter dated 28 July 1974 from the Acting Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11389).”

60. The Council heard statements by the representatives of the USSR, the United Kingdom, Greece, Turkey, Cyprus and Australia. The representatives of the United Kingdom and the USSR spoke on points of order, and

the representatives of Greece, Turkey, the USSR, Cyprus and the United Kingdom spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

61. At the 1787th meeting on 29 July, the Council continued its consideration of the item on the agenda. The President drew attention to a draft resolution sponsored by the USSR (S/11391), which, as corrected, read as follows:

“*The Security Council,*

“*Having considered* the development of events in Cyprus, which creates a serious threat to international peace and security,

“*Noting* the unsatisfactory situation with regard to the implementation of its resolution 353 (1974) of 20 July 1974 which defines the basis of a political settlement in Cyprus,

“1. *Demands* of all the States concerned that they undertake urgent and effective measures for the practical implementation of all the provisions of resolution 353 (1974);

“2. *Insists* on the immediate cessation of firing and of all acts of violence against the Republic of Cyprus and on the speediest withdrawal of all foreign forces and military personnel present in Cyprus in violation of its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity as a non-aligned State;

“3. *Decides* to send immediately to Cyprus a Special Mission composed of . . . members of the Security Council, to be appointed by the President of the Security Council after consultations with Council members and with the Secretary-General, for the purpose of verifying on the spot the implementation of resolution 353 (1974) and of reporting to the Council;

“4. *Considers it necessary*, taking into account the relevant provisions of resolution 353 (1974), that representatives of the constitutional Government of the Republic of Cyprus participate in the Geneva negotiations;

“5. *Decides*, in the absence of progress in the implementation of its resolution 353 (1974), to consider the question of further measures to be taken by the Council to ensure the implementation of the aforementioned resolution.”

62. The Secretary-General reported to the Council on developments in the Geneva negotiations called for in resolution 353 (1974). He understood that, in spite of the strenuous efforts made, fundamental differences persisted between the positions of Greece and Turkey. He also reported that he was in contact with the Prime Minister of Turkey, who had agreed to follow up on a request by the Turkish Corps Commander in Cyprus that all UNFICYP personnel, including police and civilians, should be evacuated from the area controlled by the Turkish forces. In conclusion, the Secretary-General stated that, although the prevailing situation had not been envisaged when the UNFICYP mandate was established in 1964, he believed that UNFICYP was playing and could continue to play a most useful humanitarian role in all parts of Cyprus and bring assistance and protection to elements of the civilian population afflicted by the recent hostilities.

63. Statements were made in the debate by the representatives of the USSR, who introduced the draft resolution (S/11391), Greece and Turkey.

3. FURTHER REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PARTIES (25-31 JULY 1974)

64. Between 26 and 31 July, the Secretary-General submitted further reports on the observation of the cease-fire, the humanitarian activities of UNFICYP and the changes in the strength of the Force (S/11353/Add.8-12), in which he indicated that, except for certain areas in the Kyrenia district and east of Nicosia, the cease-fire had gradually stabilized. He also reported on the protection being provided by UNFICYP to Greek Cypriots in Kyrenia and Bellapais and to Turkish Cypriots in isolated areas and communities in various parts of the country. A special section to deal with humanitarian matters had been established at UNFICYP headquarters, and UNFICYP was assisting in relief work being carried out by local and international agencies. Greek and Turkish Cypriots were assisted by UNFICYP escorts, vehicles and drivers, with medical and food supplies and blankets, and by inspection visits where personnel were being held in custody.

65. In letters dated 25 and 31 July (S/11381, S/11382 and S/11404), the representative of Greece submitted charges of cease-fire violations by Turkish forces, including the disembarkation of further military personnel and equipment at Kyrenia.

66. By a letter dated 29 July (S/11394), the representative of Turkey transmitted information on the conditions of Turkish Cypriots in Greek-controlled areas following the cease-fire.

**C. The Geneva Declaration and consideration by the Council**

1. THE GENEVA DECLARATION OF 30 JULY 1974

67. By a letter dated 30 July (S/11398), the Secretary-General transmitted a letter from the United Kingdom Foreign Secretary forwarding the text of the Declaration issued by the Foreign Ministers of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom following the Geneva talks held from 25 to 30 July. According to that Declaration, the Foreign Ministers, while recognizing the importance of setting in train measures to regularize the situation in Cyprus on a lasting basis, agreed on the need to decide first on certain immediate measures. The Ministers declared that areas controlled by opposing armed forces on 30 July should not be extended and agreed on the following measures: (a) a security zone, the size of which was to be determined by the three countries in consultation with UNFICYP, should be established at the limit of the areas occupied by Turkish armed forces on 30 July at 2200 hours Geneva time, and UNFICYP alone should enter and supervise that zone; (b) all the Turkish enclaves occupied by Greek or Greek Cypriot forces should be immediately evacuated and should continue to be protected by UNFICYP; (c) in mixed villages UNFICYP would carry out the functions of security and police; and (d) detained military personnel and civilians should be released or exchanged under ICRC supervision.

68. The three Ministers, reaffirming that resolution 353 (1974) of the Council should be implemented in the shortest possible time, agreed that measures should be elaborated which would lead to a phased reduction of armed forces and armaments in Cyprus. They also agreed that further talks aiming at the restoration of peace should begin on 8 August at Geneva and that the representatives of the two Cypriot communities should

be invited at an early stage to participate in the talks relating to the Constitution. The three Ministers further agreed to convey the contents of the Declaration to the Secretary-General and invite him to take appropriate action in the light thereof.

2. CONSIDERATION AT THE 1788TH AND 1789TH MEETINGS (31 JULY AND 1 AUGUST 1974)

69. At the 1788th meeting on 31 July, the Council, without objection, included the following subitem (e) in its agenda:

“(e) Letter dated 30 July 1974 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11398)”.<sup>3</sup>

70. The President announced the withdrawal of the following draft resolution (S/11399) sponsored by the United Kingdom:

“*The Security Council,*

“*Recalling* its resolutions 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, 353 (1974) of 20 July 1974 and 354 (1974) of 23 July 1974,

“1. *Notes* that all States have declared their respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus;

“2. *Takes note* of the Declaration agreed to by the Foreign Ministers of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in Geneva on 30 July 1974 (S/11398) and requests the Secretary-General to take appropriate action in the light of this Declaration.”

71. The Secretary-General expressed the hope that the agreement on a cease-fire reached in Geneva would be a first step towards full implementation of resolution 353 (1974). He noted that the Declaration envisaged certain tasks for UNFICYP, in particular the determination, in consultation with UNFICYP, of the character and size of the security zone, where no forces other than those of UNFICYP would be allowed to enter. He further informed the Council that as of 31 July the strength of UNFICYP was 3,484 men and would be approximately 4,443 by 12 August. The matter of the continued presence of UNFICYP in the Turkish area of control was under discussion with the Turkish military command in Cyprus. The Secretary-General felt confident that those discussions would enable UNFICYP to continue to perform its role in all parts of the island with the full agreement of all the parties concerned. The President announced that, as a result of consultations, a draft resolution (S/11400) was being circulated. The text of the draft resolution read as follows:

“*The Security Council,*

“*Recalling* its resolutions 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, 353 (1974) of 20 July 1974 and 354 (1974) of 23 July 1974,

“*Noting* that all States have declared their respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus,

“*Taking note* of the Secretary-General's statement made at the 1788th meeting of the Security Council,

“*Requests* the Secretary-General to take appropriate action in the light of his statement.”

72. Statements were then made by the representatives of Greece, Turkey, the United Kingdom, France,

<sup>3</sup> The Council's consideration of this subitem was concluded at the 1789th meeting and therefore does not appear on the agenda of subsequent meetings on the situation in Cyprus.

Kenya, Mauritania, Cyprus, the United States, Indonesia, the United Republic of Cameroon, Austria and the President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of Peru.

73. The representative of the USSR, pursuant to rule 33, paragraph 1, of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council, proposed the suspension of the meeting for two hours. The representatives of the United Kingdom and France objected, and the President put the USSR motion to the vote.

**Decision:** *At the 1788th meeting on 31 July 1974, the motion received 7 votes in favour (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mauritania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon), none against and 8 abstentions (Australia, Austria, China, Costa Rica, France, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America), and was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required majority.*

74. The representative of the USSR then introduced an oral amendment to the United Kingdom draft resolution (S/11400), which would add the following words at the end of the operative paragraph: "taking into account that the cease-fire will be the first step in the full implementation of Security Council resolution 353 (1974)". He also requested that the amendment be circulated in all official languages, in accordance with rule 46 of the provisional rules of procedure. In the ensuing procedural discussion, statements were made by the representative of the United Kingdom, France, Kenya, the USSR, the Byelorussian SSR, the United States, Mauritania and the President of the Council.

75. The representative of the USSR then introduced a second amendment (S/11401) to the United Kingdom draft resolution (S/11400) which would add to the second preambular paragraph the words "as a State not belonging to any military alliance".

76. The representative of the United States moved that both USSR amendments be circulated in writing, expressing the hope that there would be enough negative votes or abstentions on his motion to clear up the matter.

**Decision:** *At the 1788th meeting, on 31 July 1974, the United States motion received no votes in favour, 5 against (Australia, Costa Rica, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America) and 8 abstentions, and was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required majority. Two members (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not participate in the vote.*

77. The representative of China made a statement in explanation of vote before the Council proceeded to vote on the draft resolution and the amendments thereto.

78. The Council then voted on the two amendments sponsored by the USSR.

**Decision:** *The first USSR amendment (S/11401) was adopted by 14 votes in favour to none against. One member (China) did not participate in the vote.*

*The second USSR amendment (S/11401) received 2 votes in favour (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), none against and 12 abstentions, and was not adopted, having failed*

*to obtain the required majority. One member (China) did not participate in the vote.*

79. The representatives of Kenya, the USSR and the Byelorussian SSR spoke in explanation of vote before the vote on the United Kingdom draft resolution (S/11400), as amended.

80. The representatives of the United Kingdom, the USSR and the United States spoke on points of order.

81. The President then put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/11400, as amended.

**Decision:** *At the 1788th meeting, on 31 July 1974, the draft resolution (S/11400), as amended, received 12 votes in favour to 2 against (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and was not adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council. One member (China) did not participate in the vote.*

82. Following the vote, the Secretary-General and the representatives of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey, the USSR and the United Kingdom made statements.

83. At the 1789th meeting on 1 August, the Council continued its consideration of the question. The President stated that, in the course of consultations with the members of the Council, agreement had been reached on the draft resolution contained in document S/11402. The draft resolution read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling its resolutions 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, 353 (1974) of 20 July and 354 (1974) of 23 July 1974,*

*"Noting that all States have declared their respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus,*

*"Taking note of the Secretary-General's statement made at the 1788th meeting of the Security Council,*

*"Requests the Secretary-General to take appropriate action in the light of his statement and to present a full report to the Council, taking into account that the cease-fire will be the first step in the full implementation of Security Council resolution 353 (1974)."*

84. The President stated that, on the basis of the understanding reached by members of the Council, he would put the draft resolution to the vote before statements were made.

**Decision:** *At the 1789th meeting, on 1 August 1974, the draft resolution (S/11402) was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) as resolution 355 (1974). One member (China) did not participate in the vote.*

85. Statements in explanation of the vote were then made by representatives of China, Kenya, the United Republic of Cameroon, the United States, the Byelorussian SSR, the United Kingdom, Austria, France, Mauritania, Peru and the President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of the USSR. The Secretary-General stated that, on the adoption of resolution 355 (1974), he had immediately instructed his Special Representative and the Force Commander to proceed with the implementation of the task of UNFICYP mentioned in his statement the preceding day. He added that agreement had just been reached in Cyprus on the maintenance of UNFICYP presence in the area under Turkish control.

86. The representatives of Greece, Cyprus, Turkey, India and Yugoslavia also made statements.

## **D. Further reports of the Secretary-General and communications received between 26 July and 26 August 1974**

### **1. REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (2-12 AUGUST 1974)**

87. During the first part of August, the Secretary-General continued to submit progress reports on the status of the cease-fire, on the meetings of the military representatives of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom to work out an agreement on a demarcation line and on the humanitarian activities of UNFICYP (S/11353/Add.13-20).

88. On 2 and 4 August (S/11353/Add.13 and 14), he reported a generally quiet situation, except for sporadic firing in the Kyrenia area, and the beginning of the talks of the military representatives of the three countries. He also reported that Red Cross relief shipments of food to Greek and Turkish Cypriots had been initiated.

89. On 5 and 6 August (S/11353/Add.15 and 16), the Secretary-General provided details about the situation of Turkish Cypriots in areas controlled by the National Guard and of Greek Cypriots in areas under the occupation of Turkish forces, adding that UNFICYP had assumed responsibility for most of the relief convoys.

90. Subsequent progress reports (S/11353/Add.17-20) issued between 7 and 12 August contained details of acts of violation of the cease-fire, additional information about the continuing reconnaissance of military representatives with a view to fixing a demarcation line and details about the humanitarian activities of UNFICYP and the Red Cross. The Secretary-General reported on 12 August that the withdrawal of the National Guard from Turkish enclaves and the assumption by UNFICYP of responsibility for the protection of those areas had begun.

91. On 10 August, the Secretary-General submitted an interim report (S/11433) in pursuance of Council resolution 355 (1974) in which he said that, although the cease-fire, by and large, had been observed by the parties throughout most of the island, intermittent fighting and some forward movement in the area west of Kyrenia, along the coast and on the southern slopes of the Kyrenia mountains, continued.

92. On action taken pursuant to Council resolution 355 (1974), he reported that on 9 August military representatives of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom had signed an agreement concerning the demarcation line and submitted it to the Foreign Ministers in Geneva. He added that UNFICYP stood ready to assume its function of protecting the Turkish enclaves as soon as they were evacuated by Greek and Greek Cypriot forces. The Secretary-General also reported on the efforts of UNFICYP to secure effective observance of the cease-fire and on the question of the exchange or release of detained military personnel and civilians. In that connexion, he stated that both the Turkish Government and the Government of Cyprus had declared their readiness, under certain conditions, to release the detained civilians.

93. On the method of operation of UNFICYP, he recalled that all operations outside the Turkish-controlled area were based on a framework of static posts established at sensitive places, supplemented by frequent mobile patrols. Within the Turkish-controlled

area, UNFICYP activities were centred on humanitarian and relief measures in Kyrenia and certain surrounding villages. The strength of UNFICYP, obviously insufficient, was to be increased to 4,292 as of 14 August.

94. Summing up the situation, he said that although some progress had been achieved toward bringing peace to Cyprus, the cease-fire was not yet secure in all parts of the island. UNFICYP stood ready to carry out its functions pursuant to Security Council resolution 355 (1974), but full implementation of resolutions 353 (1974) and 355 (1974) was still in its first stage. For UNFICYP to carry out its task fully, a greater degree of co-operation was required with reference to the consolidation of the cease-fire, the establishment of UNFICYP-supervised security zones and the evacuation of occupied Turkish enclaves.

### **2. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL RECEIVED BETWEEN 26 JULY AND 26 AUGUST 1974**

95. By a note dated 26 July (S/11385), the Permanent Mission of Algeria transmitted the text of a message from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of his country, stressing that the aggression against the Republic of Cyprus constituted a new threat to peace and security in the eastern Mediterranean and expressing the conviction that the Security Council would discharge its responsibilities for the respect of the independence of Cyprus and for safeguarding its unity and territorial integrity.

96. In a letter dated 26 July (S/11387), the representative of Brazil stated that his Government, which had followed with the utmost concern the recent events in Cyprus, had felt greatly relieved when the Security Council adopted resolution 353 (1974), as it had consistently supported all measures aiming at safeguarding the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Cyprus.

97. By a letter dated 27 July (S/11388), the representative of Yemen transmitted a statement of his Government expressing its full support for the integrity and independence of Cyprus and its recognition of Archbishop Makarios as the lawful President.

98. By a letter dated 28 July (S/11390), the representative of the USSR transmitted a statement of his Government charging that certain NATO circles were making the independence and the territorial integrity of Cyprus the subject of cynical bargaining for the sake of strengthening their military and strategic positions in the eastern Mediterranean, which explained why the provisions of Security Council resolution 353 (1974) had not been implemented. In the statement of the Government of the USSR it was observed that the NATO circles in question were in fact working towards presenting the world with the fait accompli of the partition of the country or, at least, of the creation of the conditions for such a partition. The statement demanded an end to the encroachment on the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus and called for the participation of the Cyprus Government in all international discussions of the Cyprus problem, including the talks recently begun in Geneva.

99. By a letter dated 31 July (S/11403), the representative of the Philippines transmitted a message of the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of his country reaffirming the Philippine Government's total support of the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty

of Cyprus, the Secretary-General's appeal for observance of the cease-fire and the role of UNFICYP in preventing the recurrence of fighting.

100. By a letter dated 5 August (S/11416), the representative of Hungary transmitted an excerpt from a communiqué in which the Hungarian Government condemned activities aimed at liquidating the independent statehood of the Republic of Cyprus and at partition that would convert it into an appendix of NATO. The statement expressed support for the proposals put forward by the USSR for a settlement in Cyprus and demanded the restoration of the legitimate Government of Cyprus headed by President Makarios.

101. By a letter dated 7 August (S/11424), the representative of Algeria transmitted a Declaration adopted by the Group of Non-aligned Countries on the situation in Cyprus. The Declaration reaffirmed the solidarity of the non-aligned countries with non-aligned Cyprus, demanded the immediate and full implementation of the objectives of Council resolution 353 (1974), stated that the legitimate President of Cyprus remained Archbishop Makarios and declared that the tragic situation of Cyprus was a grave warning to all non-aligned countries that required their united action.

102. By a letter dated 22 August (S/11465), the representative of the USSR transmitted a statement of his Government pointing out that resolution 353 (1974) on the immediate ending of foreign military intervention against the Republic of Cyprus, the withdrawal of foreign troops and the restoration of the constitutional order remained unfulfilled. Attempts to settle the Cyprus problem within the narrow circle of NATO, bypassing the Security Council and its decisions, had failed and had led only to the resumption of hostilities in Cyprus. The Soviet Government considered that the time had come to convene an international conference within the framework of the United Nations to discuss the Cyprus problem, with the participation of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey, all members of the Council and other States, particularly from among the non-aligned countries.

103. By a letter dated 26 August (S/11470), the representative of the German Democratic Republic transmitted a statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of his country supporting the proposal of the USSR to convene an international conference on Cyprus within the framework of the United Nations.

### 3. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL FROM THE PARTIES BETWEEN 29 JULY AND 12 AUGUST 1974

104. The representative of Greece, in letters dated 29 and 31 July and 1, 3 and 4 August (S/11421, S/11404, S/11405, S/11417 and S/11418), submitted charges of violations of the cease-fire by Turkish forces in attacks against Greek Cypriot forces and villages in Cyprus.

105. The representative of Turkey, in letters dated 4, 7, 8 and 9 August (S/11412, S/11422, S/11439 and S/11442), submitted charges of violations of the cease-fire by Greek Cypriot National Guard forces in firing at Turkish forces and at the Turkish sector of Nicosia. In letters dated 31 July and 2 and 5 August (S/11409, S/11410, S/11420 and S/11425), the representative of Turkey also charged that Greek Cypriot forces had perpetrated massacres and other atrocities against Turkish Cypriots.

106. In a letter dated 2 August (S/11411), the representative of Greece charged that Turkish military authorities had begun mass deportations of Greek-Cypriot villagers from Kyrenia province with the aim of deracinating the area.

107. On 5 August (S/11413), the Secretary-General circulated the text of a telegram he had received on 4 August from the Acting President of Cyprus, Mr. Clerides, protesting the inhumane treatment by the Turkish army of the civilian population of the area it occupied in northern Cyprus. In a letter dated 7 August (S/11423), the representative of Turkey rejected the charges made in that telegram and declared that the Turkish action in Cyprus was aimed at securing lasting peace for all Cypriots, Greek and Turkish alike. He also protested the situation of Turkish Cypriots in villages controlled by the Cyprus National Guard. By a further letter dated 9 August (S/11435), the representative of Turkey transmitted a communication to the Secretary-General from the Vice-President of Cyprus, Mr. Denktash, also rejecting the charges levelled by Mr. Clerides and charging that the Turkish Cypriots had been subjected to violence, looting and indiscriminate killing, that their property had been wilfully destroyed and that many had been driven from their homes.

108. In a letter dated 8 August (S/11429), the representative of Greece stated that four staff members of the Greek Embassy in Nicosia who had been illegally arrested by Turkish forces on 3 August had been subjected to brutal physical force before their release.

109. In a letter dated 12 August (S/11441), the representative of Cyprus stated that, since the signing of the Geneva Declaration of 30 July, Turkish defiance of the Council's cease-fire resolutions had become graver. Turkey, he charged, had intensified its hostile actions and seized substantially more territory, imported more tanks, troops and heavy weapons, and committed further atrocities against innocent civilians.

### E. Renewed hostilities of 12 to 20 August 1974 and consideration by the Council

#### 1. CONSIDERATION AT THE 1792ND TO 1794TH MEETINGS (14-16 AUGUST 1974) AND CALL FOR A CEASE-FIRE

110. In a letter dated 13 August (S/11444), the representative of Cyprus requested an immediate emergency meeting of the Security Council to consider the grave situation in Cyprus as a consequence of renewed acts of aggression by Turkey.

111. In a letter dated 13 August (S/11445), the representative of Greece also requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to take appropriate steps in the explosive situation created after the interruption of the second phase of the Geneva talks.

112. At the 1792nd meeting, held in the early hours of 14 August, the Security Council decided, without objection, to add the following two subitems to its agenda:

“(e) Letter dated 13 August 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11444);

“(f) Letter dated 13 August 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the

United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11445)."

113. Prior to the meeting, a draft resolution (S/11446) had been submitted by the United Kingdom, which read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling its resolutions 353 (1974) of 20 July 1974, 354 (1974) of 23 July 1974, and 355 (1974) of 1 August 1974,*

*"Deeply deploring the resumption of fighting in Cyprus, contrary to the provisions of its resolution 353 (1974),*

*"1. Reaffirms its resolution 353 (1974) in all its provisions and calls upon the parties concerned to implement those provisions without delay;*

*"2. Demands that all parties to the present fighting cease all firing and military action forthwith;*

*"3. Calls for the resumption of negotiations without delay for the restoration of peace in the area and constitutional government in Cyprus."*

114. The President announced that, during consultations, members of the Council had agreed upon a revised text (S/11446/Rev.1), which he put to the vote at once.

**Decision:** *At the 1792nd meeting, on 14 August 1974, the revised draft resolution (S/11446/Rev.1) was adopted unanimously as resolution 357 (1974).*

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling its resolutions 353 (1974) of 20 July, 354 (1974) of 23 July, and 355 (1974) of 1 August 1974,*

*"Deeply deploring the resumption of fighting in Cyprus, contrary to the provisions of its resolution 353 (1974),*

*"1. Reaffirms its resolution 353 (1974) in all its provisions and calls upon the parties concerned to implement those provisions without delay;*

*"2. Demands that all parties to the present fighting cease all firing and military action forthwith;*

*"3. Calls for the resumption of negotiations without delay for the restoration of peace in the area and constitutional government in Cyprus, in accordance with resolution 353 (1974);*

*"4. Decides to remain seized of the situation and on instant call to meet as necessary to consider what more effective measures may be required if the cease-fire is not respected."*

115. Statements were then made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United Republic of Cameroon, Greece, France, the United States, Cyprus, Turkey and the President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of the USSR. The representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

116. Before adjourning the meeting, the President noted that in accordance with paragraph 4 of resolution 357 (1974) the Council remained seized of the situation, and on instant call to meet as necessary.

117. On 14 August, the Secretary-General submitted five further reports (S/11153/Add.21-25) to the Security Council in connexion with attacks by Turkish forces in various areas in Nicosia and elsewhere in Cyprus, which had begun at 0500 hours local time and had led to and caused casualties among the UNFICYP contingents from Canada, Finland and the United

Kingdom and the death of three members of the Austrian contingent. The reports referred to damages incurred by UNFICYP posts and the efforts of the Force to arrange local cease-fires.

118. Later, on 14 August, the Secretary-General circulated a message (S/11447) from the Acting President of Cyprus charging that, notwithstanding the Council's adoption of resolution 357 (1974), Turkish troops and aircraft were continuing their attacks and extending their area of control.

119. In further reports, issued on 15 August (S/11353/Add.26 and 27), the Secretary-General gave an account of continued military operations, including a Turkish advance in the direction of Famagusta, and of the efforts of UNFICYP to arrange cease-fires, especially in Nicosia.

120. At the 1793rd meeting on 15 August, the Council continued its consideration of the situation in Cyprus at the request of the representative of Cyprus. The representative of Algeria was invited, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

121. At the outset of the meeting, the President expressed very deep concern over the losses sustained by the Austrian, British, Canadian and Finnish contingents of UNFICYP.

122. The Council then heard a report by the Secretary-General in which he deeply deplored the resumption of fighting and the breakdown of negotiations. He said that in the existing situation it was impossible for UNFICYP to continue with the tasks of implementing resolution 353 (1974), although it was doing its utmost to assist the population, arrange local cease-fires, de-escalate the fighting and prevent the recurrence of intercommunal strife. He then referred to the difficulties encountered in the functioning of UNFICYP in the Turkish-controlled area and said that the Force could not fulfil its tasks if it was excluded from one area or another. After expressing his deepest concern and regret for the casualties suffered by UNFICYP, the Secretary-General referred to the protests that he and the Force Commander had sent to the parties concerned. The Prime Minister of Turkey had expressed his Government's profound regret in that regard. Commenting on questions of principle, the Secretary-General stressed that the essential basis for a United Nations peace-keeping operation, which was not an enforcement action under Chapter VII of the Charter, was acceptance and co-operation by the parties concerned, without which it could not function effectively. Under its mandate and at its current strength, UNFICYP could not interpose between the two armies. He concluded by saying that the continued fighting, in spite of the cease-fire appeals of the Security Council, called in question the very essence of the Charter and the *raison d'être* of the organization.

123. The President stated that there were two draft resolutions before the Council. The first draft resolution (S/11448), elaborated during previous consultations among the members of the Council, read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Deeply concerned about the continuation of violence and bloodshed in Cyprus,*

*"Deeply deploring the non-compliance with its resolution 357 (1974) of 14 August 1974,*

"1. *Recalls* its resolutions 353 (1974) of 20 July 1974, 354 (1974) of 23 July 1974, 355 (1974) of 1 August 1974 and 357 (1974) of 14 August 1974;

"2. *Insists* on the full implementation of the above resolutions by all parties and on the immediate and strict observance of the cease-fire."

**Decision:** *At the 1793rd meeting, on 15 August 1974, the draft resolution (S/11448) was adopted unanimously as resolution 358 (1974).*

124. The representative of Austria introduced the second draft resolution (S/11449), sponsored by Australia, Austria, France and Peru, which read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Noting with concern* from the Secretary-General's report on developments in Cyprus, in particular documents S/11353/Add.24 and 25, that casualties are increasing among the personnel of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus as a direct result of the military action which is still continuing in Cyprus,

*"Recalling* that the United Nations Force was stationed in Cyprus with the full consent of the Governments of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece,

*"Bearing in mind* that the Secretary-General was requested by the Security Council in resolution 355 (1974) of 1 August 1974 to take appropriate action in the light of his statement made at the 1788th meeting of the Council in which he dealt with the role, functions and strength of the United Nations Force and related issues arising out of the most recent political developments in respect of Cyprus,

"1. *Deeply deplotes* the fact that members of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus have been killed and wounded;

"2. *Demands* that all parties concerned fully respect the international status of the United Nations Force and refrain from any action which might endanger the lives and safety of its members;

"3. *Demands further* that all parties co-operate with the United Nations Force in carrying out its tasks, including humanitarian functions, in all areas of Cyprus and in regard to all sections of the population of Cyprus;

"4. *Emphasizes* the fundamental principle that the status and safety of the members of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus, and for that matter of any United Nations peace-keeping force, must be respected by the parties under all circumstances."

125. The representative of Austria proposed, under rule 33 of the provisional rules of procedure, a suspension of the meeting for one hour for the purpose of consultations. There being no objection, it was so decided.

126. After the resumption of the meeting, the President informed the members of the Council that a revised draft resolution (S/11449/Rev.1), sponsored by Australia, Austria, France, Peru and the United Republic of Cameroon, had been submitted, which read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Noting with concern* from the Secretary-General's report on developments in Cyprus, in particular documents S/11353/Add.24 and 25, that casualties are increasing among the personnel of the United

Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus as a direct result of the military action which is still continuing in Cyprus,

*"Recalling* that the United Nations Force was stationed in Cyprus with the full consent of the Governments of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece,

*"Bearing in mind* that the Secretary-General was requested by the Security Council in resolution 355 (1974) of 1 August 1974 to take appropriate action in the light of his statement made at the 1788th meeting of the Council in which he dealt with the role, functions and strength of the Force and related issues arising out of the most recent political developments in respect of Cyprus,

"1. *Deeply deplotes* the fact that members of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus have been killed and wounded;

"2. *Demands* that all parties concerned fully respect the international status of the United Nations Force and refrain from any action which might endanger the lives and safety of its members;

"3. *Urges* the parties concerned to demonstrate in a firm, clear and unequivocal manner their willingness to fulfil the commitments they have entered into in this regard;

"4. *Demands further* that all parties co-operate with the United Nations Force in carrying out its tasks, including humanitarian functions, in all areas of Cyprus and in regard to all sections of the population of Cyprus;

"5. *Emphasizes* the fundamental principle that the status and safety of the members of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus, and for that matter of any United Nations peace-keeping force, must be respected by the parties under all circumstances."

**Decision:** *At the 1793rd meeting, on 15 August 1974, the revised draft resolution (S/11449/Rev.1) was adopted by 14 votes to none as resolution 359 (1974). One member (China) did not participate in the vote.*

127. Following the vote, statements in explanation of the vote were made by the representatives of China, Austria, the United States, the United Kingdom and the President, speaking as the representative of the USSR. Other statements were made by the representatives of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and Algeria. Statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the USSR and Austria.

128. In further reports dated 16 August (S/11353/Add.28 and 29), the Secretary-General described the military situation in Cyprus as reported by the UNFICYP Force Commander up to 1245 hours New York time on 16 August. Beginning at dawn fighting had resumed in the area of Nicosia, and movements of forces were reported in other areas. UNFICYP casualties since the resumption of hostilities on 14 August then totalled 35—3 Austrian soldiers who had been killed by napalm and 32 wounded—9 British, 5 Canadian, 2 Danish and 16 Finnish soldiers who had been wounded. Later the same day, it was reported that a cease-fire had gone into effect and was holding but that in a mine incident 2 Danish soldiers had been killed and 3 wounded.

129. At the 1794th meeting, on 16 August 1974, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Prime Minister of Turkey had announced the accept-

ance by his Government of a cease-fire as from 1200 hours New York time that day, and that reports from UNFICYP indicated that it had gone into effect. He also informed the Council of the further casualties suffered by UNFICYP.

130. The President noted that a draft resolution (S/11450) submitted by France the previous day had been twice revised. The original text read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling its resolutions 353 (1974) of 20 July 1974, 354 (1974) of 23 July 1974, 355 (1974) of 1 August 1974 and 357 (1974) of 14 August 1974,*

*"Noting that all States have declared their respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus and for the constitutional structure of that country, as established and guaranteed by international agreements,*

*"Gravely concerned at the further deterioration of the situation in Cyprus, resulting from the military operations conducted by Turkey, which constitutes a most serious threat to peace and security in the Eastern Mediterranean area,*

*"Deeply deploring the casualties suffered by the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus in the execution of the mandate entrusted to it,*

*"1. Records its formal disapproval of the resumption of military operations in Cyprus by Turkey;*

*"2. Demands once again that all parties cease all firing and all military activity forthwith and strictly observe the cease-fire throughout the island;*

*"3. Urges the parties to comply with all the provisions of previous resolutions of the Security Council, including those concerning the withdrawal without delay from the Republic of Cyprus of foreign military personnel present otherwise than under the authority of international agreements, and to resume negotiations without delay for the restoration of peace and constitutional government in Cyprus, in conformity with resolution 353 (1974);*

*"4. Urges the parties to co-operate fully with the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus, as requested by the Secretary-General in the final part of his interim report dated 10 August 1974 (S/11433);*

*"5. Requests the Secretary-General to report to it as necessary with a view to the adoption of further measures designed to promote the restoration of peaceful conditions;*

*"6. Decides to remain permanently seized of the question and to meet at any time to consider measures which may be required in the light of the developing situation."*

131. As revised, the draft resolution (S/11450/Rev.2) read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling its resolutions 353 (1974) of 20 July 1974, 354 (1974) of 23 July 1974, 355 (1974) of 1 August 1974, 357 (1974) of 14 August 1974 and 358 (1974) of 15 August 1974,*

*"Noting that all States have declared their respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus,*

*"Gravely concerned at the deterioration of the situation in Cyprus, resulting from the further military operations, which constituted a most serious*

threat to peace and security in the Eastern Mediterranean area,

*"1. Records its formal disapproval of the unilateral military actions undertaken against the Republic of Cyprus;*

*"2. Urges the parties to comply with all the provisions of previous resolutions of the Security Council, including those concerning the withdrawal without delay from the Republic of Cyprus of foreign military personnel present otherwise than under the authority of international agreements;*

*"3. Urges the parties to resume without delay, in an atmosphere of constructive co-operation, the negotiations called for in resolution 353 (1974) whose outcome should not be impeded or prejudged by the acquisition of advantages resulting from military operations;*

*"4. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Council, as necessary, with a view to the possible adoption of further measures designed to promote the restoration of peaceful conditions;*

*"5. Decides to remain seized of the question permanently and to meet at any time to consider measures which may be required in the light of the developing situation."*

**Decision:** *At the 1794th meeting, on 16 August 1974, the revised draft resolution (S/11450/Rev.2) was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Iraq, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) as resolution 360 (1974). One member (China) did not participate in the vote.*

132. After the vote, statements were made by the representatives of France, China, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Iraq, the United States, the United Republic of Cameroon, Australia, Austria, the United Kingdom, Mauritania, Kenya, the President, speaking as the representative of the USSR, Turkey, Greece and Cyprus. Statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the USSR, France, Turkey and Cyprus.

## 2. PROGRESS REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL BETWEEN 17 AND 20 AUGUST 1974 AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PARTIES.

133. In progress reports issued between 17 and 20 August (S/11353/Add.30-33), the Secretary-General provided information about continued firing and Turkish advances on 17 and 18 August and indicated that the Force Commander's protests of the breaches of the cease-fire had been followed up at United Nations Headquarters. On 19 and 20 August, it was reported that as of 1600 hours local time the cease-fire was holding and there was no report of firing throughout the island.

134. During that period, the Secretary-General received a number of communications from Greece, Turkey and Cyprus in connexion with the situation.

135. By a letter dated 14 August (S/11453), the representative of Cyprus transmitted the text of a statement of the President of Cyprus condemning Turkey's new aggression against Cyprus and its failure to comply with the resolutions of the Council calling for a cease-fire. By another letter of the same date (S/11456), the representative of Cyprus transmitted a further statement of the President of Cyprus in which he accused Turkey of bad faith at the Geneva talks and appealed for urgent action to rescue Cyprus.

136. Complaints of atrocities committed against the civilian population of Cyprus were submitted by all parties. In letters dated 12, 18 and 22 August (S/11462, S/11458 and S/11466), the representative of Turkey protested the burning and desecration of mosques, the murder and deportation of civilians, the abuse of women and children and the incarceration of Turkish Cypriots in concentration camps. The representative of Cyprus, in letters dated 20 and 22 August (S/11461 and S/11464), transmitted press reports of the indiscriminate killing of Greek Cypriots by Turkish forces and the expulsion of over 200,000 people from their homes. He charged that UNFICYP and ICRC had been hindered in their humanitarian activities. The examples of murder, rape and terrorism reported by the international press, he stated, could not fully convey the fear and suffering caused by the behaviour of the Turkish forces. The representative of Greece addressed letters to the Secretary-General on 18 and 27 August (S/11459 and S/11469) stating that, despite its third acceptance of the Council's call for a cease-fire, Turkey had, since 22 July, committed almost daily cease-fire violations, fabricated slanderous accounts of atrocities committed against Turkish Cypriots and prevented impartial investigation by UNFICYP of its charges.

137. The representative of Cyprus, by a letter dated 23 August (S/11467), drew attention to the magnitude of the dislocations of economic life on the island and provided details of the damage suffered by the principal branches of the economy and the situation of the refugees. By another letter dated 27 August (S/11475), he protested against Turkish measures prohibiting shipping around Cyprus and asked that urgent consideration be given to the situation.

138. By a letter dated 28 August (S/11474), the representative of Turkey transmitted the text of a declaration in which the Turkish Government, after reviewing the background of the Cyprus crisis, reaffirmed Turkey's opposition to *enosis* and to proposals for involving a large number of States in the Cyprus issue, urged the resumption of the negotiations on Cyprus within the framework already drawn up by the Council and suggested that the three guarantor Powers should promptly help to create the conditions for the talk.

### 3. REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (27 AND 28 AUGUST 1974)

139. On 27 August, the Secretary-General submitted a report (S/11468) on developments in Cyprus for the period 20 to 25 August 1974. After touching briefly on his visit to Cyprus, which would be the subject of a separate report, he outlined the activities of UNFICYP in providing protection to the Turkish-inhabited areas outside the area of Turkish control, investigating alleged atrocities, rendering humanitarian assistance, such as relief convoys to Greek and Turkish Cypriot towns and villages, and negotiating for the restoration of electrical and water facilities.

140. On 28 August, the Secretary-General submitted a report (S/11473) on his recent visit to Cyprus, Greece and Turkey. In Cyprus, he had presided over a joint meeting on 26 August of the leaders of the two Cypriot communities, Mr. Clerides and Mr. Denktash. He had also met with the Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers of Greece and Turkey during his visits to Athens and Ankara. He had found on all sides a strong desire to achieve a negotiated settlement, despite exist-

ing obstacles to such a course. His conversations had centred in particular on the future of the negotiations, the possible basis of a settlement in Cyprus, humanitarian questions, including refugees and the reopening of the Nicosia airport, and the future role of UNFICYP.

141. With regard to UNFICYP, the Secretary-General felt that, because the situation in Cyprus was not the one in which its original mandate had been established, its functions would soon have to be re-defined. In the meantime, it was his intention to ensure that the Force played a useful role in Cyprus, in full co-operation with all the parties. Inasmuch as the situation in Cyprus remained a matter of deep concern as far as international peace and security were concerned, it was vital to make real progress towards peace and to avoid a recurrence of fighting. He believed that the Council could play a most important role in ensuring that result.

### 4. CONSIDERATION AT THE 1795TH MEETING (30 AUGUST 1974)

142. In a letter dated 27 August (S/11471), the representative of Cyprus requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the grave situation in Cyprus, including the refugee problem. By a letter dated 29 August (S/11477), the representative of Turkey transmitted a letter from the Vice-President of Cyprus, Mr. Rauf Denktash, contesting the right of the representative of Cyprus to call for a Council meeting without having consulted him.

143. At the 1795th meeting on 30 August, the Council included the following subitem (g) in its agenda:

“(g) Letter dated 27 August 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11471).”

144. The President drew attention to a draft resolution (S/11479) sponsored by Austria, France and the United Kingdom, which read as follows:

“*The Security Council,*

“*Conscious of its special responsibilities under the United Nations Charter,*

“*Recalling its resolutions 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, 353 (1974) of 20 July 1974, 354 (1974) of 23 July 1974, 355 (1974) of 1 August 1974, 357 (1974) of 14 August 1974, 358 (1974) and 359 (1974) of 15 August 1974 and 360 (1974) of 16 August 1974,*

“*Noting that a large number of people in Cyprus have been displaced, and are in dire need of humanitarian assistance,*

“*Mindful of the fact that it is one of the foremost purposes of the United Nations to lend humanitarian assistance in situations such as the one currently prevailing in Cyprus,*

“*Noting also that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has already been appointed Co-ordinator of United Nations Humanitarian Assistance for Cyprus, with the task of co-ordinating relief assistance to be provided by United Nations programmes and agencies and from other sources,*

“*Having considered the report of the Secretary-General contained in document S/11473,*

“1. *Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the part he has played in bringing about*

talks between the leaders of the two communities in Cyprus;

"2. *Warmly welcomes* this development and calls upon those concerned in the talks to pursue them actively with the help of the Secretary-General and in the interests of the Cypriot people as a whole;

"3. *Calls upon* all parties to do everything in their power to alleviate human suffering, to ensure the respect of fundamental human rights for every person and to refrain from all action likely to aggravate the situation;

"4. *Expresses its grave concern* at the plight of the refugees and other persons displaced as a result of the situation in Cyprus and urges the parties concerned, in conjunction with the Secretary-General, to search for peaceful solutions to the problems of refugees and take appropriate measures to provide for their relief and welfare and to permit persons who wish to do so to return to their homes in safety;

"5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to submit at the earliest possible opportunity a full report on the situation of the refugees and other persons referred to in paragraph 4 above and decides to keep that situation under constant review;

"6. *Further requests* the Secretary-General to continue to provide emergency United Nations humanitarian assistance to all parts of the population of the island in need of such assistance;

"7. *Calls upon* all parties, as a demonstration of good faith, to take, both individually and in co-operation with each other, all steps which may promote comprehensive and successful negotiations;

"8. *Reiterates* its call to all parties to co-operate fully with the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus in carrying out its tasks;

"9. *Expresses the conviction* that the speedy implementation of the provisions of the present solution will assist the achievement of a satisfactory settlement in Cyprus."

145. Statements were then made by the representatives of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey, Austria and the President, speaking as representative of the USSR.

**Decision:** *At the 1795th meeting, on 30 August 1974, the draft resolution (S/11479) was adopted unanimously as resolution 361 (1974).*

146. Following the vote, statements in explanation of the vote were made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the President, speaking as the representative of the USSR, France, the United States, China, Indonesia, Iraq, the United Republic of Cameroon, Australia, the Byelorussian SSR and Mauritania. Statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of the USSR, Greece, Cyprus and Turkey.

## **F. Further reports of the Secretary-General and communications to the Council from 1 September to 31 December 1974**

### **1. PROGRESS REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL**

147. Throughout September and the first half of October, the Secretary-General submitted progress reports every two weeks on developments in Cyprus (S/11468/Add.1-4). The reports dealt with the situation of UNFICYP, the location of UNFICYP posts, observance of the cease-fire, meetings between Mr.

Clerides and Mr. Denktash and the humanitarian activities of UNFICYP.

148. On the situation of UNFICYP, the reports noted that in the areas under National Guard control UNFICYP enjoyed virtually complete freedom of movement, but in the Turkish-controlled areas, UNFICYP freedom of movement remained restricted. One Canadian soldier had been shot and killed by the National Guard, apparently owing to mistaken identification.

149. With regard to observance of the cease-fire, some forward movement by Turkish forces and their subsequent withdrawal was reported. Minor violations by both sides had occurred, but relative quiet continued to prevail in Cyprus throughout the period.

150. The meetings of Mr. Clerides and Mr. Denktash covered primarily humanitarian matters, such as the release of prisoners and detainees, the tracing of missing persons and assistance to the aged and infirm. As a result of the agreements reached at those meetings, the release of several categories of prisoners had begun on 16 September.

151. The reports contained details about the humanitarian activities carried on by UNFICYP, the assessment of the needs of refugees undertaken by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the deliveries of UNHCR supplies to refugees by UNFICYP and activities of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, who had earlier been appointed Co-ordinator of United Nations Humanitarian Assistance for Cyprus. The last report submitted during that period (S/11468/Add.4) noted that, as a consequence of all those factors, the general state of the refugees continued to improve slowly.

### **2. REPORTS ON HUMANITARIAN ACTIVITIES**

152. On 4 September, pursuant to resolution 361 (1974), the Secretary-General submitted a report (S/11488) in which he announced that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, in his capacity as Co-ordinator of United Nations Humanitarian Assistance for Cyprus, had visited the island from 22 to 27 August to study the problem at first hand. Attached to the report was the High Commissioner's report, which estimated the number of refugees in the south to be 163,800 Greek Cypriots and 34,000 Turkish Cypriots. The Co-ordinator also described the assistance already provided and expressed the hope for further support from the international community.

153. To obtain such increased support, the Secretary-General, on 6 September (S/11488/Add.1), appealed for voluntary contributions from all States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies and estimated that some \$22 million would be required for humanitarian assistance in Cyprus from 1 September to the end of 1974.

154. In a further report dated 31 October (S/11488/Add.2), the Secretary-General, referring to the progress report of his Co-ordinator, indicated that the response to his appeal had been prompt and generous, amounting to approximately \$20 million in cash. In the annex to his report, the Co-ordinator, after having outlined the magnitude of the refugee problem, gave details about the assistance that had been provided by the United Nations.

155. In a letter dated 20 September (S/11528), the Secretary-General addressed a further appeal to

Governments for voluntary contributions for the financing of UNFICYP, the costs of which, owing to recent events in Cyprus, had led to a substantial increase in costs to the United Nations for the period to 15 December 1974. The need for additional funds to maintain UNFICYP was urgent, he stated, and would amount to some \$13-14 million for every six-month period during which the Force remained at its existing level.

### 3. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL (29 AUGUST-DECEMBER 1974)

156. A number of communications continued to be received by the Secretary-General during the remainder of the year 1974 from the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey. The communications covered a wide range of subjects: the observance and violations of the cease-fire, the situation of the refugees, acts against the civilian population and economic matters. Six communications containing charges of violations of the cease-fire were received from Cyprus (S/11478 of 29 August, S/11490 of 3 September, S/11499 of 6 September, S/11511 of 14 September, S/11541 of 19 October and S/11549 of 28 October), and two from Greece (S/11548 of 26 October and S/11556 of 6 November).

157. Other communications contained charges of ill-treatment of civilians. Those from Cyprus were contained in letters dated 5 September (S/11492), 7 September (S/11500), 13 September (S/11513) and 6 December (S/11569). Letters dated 31 August and 6 September from Greece (S/11495 and S/11496) contained charges of mass arrests of Greek Cypriots. Turkey, in letters dated 4 and 5 September (S/11489 and S/11493), reported the discovery of a mass grave of Turkish Cypriot civilians at the village of Maratha, and, in a letter dated 12 September (S/11505), charged the imprisonment of 40,000 Turkish Cypriot civilians.

158. Additional communications from the parties dealt with various other complaints and charges.

159. Cyprus submitted complaints in letters dated 3 September (S/11484), charging the looting and destruction by Turks of film archives and works of art; 3 September (S/11485), charging the transport of Turks from Turkey to settle in occupied areas of Cyprus where the Greek Cypriots had been a majority; 5 September (S/11491), transmitting an appeal by the UNESCO school organizations in Cyprus for prompt withdrawal of the foreign invasion forces; 7 September (S/11501), charging the looting of museums in Kyrenia; 16 September (S/11514), charging further Turkish administrative measures to consolidate and annex the occupied portion of Cyprus; 18 September (S/11515), charging that measures to confiscate Greek-Cypriot property and expel residents of 40 per cent of Cyprus indicated that Mr. Denktash was operating as the virtual representative of the Turkish invasion force in Cyprus; 28 October (S/11549), charging the conversion of churches in occupied Cyprus to mosques; 31 October (S/11550), charging Turkish Cypriots and Turkish armed forces with looting of villages in Turkish-occupied areas; 6 November (S/11552), charging further seizures of Greek-Cypriot property and other violations of the Geneva Conventions of 1949; 6 November (S/11553), charging the illegal confiscation and sale of private cars belonging to Greek Cypriots and the leasing of their farms and lands; and 15 November (S/11559), charging that produce from occu-

ried Greek Cypriot agricultural areas was being mislabelled as Turkish and sold in Europe by Turkish exporters.

160. Other complaints submitted by Greece were contained in letters dated 30 August (S/11480), charging Turkish forces with arson on the Greek-Cypriot side of the Green Line in Nicosia; 31 August (S/11481), protesting Turkish measures to colonize the occupied part of Cyprus; and 26 September (S/11524), citing further evidence that Turkey was taking steps to colonize Cyprus with Turks from Turkey.

161. Other communications from Turkey during the same period included the following: a letter dated 23 September (S/11517), protesting complaints by Greece that Turkish Cypriots forced to leave their homes over the years by oppressive Greek policies were now considering returning to Cyprus; a letter dated 26 September (S/11521), transmitting a communication from Mr. Denktash defending his stand that Ambassador Rossides had no mandate to request inscription of the question of Cyprus on the agenda of the General Assembly because he had no mandate from the Vice-President of Cyprus to make such a request or to represent the Turkish community of Cyprus, which was a co-founder of the Republic of Cyprus; and a letter dated 4 October (S/11531), transmitting another communication from Mr. Denktash concerning the appointment of Mr. Kyprianou as head of the Cyprus delegation to the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

162. By a letter dated 26 August (S/11470), the Permanent Mission of the German Democratic Republic transmitted a Foreign Ministry statement, expressing support for the Soviet proposal to convene, within the framework of the United Nations, an international conference to settle the Cyprus conflict.

163. By a letter dated 13 September (S/11509), the representative of Algeria transmitted a Declaration by the Co-ordinating Committee of the Group of Non-aligned Countries accredited to the United Nations on developments concerning Cyprus.

164. By a letter dated 7 November (S/11557), the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council, at the request of the General Assembly, the text of resolution 3212 (XXIX) on the question of Cyprus, adopted by the Assembly at its 2275th plenary meeting on 1 November 1974.

### G. Report of the Secretary-General on UNFICYP and the renewal of its mandate in December 1974

#### 1. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS OPERATION IN CYPRUS

165. Before the mandate of UNFICYP was due to expire on 15 December, the Secretary-General, on 6 December, submitted a report to the Council covering United Nations operations in Cyprus during the period from 23 May to 5 December (S/11568). He outlined the events from the coup d'état of 15 July to the cease-fire of 16 August 1974 and provided a summary of UNFICYP operations during that period. He also provided information on UNFICYP operations and the methods used by the Force in helping to maintain the cease-fire until 5 December, including changes in its composition and deployment. He put the military strength of the Force at 4,335 as of 4 December and

indicated that, during the period covered by the report, UNFICYP had sustained casualties totalling 9 killed and 65 wounded. The Secretary-General also referred to complaints received concerning atrocities committed during the worst of the fighting and reports of violations of civilian safety in the wake of the hostilities. He described the efforts of UNFICYP military and police units, in co-operation with the authorities concerned, to provide protection to the villages along both sides of the cease-fire lines and gave a detailed account of the humanitarian activities of UNFICYP and the economic situation prevailing in the island. He also reported on his visit to Cyprus, Greece and Turkey and the meetings that had taken place between Mr. Clerides and Mr. Denktash. Concerning the financial aspects of the operation, the Secretary-General cited a deficit of \$27.4 million, resulting from the anticipated receipt of \$159 million against costs of \$186.4 million, and indicated that, if the mandate of UNFICYP was to be renewed for a further period of six months, voluntary contributions to the UNFICYP Special Account totalling \$41.9 million would be needed.

166. In closing, the Secretary-General observed that the gravest crisis experienced by Cyprus since the establishment of the United Nations operations in the island in 1964 had confronted UNFICYP with a new situation not covered by its mandate. In the circumstances, UNFICYP had tried pragmatically to maintain surveillance of the cease-fire called for by the Council, but its major activity had become humanitarian relief assistance. The Secretary-General concluded by saying that the situation in Cyprus would remain unstable and potentially dangerous so long as a settlement of the basic problems was not agreed upon. He felt that the continued presence of UNFICYP was essential not only to help maintain the cease-fire and provide humanitarian assistance but to facilitate the search for a peaceful solution.

## 2. CONSIDERATION BY THE COUNCIL AT ITS 1810TH MEETING (13 DECEMBER 1974) AND EXTENSION OF THE MANDATE OF UNFICYP

167. The Council held its 1810th meeting on 13 December and adopted the following agenda without objection:

“The situation in Cyprus:

“Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (S/11568)”.

168. The representatives of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

169. The President stated that, in the course of informal consultations, members of the Council had agreed that the Council should extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Vedat A. Çelik. As there was no objection, it was so decided.

170. The Council had before it two draft resolutions (S/11573 and S/11574) which, as the President explained, had been prepared in the course of extensive consultations among the members of the Council.

171. The first draft resolution (S/11573) read as follows:

“The Security Council,

“Noting from the report of the Secretary-General of 6 December 1974 (S/11568) that in existing cir-

cumstances the presence of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus is still needed to perform the tasks it is currently undertaking if the cease-fire is to be maintained in the island and the search for a peaceful settlement facilitated,

“Noting from the report the conditions prevailing in the island,

“Noting also the statement by the Secretary-General contained in paragraph 81 of his report, that the parties concerned had signified their concurrence in his recommendation that the Security Council extend the stationing of the Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

“Noting that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 December 1974,

“Noting also the letter dated 7 November 1974 (S/11557) from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council together with the text of resolution 3212 (XXIX) entitled ‘Question of Cyprus’ adopted unanimously by the General Assembly at its 2275th plenary meeting on 1 November 1974,

“Noting further that resolution 3212 (XXIX) enunciates certain principles intended to facilitate a solution to the current problems of Cyprus by peaceful means, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations,

“1. *Reaffirms* its resolutions 186 (1964) of 4 March, 187 (1964) of 13 March, 192 (1964) of 20 June, 193 (1964) of 9 August, 194 (1964) of 25 September and 198 (1964) of 18 December 1964, 201 (1965) of 19 March, 206 (1965) of 15 June, 207 (1965) of 10 August and 219 (1965) of 17 December 1965, 220 (1966) of 16 March, 222 (1966) of 16 June and 231 (1966) of 15 December 1966, 238 (1967) of 19 June and 244 (1967) of 22 December 1967, 247 (1968) of 18 March, 254 (1968) of 18 June and 261 (1968) of 10 December 1968, 266 (1969) of 10 June and 274 (1969) of 11 December 1969, 281 (1970) of 9 June and 291 (1970) of 10 December 1970, 293 (1971) of 26 May and 305 (1971) of 13 December 1971, 315 (1972) of 15 June and 324 (1972) of 12 December 1972, 334 (1973) of 15 June and 343 (1973) of 14 December 1973 and 349 (1974) of 29 May 1974, and the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting on 11 August 1964 and at the 1383rd meeting on 25 November 1967;

“2. *Reaffirms also* its resolutions 353 (1974) of 20 July, 354 (1974) of 23 July, 355 (1974) of 1 August, 357 (1974) of 14 August, 358 (1974), 359 (1974) of 15 August, 360 (1974) of 16 August and 361 (1974) of 30 August 1974;

“3. *Urges* the parties concerned to act with the utmost restraint and to continue and accelerate determined co-operative efforts to achieve the objectives of the Security Council;

“4. *Extends* once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force, established under Security Council resolution 186 (1964), for a further period ending 15 June 1975, in the expectation that by then sufficient progress towards a final solution will make possible a withdrawal or substantial reduction of the Force;

"5. *Appeals again* to all parties concerned to extend their full co-operation to the United Nations Force in its continuing performance of its duties."

172. The second draft resolution (S/11574) read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having received* the text of resolution 3212 (XXIX) of the General Assembly on the 'Question of Cyprus',

*"Noting with satisfaction* that that resolution was adopted unanimously,

*"1. Endorses* General Assembly resolution 3212 (XXIX) and urges the parties concerned to implement it as soon as possible;

*"2. Requests* the Secretary-General to report on the progress of the implementation of the present resolution."

173. The President also stated that the members of the Council had agreed that the draft resolutions should be voted upon before statements were made and that, accordingly, if there were no objections, he would put the two draft resolutions to the vote immediately.

**Decision:** *At the 1810th meeting, on 13 December 1974, the first draft resolution (S/11573) was adopted by 14 votes to none as resolution 364 (1974). One member (China) did not participate in the vote.*

*The second draft resolution (S/11574) was adopted by consensus as resolution 365 (1974).*

174. Following the vote, statements were made by the representatives of Cyprus, Turkey, Greece, the USSR, France, Austria, China, the United Kingdom, Costa Rica, the United Republic of Cameroon, the United States, Peru, Mauritania, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, the Byelorussian SSR and the President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of Australia. The Council also heard a statement by Mr. Çelik, in conformity with the decision taken at the beginning of the meeting. The representatives of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece also spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

175. Before adjourning the meeting, the President stated that the item, as formulated and inscribed on the agenda of the meeting, had superseded the item under which the matter had formerly been considered ("Letter dated 26 December 1963 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the President of the Security Council") and, in the absence of objection, requested the Secretary-General to delete the latter item from the list of matters of which the Security Council was seized.

## **H. Developments between 1 January and 31 March 1975**

### **1. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL RECEIVED BETWEEN 1 JANUARY AND 20 FEBRUARY 1975**

176. During the first part of 1975, Cyprus, Greece and Turkey continued to address communications to the Council with regard to the political, economic, humanitarian and other aspects of the Cyprus situation.

#### **(a) Communications from the representative of Cyprus**

177. A letter dated 6 January (S/11596), charging that statements made in Cyprus by the former Prime Minister of Turkey were provocative and contemptu-

ous of the Security Council, in that he had declared that the Republic of Cyprus had been abolished and that Archbishop Makarios was no longer its President.

178. A letter dated 20 January (S/11603), complaining that a grave situation had arisen in Cyprus as a consequence of the British Government's agreement to arbitrary Turkish demands for the removal of Turkish Cypriot refugees to Turkey from the British bases, whence it was feared they would be sent to Turkish-controlled areas of northern Cyprus in order to change its demographic character.

179. A letter dated 28 January (S/11609), expressing gratitude for the humanitarian assistance afforded the people of Cyprus by the international community in the period September-December 1974 and for the administration of that task by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in his capacity as Co-ordinator of United Nations Humanitarian Assistance for Cyprus.

180. A letter dated 29 January (S/11610), transmitting a protest by the "British Residents for Justice in Cyprus" against the British Government's decision to allow the Turkish authorities to evacuate Turkish Cypriot refugees from the Akrotiri base to Turkey.

181. A letter dated 29 January (S/11611), protesting the intervention in the intercommunal talks in Cyprus by the Foreign Minister of Turkey in statements rejecting any cantonal system of administration for Cyprus and advocating a bi-zonal federation based on geographical separation.

182. A letter dated 5 February (S/11616), charging that Turkish Cypriot authorities were allowing the produce of usurped properties to go to waste despite urgent need for grain to feed displaced persons.

183. Another letter dated 5 February (S/11617), transmitting a statement on the question of Cyprus by 24 representatives of non-governmental organizations associated with the United Nations charging that the lack of preventive action had led to the ruin of large parts of Cyprus, the collapse of its economy and the creation of an enormous wave of homeless refugees.

184. A letter dated 10 February (S/11619), protesting the commencement of scheduled air operations operating illegally between Turkey and an airfield on Cyprus.

185. A letter dated 12 February (S/11621), stating that, according to press reports, the Turkish Cypriot administration had decided to establish honorary consulates in Turkish cities and envisaged establishing commercial agencies in European and Arab countries.

186. A letter dated 14 February (S/11630), charging further measures calculated to alter the demographic character of Cyprus through introduction of a proposal to grant citizenship of the "Turkish Cypriot Administration" to members of the Turkish armed forces and others.

187. A letter dated 20 February (S/11634), transmitting a resolution passed on that date by the House of Representatives of Cyprus expressing confidence that the Security Council would take the measures required for implementation of its resolutions and those of the General Assembly regarding Cyprus.

188. Another letter dated 20 February (S/11635), transmitting an appeal from the Pancyprian Committee for Refugees denouncing the proclamation of a federated Turkish State.

(b) *Communications from the representative of Greece*

189. A letter dated 28 January (S/11608), charging that the Turkish army in occupied northern Cyprus was taking measures to partition Cyprus by compulsorily uprooting the population.

190. A letter dated 31 January (S/11612), presenting further charges of Turkish measures to uproot the Greek Cypriot population and drive it south.

191. A letter dated 12 February (S/11621), protesting the reported decision of the Turkish Cypriot administration to establish honorary consulates in Turkish cities and, possibly, to establish commercial agencies in European and Arab countries.

192. A letter dated 14 February (S/11623), expressing his Government's view that the proclamation of the Turkish-occupied territory as "a separate federated State in a future Cyprus federation" was practically equivalent to a proclamation of a separate Turkish Cypriot State and a continuation of a policy of faits accomplis based on the use of force.

(c) *Communications from the representative of Turkey*

193. A letter dated 4 February (S/11615), transmitting a letter from Mr. Denktash stating that Ambassador Rossides had ceased to represent Cyprus as a whole since the end of 1963 and that the Greek Cypriot Administration had usurped Government machinery and posed for 11 years as the Government of Cyprus. On these grounds, Mr. Denktash rejected charges contained in the letter from the representative of Cyprus dated 10 January (S/11596).

194. A letter dated 11 February (S/11620), rejecting charges made by the representative of Cyprus in a letter dated 20 January (S/11603) and transmitting a letter in that connexion from Mr. Denktash defending the decision to evacuate the Turkish Cypriot refugees from the Akrotiri base to Turkey.

195. A further letter dated 11 February (S/11622), transmitting a letter from Mr. Denktash protesting restrictions on the freedom of movement of Turkish Cypriots living in the south who sought to move north owing to the harassment to which they were being subjected.

196. A letter dated 20 February (S/11631), transmitting a letter from Mr. Denktash and requesting that that letter of "the President of the Federated Turkish State of the Cyprus Republic" be circulated. In his letter, Mr. Denktash rejected complaints submitted by the representative of Cyprus in a letter dated 29 January (S/11611).

197. A second letter dated 20 February (S/11632), transmitting a letter from Mr. Vedat A. Çelik, "Representative of the Federated Turkish State of the Cyprus Republic" rejecting charges contained in a letter dated 12 January (S/11612) from the representative of Greece.

198. A third letter dated 20 February (S/11633), also transmitting a letter from Mr. Çelik in connexion with the letter dated 12 February (S/11619) from the representative of Cyprus regarding air service to the Turkish Cypriot controlled region and charging that the Greek Cypriot Administration was interfering with Turkish Cypriot Airlines flights by transmitting misleading information.

2. REQUEST FOR A MEETING OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND RELATED COMMUNICATIONS

199. In a letter dated 17 February (S/11625), the representative of Cyprus requested the President to convene an urgent meeting of the Security Council. He charged that Turkey had violated the provisions of General Assembly resolution 3212 (XXIX) of 1 November 1974 and Security Council resolution 365 (1974) of 13 December 1974, had encouraged dilatory tactics by the Turkish side in the local talks, meanwhile forcibly transferring population and, in violation of the 1960 Treaty on Cyprus and of United Nations resolutions, had issued the "Declaration" of 13 February purporting to make the occupied territory in Cyprus a separate Turkish State. By that action, the procedure of the talks had been wrecked. Accordingly, determined and effective action by the Council was required to enforce the strict implementation of the resolutions of the Assembly and the Council, and new procedures of negotiation should be established so that there could be progress towards a just and peaceful solution.

200. The Secretary-General also received communications from other Member States concerning the declaration of a Turkish Federated State in the northern part of Cyprus.

201. By a letter dated 18 February (S/11626), the representative of Bulgaria transmitted a communication of the Bulgarian News Agency on the latest developments in Cyprus.

202. By a letter dated 18 February (S/11627), the representative of the USSR transmitted a TASS statement of 16 February charging that the latest unilateral step of the Turkish community to establish a separate State formation further complicated the situation in Cyprus. These actions were in clear contradiction to the decisions of the United Nations. In the statement the need to convene an international conference within the framework of the United Nations to consider the Cyprus problem was again stressed.

203. By a letter dated 19 February (S/11628), the representative of Hungary transmitted an official statement of the Hungarian News Agency, expressing deep concern over the step of the Turkish Cypriot community and supporting the proposal to convene an international conference to solve the Cyprus problem.

204. By a letter dated 19 February (S/11629), the representative of Ireland transmitted a statement by which the nine member countries of the European Economic Community, recalling the association of Greece, Turkey and Cyprus with the Community, expressed themselves in favour of a negotiated solution by the two communities and further expressed their willingness to hold discussions with all the interested parties to that end.

3. SPECIAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (18 FEBRUARY 1975)

205. On 18 February, the Secretary-General submitted a special report on recent events in Cyprus (S/11624). The report contained an account of the talks between Mr. Clerides and Mr. Denktash on the substance of the problem that had produced an agreement on 8 January to begin the negotiations by discussing the powers and functions of the central government in a federal State. The two leaders had also agreed to continue their talks on humanitarian issues and had later set up a sub-committee for that purpose.

206. The Secretary-General further informed the Council that, in pursuance of resolution 365 (1974), he had addressed identical notes to the parties concerned, asking them to provide all relevant information concerning steps taken or contemplated by them in regard to General Assembly resolution 3212 (XXIX). The replies received from the Governments of Greece and Cyprus appeared among the documents in the annex to the report. Also annexed to the report was the statement issued by Mr. Denktash on 13 February, announcing the restructuring and reorganization of the Turkish Cypriot Administration on the basis of a secular and federated State, as well as Turkish Cypriot proposals on the constitutional aspects received on 13 February and statements made by President Makarios and the Secretary-General with regard to those developments.

207. With regard to the maintenance of the cease-fire, the Secretary-General further reported that the frequency of shooting incidents since his last report on Cyprus had remained unchanged at an average of 27 daily. As for the freedom of movement of UNFICYP, the Secretary-General reported an agreement allowing UNFICYP teams to visit Greek Cypriot inhabitants in the north.

#### 4. CONSIDERATION AT THE 1813TH TO 1820TH MEETINGS (20 FEBRUARY-12 MARCH 1975)

208. At the 1813th meeting on 20 February 1975, the Council adopted the following agenda without objection:

“The situation in Cyprus:

“Letter dated 17 February 1975 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11625).”

209. The President, with the consent of the Council, invited the representatives of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The President also recalled that, in the course of consultations, members of the Council had agreed to extend an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council to Mr. Vedat A. Çelik.

210. Statements were then made by the representatives of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and the USSR. The Council also heard a statement by Mr. Çelik, in conformity with the decision taken at the beginning of the meeting.

211. At the 1814th meeting on 21 February, the Secretary-General reported to the Council on his talks with Turkish and Greek leaders in Ankara and Athens on 19 February. He emphasized the great seriousness of the risks to peace and security in the eastern Mediterranean which the unsolved Cyprus situation represented. From his talks he had gained the impression that the parties, and the world in general, expected the United Nations to be able to shoulder its responsibilities in the matter. He still believed that the talks between Mr. Clerides and Mr. Denktash in the presence of his Special Representative could provide a basis for progress, although he fully recognized the need for a new and fresh approach in the negotiating process. Despite the very great differences between the parties, a peaceful settlement was an urgent necessity, and it was vitally important to create as soon as possible conditions in which meaningful negotiations for a settlement could proceed.

212. The representatives of Greece, Cyprus and Turkey made statements. The representative of Cyprus spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

213. At the 1815th meeting on 24 February, the representative of Bulgaria was invited, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. Statements were made by the representatives of Guyana, Sweden, France, Bulgaria, Greece, Turkey and Cyprus. The Council also heard a statement by Mr. Çelik, in conformity with the decision taken at the 1813th meeting. The representatives of Greece and Turkey spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

214. At the 1816th meeting on 25 February, the representative of Saudi Arabia was invited, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. Statements were made by the representatives of Japan, the United Republic of Cameroon, Italy and Saudi Arabia.

215. At the 1817th meeting on 27 February, the representative of Romania was invited, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. Statements were then made by the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania, the President, speaking as the representative of China, the United States, Turkey, Mauritania and Romania. The representatives of the USSR, Greece, Cyprus, Turkey and China spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

216. At the 1818th meeting on 4 March, the Council heard statements by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the Byelorussian SSR, Cyprus and Turkey. The representatives of Greece and Turkey spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

217. At the 1819th meeting on 5 March, statements were made by the representatives of Iraq, the President, speaking as the representative of Costa Rica, Saudi Arabia, Cyprus, Turkey and Greece. The Council also heard a statement by Mr. Çelik, in conformity with the decision taken at its 1813th meeting. Statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Cyprus, Turkey, Greece, Italy and Saudi Arabia.

218. Before adjourning, the President declared the general debate closed and stated that he intended to convene the members of the Council for informal consultations the next day, as it was the duty of the Council not to postpone unnecessarily a decision that could lead to resumed negotiations between the two communities with the active participation of the Secretary-General.

219. At the 1820th meeting of the Council on 12 March, the President drew attention to a draft resolution (S/11657) prepared in the course of protracted consultations. The draft resolution read as follows:

“*The Security Council,*

“*Having considered* the situation in Cyprus in response to the complaint submitted by the Government of the Republic of Cyprus,

“*Having heard* the report of the Secretary-General and the statements made by the parties concerned,

“*Deeply concerned* at the continuation of the crisis in Cyprus,

“*Recalling* its previous resolutions, in particular resolution 365 (1974) of 13 December 1974, by which it endorsed General Assembly resolution 3212 (XXIX) adopted unanimously on 1 November 1974,

"Noting the absence of progress towards the implementation of its resolutions,

"1. *Calls once more upon* all States to respect the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus and urgently requests them, as well as the parties concerned, to refrain from any action which might prejudice that sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment, as well as from any attempt at partition of the island or its unification with any other country;

"2. *Regrets* the unilateral decision of 13 February 1975 declaring that a part of the Republic of Cyprus would become "a Federated Turkish State" as, *inter alia*, tending to compromise the continuation of negotiations between the representatives of the two communities on an equal footing, the objective of which must continue to be to reach freely a solution providing for a political settlement and the establishment of a mutually acceptable constitutional arrangement, and expresses its concern over all unilateral actions by the parties which have compromised or may compromise the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions;

"3. *Affirms* that the decision referred to in paragraph 2 above does not prejudice the final political settlement of the problem of Cyprus and takes note of the declaration that this was not its intention;

"4. *Calls* for the urgent and effective implementation of all parts and provisions of General Assembly resolution 3212 (XXIX), endorsed by Security Council resolution 365 (1974);

"5. *Considers* that new efforts should be undertaken to assist the resumption of the negotiations referred to in paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 3212 (XXIX) between the representatives of the two communities;

"6. *Requests* the Secretary-General accordingly to undertake a new mission of good offices and to that end to convene the parties under new agreed procedures and place himself personally at their disposal, so that the resumption, the intensification and the progress of comprehensive negotiations, carried out in a reciprocal spirit of understanding and of moderation under his personal auspices and with his direction as appropriate, might thereby be facilitated;

"7. *Calls upon* the representatives of the two communities to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General in the discharge of this new mission of good offices and asks them to accord personally a high priority to their negotiations;

"8. *Calls upon* all the parties concerned to refrain from any action which might jeopardize the negotiations between the representatives of the two communities and to take steps which will facilitate the creation of the climate necessary for the success of those negotiations;

"9. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made towards the implementation of resolution 365 (1974) and of the present resolution and to report to the Council whenever he considers it appropriate and, in any case, before 15 June 1975;

"10. *Decides* to remain actively seized of the matter."

220. As members had agreed to make their statements after the adoption of the draft resolution, the President put the draft resolution to the Council for adoption without vote.

**Decision:** *At the 1820th meeting, on 12 March 1975, the draft resolution (S/11657) was adopted without vote as resolution 367 (1975).*

221. After the adoption of the resolution, the President stated that the members of the Security Council requested the Secretary-General to report to it, as appropriate, taking into account the views of the parties concerned, on additional new elements which he believed might facilitate the early and successful conclusion of the negotiations in fulfilment of the provisions of the resolution. The President further stated that, in the view of the Council, the most practical arrangement would be to hold the talks at Headquarters in New York. He understood that it was the Secretary-General's intention to consult with the parties on all modalities of the talks.

222. Statements were then made by the representatives of the USSR, the United Kingdom, Japan, Guyana, the United Republic of Cameroon, France, China, Italy, Sweden, the United States, Mauritania, the Byelorussian SSR, the United Republic of Tanzania, Iraq, the President, speaking as the representative of Costa Rica, Greece, Saudi Arabia, Cyprus and Turkey. A statement was also made by Mr. Çelik, in accordance with the decision taken at the 1813th meeting. The representatives of Greece, Turkey and Cyprus spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

#### 5. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL RECEIVED BETWEEN 20 FEBRUARY AND 31 MARCH 1975

223. During the course of the Security Council's discussions in February and March, the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey continued to address communications to the Council bearing on various aspects of the problem.

224. Letters from the representative of Cyprus dated 21, 22, 24 and 28 February were circulated in documents S/11643, S/11644, S/11645, S/11646, S/11647 and S/11652. They contained charges of cease-fire violations by Turkish forces, the establishment of scheduled air services between Turkey and the occupied area of Cyprus, petitions from Greek Cypriots for the safety and return home of refugees and protests over the transfer of Turks from Turkey to occupied areas, a protest at the treatment of shepherds by Turkish soldiers and charges of misrepresentation by the representative of Turkey in his letter dated 26 February (S/11648).

225. In letters dated 24 February and 4 March (S/11640 and S/11653), the representative of Greece charged that Turkish forces had advanced their positions and refused to withdraw them despite UNFICYP efforts and that Turkish Cypriots were being settled in Greek Cypriot villages close to the cease-fire line.

226. By three letters dated 26 February (S/11648, S/11649 and S/11650) and one dated 28 February (S/11651), the representative of Turkey forwarded the texts of communications addressed to the Secretary-General. One, from Mr. Çelik, charged, on behalf of the President of the "Federated Turkish State of Cyprus", that the Greek Cypriot Administration was prohibiting the reunification of divided families or the resumption of studies by students in the south; a sec-

ond, from the Cyprus Turkish Trade Unions Federation, protested infringement of the rights of the Turkish Cypriot community and supported establishment of the Turkish Federal State; the third, from the Cyprus Turkish Farmers Union, also supported the establishment of a Federated Turkish State in Cyprus. The fourth letter, from Mr. Denktash, challenged the designation by the Greek Cypriot Administration of a delegation headed by Mr. Clerides to represent "Cyprus as a whole" in Security Council meetings and reiterated that, as the Greek Cypriot Administration had usurped governmental machinery since December 1963, it could, under no circumstances, authorize a delegation to represent the Republic of Cyprus as a whole, in particular, the Turkish Cypriot community.

227. During the same period, the Permanent Mission of the Mongolian People's Republic, by a letter dated 10 March (S/11656), transmitted the text of a statement issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in connexion with the new aggravation of the situation in Cyprus.

228. In a letter dated 21 March (S/11662) addressed to Governments of States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies, the Secretary-General issued a further appeal for voluntary contributions for the financing of UNFICYP. He stated that the accumulated deficit for the period through 15 December 1974 stood at \$21.5 million and that it was estimated that \$13.7 million would be required to maintain the Force during the current six-month period ending 15 June 1975. Unfortunately, voluntary contributions had failed to keep up with the increased requirements, and he viewed the necessary support for that important United Nations peace-keeping effort as all the more important in view of the Council's decision in resolution 367 (1975) that new efforts should be undertaken to assist the resumption of negotiations.

## **I. Developments between 1 April and 15 June 1975**

### **1. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL RECEIVED BETWEEN 1 APRIL AND 15 JUNE 1975**

229. Between 1 April and 15 June, a number of communications were received from Cyprus and Turkey, dealing with the military developments and with social and political issues connected with the situation in Cyprus.

230. With regard to military developments, the representative of Cyprus submitted letters dated 30 April, 8 and 10 May and 6 June (S/11681, S/11685, S/11686 and S/11716), in which it was charged that Turkish military aircraft had committed a series of violations of the air space of Cyprus between 30 April and 5 June which created fear and tension among the populations and were incompatible with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

231. In commenting on the above charges, the representative of Turkey, in a letter dated 2 May (S/11682), stated that no complaint regarding overflights had been registered by the authorities of the area described by the representative of Cyprus. In the same connexion, the representative of Turkey, by a letter dated 6 June (S/11714), transmitted a letter from Mr. Nail Atalay, enclosing a letter of 22 May from Mr. Denktash stating that the Turkish jet fighters referred to had not violated the air space of Cyprus,

inasmuch as the flights in question had been over the territory of the "Turkish Federated State of Cyprus", with the full knowledge and consent of that State. In a letter dated 21 May (S/11696), the representative of Turkey charged that the National Guard in Cyprus had fired on Turkish Cypriot positions on 19 occasions between 12 April and 10 May.

232. In connexion with social issues, letters dated 18 and 25 April, 19 and 21 May and 11 June (S/11677, S/11678, S/11692, S/11698, S/11699 and S/11724) were received from the representative of Cyprus, charging that the Turkish Cypriot authorities were usurping the properties of the Greek Cypriots who had been forcibly expelled from their homes and were being designated aliens in their own country; that the demographic composition of Cyprus was being systematically altered by the massive transfer of population from the Turkish mainland; that factories owned by Greek Cypriots in occupied areas were being operated under Turkish names; and that factories and hotels in occupied areas were being offered to foreigners for lease, thus exploiting property belonging to Greek Cypriot refugees.

233. Letters dated 22 April, 2 and 9 May and 9 June (S/11679, S/11682, S/11687, and S/11718), also dealing with social issues, were received from the representative of Turkey. They contained a message forwarded by Mr. Nail Atalay from the Committee of Turkish Cypriot Women, charging oppression of Turkish Cypriots; a reply to letters from the representative of Cyprus, stating the Turkish view that Turkish Cypriots had long been denied both citizens' and human rights by the Greek Cypriot administration and that Turkish citizens should have as free access to Cyprus as that long enjoyed by Greeks; a letter from Dr. Necdet Uzel, charging that Turkish Cypriots in the south of Cyprus were being prevented by the Greek Cypriot Administration from crossing to the north; and a letter from Mr. Nail Atalay, forwarding a letter from Mr. Denktash, who rejected as unfounded the charges that Greek Cypriots were being deliberately expelled from the north of Cyprus and that Turks were emigrating from Turkey in order to change the demographic character of the island, and stated that Turkish Cypriots had been forced to abandon their homes and property on several occasions prior to 1974, that Turkish technicians were coming to Cyprus on a temporary basis and that the return of refugees was a matter to be settled within the framework of a final solution of the Cyprus problem.

234. With regard to political issues, letters dated 10 April and 2, 21, 28 and 29 May (S/11674, S/11683, S/11695, S/11704 and S/11706) were received from the representative of Turkey protesting the charges of racial discrimination presented to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination by the representative of Cyprus at a time when the talks between the two communities of Cyprus were to be resumed, as well as the letter-publishing campaign waged by the same representative while those talks were being held. He also forwarded communications from Mr. Nail Atalay concerning the status of the Republic of Cyprus, the administration of the two areas of the country, and the establishment of the Turkish Federated State of Cyprus and transmitting a letter from Mr. Denktash protesting the policies of the Greek Cypriots in connexion with the presence of Archbishop Makarios at the Commonwealth Confer-

ence in Jamaica, the use of the refugee problem as a political tool against the Turkish side and provocative sloganeering by leaders of the Greek Cypriot National Guard.

235. Letters dated 15 and 28 May and 10 June (S/11691 and Corr. 1, S/11703, S/11719, S/11720 and S/11723), also dealing with political issues, were received from the representative of Cyprus, in which he protested the circulation of letters signed by Mr. Nail Atalay as "Acting Representative of the Turkish Federated State of Cyprus" at the request of the representative of Turkey and stated that the basic premise of the Constitution of Cyprus of 1960 was that of an integrated State and that no Federation existed; asked that the representative of Turkey, if he persisted in acting as though a separate State existed in Cyprus, define its geographic limits and population; and charged that the circulation of such letters purporting to emanate from a non-existent source constituted a further aggravation of a deliberate misrepresentation of fact prejudicial to the territorial integrity and independence of Cyprus, a State Member of the United Nations. He also forwarded a letter from the Cyprus Refugee Committee protesting the constitution of the so-called "Federal Turkish Cypriot State" approved on 8 June in a referendum, the holding of which his Government considered was a demonstration of defiance of international legal order and relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly at the very time when talks were being held in Vienna.

## 2. REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

236. On 4 May, the Secretary-General submitted an interim report (S/11684) to the Security Council in connexion with the new mission of good offices entrusted to him in paragraph 6 of resolution 367 (1975). The report dealt with the first round of negotiations between the two Cypriot communities. Annexed to the report as the text of the communiqué issued on 3 May in Vienna, which stated that the talks held from 28 April to 3 May, covering the powers and functions of the central government, the question of displaced and missing persons and the geographical aspects of a possible future settlement in Cyprus, had been held in a friendly atmosphere and that it had been agreed that an expert committee of the two parties would examine proposals on governmental issues. Agreement had also been reached in principle on the reopening of Nicosia international airport. The parties had further agreed that the next meeting of the negotiations would be held in Vienna between 5 and 9 June 1975.

237. Before the mandate of UNFICYP was due to expire on 15 June, and in pursuance of Security Council resolution 367 (1975) requesting him to report to the Council before 15 June on his new mission of good offices, the Secretary-General submitted a report (S/11717) on 9 June covering the United Nations operations in Cyprus during the period 7 December 1974 and 9 June 1975, as well as the actions taken in exercise of his good offices. The report provided up-to-date details about the composition and deployment of UNFICYP and its operations in the maintenance of the cease-fire. In that connexion, it was noted that, since March, there had been a noticeable decline in the number of daily shooting violations, but, regrettably, more such incidents had involved cases of shooting at UNFICYP troops. Although mine-laying by

both sides had decreased, its wide-scale use remained a matter of concern. The freedom of movement of UNFICYP was restricted in the northern part of the island, although teams distributing relief supplies and money had been afforded controlled access; but in southern areas UNFICYP continued to have complete freedom of movement. The Secretary-General reviewed the humanitarian and economic situation on the island and activities of the United Nations in providing assistance to both sides. Particular mention was made of the two series of meetings in Vienna in May and June with the representatives of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities, in the course of which some limited progress had been made without it having been possible to achieve agreement on the basic issues. It had been agreed that the next round of talks in Vienna would be held between 24 and 27 July. With regard to the financial aspects of UNFICYP, the Secretary-General noted insufficiency of voluntary contributions and the resulting anticipated deficit of \$33.8 million and expressed his intention to try to achieve a further reduction of the total strength of UNFICYP. On the over-all situation in Cyprus, the report underlined that the situation on the island was unstable and potentially dangerous and would remain so unless and until an agreed settlement of the basic problems could be reached. For that reason, it seemed to him that the negotiating process between the community representatives should be maintained and, if possible, accelerated. In those conditions, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNFICYP to be essential, not only to maintain the cease-fire but to facilitate the search for a peaceful settlement, and recommended the extension of the Force's mandate for a further period of six months.

## 3. CONSIDERATION AT THE 1830TH AND 1831ST MEETINGS (13 AND 16 JUNE 1975)

238. At the 1830th meeting on 13 June, the Council adopted the following agenda without objection:

"The situation in Cyprus:

"Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (S/11717)."

239. The representatives of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

240. The President stated that, in the course of informal consultations, members of the Council had agreed that the Council should extend an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Vedat A. Çelik. As there was no objection, it was so decided.

241. The President drew attention to a draft resolution (S/11725) prepared in the course of prior consultations and read out a revision to operative paragraph 6, which had originally requested the Secretary-General "to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to report to it whenever he considered it appropriate and, in any case, not later than 15 December 1975". In its revised form, the draft resolution (S/11725/Rev.1) read as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Noting from the report of the Secretary-General of 9 June 1975 (S/11717) that in existing circumstances the presence of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus is still needed to perform

the tasks it is currently undertaking if the cease-fire is to be maintained in the island and the search for a peaceful settlement facilitated,

"*Noting* from the report the conditions prevailing in the island,

"*Noting further* that, in paragraphs 67 and 68 of his report, the Secretary-General has expressed the view, in connexion with the talks in Vienna between the representatives of the two communities held pursuant to resolution 367 (1975) of 12 March, 1975, that the negotiating process should be maintained and, if possible, accelerated and that its success would require from all parties determination, understanding and a willingness to make reciprocal gestures,

"*Noting also* the statement by the Secretary-General contained in paragraph 69 of his report that the parties concerned had signified their concurrence in his recommendation that the Security Council extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

"*Noting* that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 June 1975,

"1. *Reaffirms* the provisions of resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, as well as subsequent resolutions and decisions on the establishment and maintenance of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus and on other aspects of the situation in Cyprus;

"2. *Reaffirms once again* its resolution 365 (1974) of 13 December 1974, by which it endorsed General Assembly resolution 3212 (XXIX), adopted unanimously on 1 November 1974, and calls for their urgent and effective implementation and that of its resolution 367 (1975);

"3. *Urges* the parties concerned to act with the utmost restraint and to continue and accelerate determined co-operative efforts to achieve the objectives of the Security Council;

"4. *Extends once more* the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force, estab-

lished under Security Council resolution 186 (1964), for a further period ending 15 December 1975 in the expectation that by then sufficient progress towards a final solution will make possible a withdrawal or substantial reduction of the Force;

"5. *Appeals again* to all parties concerned to extend their full co-operation to the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus in its continuing performance of its duties;

"6. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue the mission of good offices entrusted to him by paragraph 6 of resolution 367 (1975), to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made, and to submit an interim report by 15 September 1975 and a definitive report not later than 15 December 1975."

242. As members had agreed to make their statements after the vote, the President put the draft resolution (S/11725/Rev.1) to the vote.

**Decision:** *At the 1830th meeting, on 13 June 1975, the draft resolution (S/11725/Rev.1) was adopted by 14 votes to none as resolution 370 (1975). One member (China) did not participate in the vote.*

243. Following the vote, statements were made by the Secretary-General and by the representatives of China, the United States, Japan, France, the United Kingdom, Italy, Sweden, Mauritania, the United Republic of Cameroon, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Republic of Tanzania, Guyana, Costa Rica, the Byelorussian SSR, the President, speaking in his capacity of representative of Iraq, Greece and Turkey. The Council also heard a statement by Mr. Çelik in accordance with its earlier decision. The representatives of Greece, Turkey and Cyprus also spoke in exercise of the right of reply,

244. At the 1831st meeting on 16 June, the representative of Cyprus made a statement. The Council also heard a statement by Mr. Çelik, who spoke in accordance with the decision taken at the previous meeting.

245. The representative of Cyprus spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

## Chapter 2

### RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND SOUTH AFRICA

#### A. Communications to the Security Council and request for a meeting

246. By a letter dated 30 September 1974 addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11525), the President of the General Assembly transmitted the text of resolution 3207 (XXIX) of 30 September 1974, in which the General Assembly called on the Security Council to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of the constant violation by South Africa of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

247. In a letter dated 9 October (S/11532), the representative of Tunisia, as Chairman of the African Group, requested a meeting of the Council to review

the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in conformity with General Assembly resolution 3207 (XXIX).

#### B. Consideration at the 1796th to 1798th, 1800th to 1804th and 1806th to 1808th meetings (18, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 28-30 October 1974)

248. At its 1796th meeting on 18 October 1974, the Security Council adopted the following agenda without objection:

"Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa:

"(a) Letter dated 30 September 1974 from the President of the General Assembly addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11525);

“(b) Letter dated 9 October 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11532).”

It considered the item at 11 meetings held between 18 and 30 October.

249. In the course of the discussion, the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Barbados, the Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Kuwait, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia and Zaire were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

250. At the 1796th meeting on 18 October, the Council began its discussion of the question with statements by the representatives of Tunisia, Somalia and Sierra Leone. At the same meeting, the President drew the Council's attention to a letter dated 18 October (S/11539) from the representatives of Kenya and Mauritania, requesting that an invitation, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, be extended to Mr. David Sibeko of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania. In the absence of objection, the Council decided to extend the invitation as requested.

251. At the 1797th meeting on 21 October, statements were made by the representatives of Egypt, Nigeria, Mauritius, Zaire, the Syrian Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia. The President then drew the Council's attention to a letter dated 21 October (S/11540) from the representatives of Kenya and Mauritania, requesting that an invitation, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, be extended to Mr. Duma Nokwe of the African National Congress. In the absence of objection, the Council decided to extend the invitation as requested.

252. At the 1798th meeting on 22 October, statements were made by the representatives of Dahomey, Algeria, Guyana, the German Democratic Republic and Bangladesh. In accordance with the decision taken at the 1796th meeting, a statement was made by Mr. Sibeko.

253. At the 1800th meeting on 24 October, the Council continued its discussion, with statements by the representatives of Uganda, Yugoslavia, South Africa and Cuba.

254. At the 1801st meeting on the same day, the Council heard statements by the representatives of Madagascar, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Czechoslovakia.

255. At the 1802nd meeting, on 25 October, the Council heard statements by the representatives of Pakistan, India and Barbados. In accordance with the decision taken at the 1797th meeting, a statement was made by Mr. Nokwe.

256. At the same meeting, the Council had before it a draft resolution (S/11543) submitted by Kenya, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon and later co-sponsored by Iraq which read as follows:

“The Security Council,

Having considered General Assembly resolution 3207 (XXIX) of 30 September 1974, in which the

Assembly called upon the Security Council ‘to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of the constant violation by South Africa of the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights’,

“Having heard the statements of the persons invited to address the Council on this issue,

“Taking note of the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* entitled ‘Violations of the Charter of the United Nations and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council by the South African régime’ (S/11537),

“Mindful of the provisions of the Charter concerning the rights and obligations of Member States, particularly those of Articles 1, 2, 6, 55 and 56,

“Recalling its resolutions 134 (1960) of 1 April 1960, 181 (1963) of 7 August 1963, 182 (1963) of 4 December 1963, 190 (1964) of 9 June 1964, 282 (1970) of 23 July 1970 and 311 (1972) of 4 February 1972, on the question of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa,

“Reaffirming that the policies of *apartheid* are contrary to the principles and purposes of the Charter and inconsistent with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as South Africa's obligations under the Charter,

“Recalling that the General Assembly and the Security Council have more than once condemned the South African Government for its persistent refusal to abandon its policies of *apartheid* and to abide by its obligations under the Charter, as called for by the Council and the Assembly,

“Noting with concern South Africa's refusal to withdraw its police and military forces, as well as its civilian personnel, from the Mandated Territory of Namibia and to co-operate with the United Nations in enabling the people of Namibia as a whole to attain self-determination and independence,

“Noting further that, in violation of the pertinent resolutions of the Security Council, particularly resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, South Africa has not only given support to the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, but has also sent into that Territory military and police personnel for the purpose of strengthening that régime in its attempt to impede the exercise by the people of the Territory of their inalienable rights,

“Considering that effective measures should be taken to resolve the present situation arising out of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa,

“Recommends to the General Assembly the immediate expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations in compliance with Article 6 of the Charter.”

257. At the 1803rd meeting on the same day, the Council heard statements by the representatives of Romania, Mali, the United Republic of Tanzania, Qatar, Liberia and Kuwait.

258. At the 1804th meeting on 28 October, the President drew the Council's attention to two letters dated 25 October (S/11545 and S/11546) from the representatives of Kenya and Mauritania, requesting, respectively, that invitations under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, be extended to Mr. Noël

Mukono of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and Mr. T. George Silundika of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and to Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). In the absence of objection, the Council decided to extend the invitations as requested. The Council then continued its discussion with statements by the representatives of Upper Volta, Guinea, the Congo and the Libyan Arab Republic. In accordance with the decisions taken at that meeting and at the 1796th meeting, statements were also made by Mr. Silundika and Mr. Sibeko.

259. At the same meeting, the President drew attention to a draft resolution submitted under rule 38 by Saudi Arabia (S/11547), which read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling that it is currently considering the item entitled 'Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa' and noting that the question of Namibia is of great relevance to this item,*

*"Recalling further that the Territory now known as Namibia was placed under the Mandate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by a decision taken by the League of Nations in 1920,*

*"Noting that the United Kingdom entrusted the Mandate over the Territory to South Africa with a view to preparing the people for self-determination and eventual independence in conformity with the spirit and letter of the decisions of the League of Nations pertaining to Mandated Territories,*

*"Taking into account that over half a century has elapsed since South Africa assumed the responsibility of preparing the people of Namibia to govern themselves, during which period all other mandated territories have gained full independence,*

*"Mindful of the fact that, through the Trusteeship Council, the United Nations has assumed the responsibility of accelerating the process of liberation of Non-Self-Governing Territories,*

*"1. Urges South Africa to transfer without undue delay its authority over Namibia to the Trusteeship Council;*

*"2. Requests the Secretary-General, after consultation with the Security Council, to appoint two co-administrators from neutral countries to administer*

Namibia together with South Africa during the period of transfer, which should be completed within two years or less;

*"3. Requests the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia to assist by co-ordinating the transfer of power from South Africa to the Trusteeship Council."*

260. At the 1806th meeting on 29 October, the Council continued its discussion, with statements by the representatives of Kenya, Saudi Arabia, Mauritania, Peru, China, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Morocco. In accordance with the decision taken at the 1804th meeting, a statement was made by Mr. Mukono.

261. At the 1807th meeting on 30 October, the Council heard statements by the representatives of Indonesia, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Iraq and Australia.

262. At the 1808th meeting on the same day, the Council concluded its discussion with statements by the representatives of Austria, Costa Rica, the United States of America, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Kenya, Iraq and Mauritania and by the President of the Council, speaking in his capacity as the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon. The President then put to the vote the four-Power draft resolution (S/11543).

**Decision:** *At the 1808th meeting, on 30 October 1974, the draft resolution (S/11543) submitted by Iraq, Kenya, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon received 10 votes in favour, 3 against (France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America), and 2 abstentions (Austria, Costa Rica) and was not adopted, owing to the negative votes of three permanent members of the Council.*

263. Following the vote, the President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon, made a statement.

264. On the following day, the President of the Security Council addressed a letter to the President of the General Assembly, informing him that the Security Council, after having considered the question of the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa, had not been able to adopt a resolution on the item and, accordingly, remained seized of the matter. The letter was subsequently circulated as a document of the General Assembly (A/9847).

### Chapter 3

#### THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

##### A. Reports of the Secretary-General, consideration by the Security Council and communications received

###### 1. THE OPERATIONS OF THE UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY FORCE IN THE EGYPT-ISRAEL SECTOR

265. During the period under review, the Secretary-General continued to issue progress reports on the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) and its operations in the area.

(a) *Reports of the Secretary-General issued between 16 June and 12 October 1974*

266. In a progress report issued on 18 June 1974 (S/11248/Add.5), covering the period since his report

of 13 May 1974, the Secretary-General stated that the military situation in the UNEF area of operations had remained calm. He informed the Council of the repatriation of the Irish contingent of UNEF on 22 May and the deployment to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) of certain elements of UNEF, totalling approximately 1,050 troops and 235 vehicles of all types. As of 18 June, the strength of personnel in the UNEF area of operations, including headquarters staff, was 5,079 men. In addition, rear parties remaining in the UNEF area of operations as of the same date numbered 118 men. After indicating in detail the current deployment of contingents, the Secretary-General stated that the Force had continued to man, patrol and control the zone of disengagement

and conduct weekly inspections of the Israeli and Egyptian areas of limited armaments and forces, as well as inspections of other areas agreed by the parties. Operations involving the recovery of bodies of soldiers killed during the hostilities in the Suez Canal area had been conducted from 20 May to 31 May and recommenced on 12 June. Bodies thus recovered had been turned over to the parties with no major problem.

267. On 20 May, Israel had transferred to Egypt 26 civilian detainees and 27 family members, and, on 3 June, 14 civilian detainees and 15 family members. In addition, under a family reunification programme, 139 persons had passed from Israel to Egypt on 21 May, and 73 from Egypt to Israel. The arrangement had been made through the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and had taken place in the zone of disengagement under UNEF supervision.

268. In a further report dated 23 July (S/11248/Add.6), the Secretary-General informed the Council that the strength of personnel in the UNEF area of operations, including headquarters staff, amounted to 5,527 men. As indicated in the previous report, the military situation had remained calm, and the Force had continued to carry out the tasks assigned to it, including the search operations for the recovery of bodies of soldiers killed, which had terminated on 18 June. The transfer to and from both Egypt and Israel had continued in July, with 13 civilian detainees transferred to Egypt, in addition to 169 persons who had crossed from Israeli-held territory to Egypt and 395 persons from Egypt to Israeli-held territory in a family reunification programme. During July also, 1,355 students had crossed from Egypt to their homes in Israeli-held territory. As before, those transfers had been arranged through ICRC and had taken place in the zone of disengagement.

269. In his report of 30 August (S/11248/Add.7), the Secretary-General indicated that the military situation in the UNEF area of operations had remained stable. As originally agreed, the Nepalese contingent had been withdrawn but not replaced, with the Swedish battalion taking over responsibility for the extended Nepalese sector. On 27 August, the strength of personnel in the UNEF area of operations, including headquarters, totalled 5,247 men. Reviewing the activities of the Force, he reported that 3,148 students had crossed the zone of disengagement to their homes in Israeli-held territory during the period 10 July to 5 August. Furthermore, under family reunification programmes, 509 persons had crossed to the occupied territories during August, and 268 had crossed in the other direction under ICRC transfer arrangements and UNEF supervision.

270. The Secretary-General also reported that, on 9 August, a UNEF Buffalo aircraft had crashed in Syria while on flight in support of UNDOF, and nine members of the Canadian contingent had been killed. Boards of inquiry had been set up by the Canadian and Syrian authorities, as well as by the United Nations, to investigate the tragic incident.

(b) *Extension of the mandate of UNEF until 25 April 1975*

(i) *Report of the Secretary-General dated 12 October 1974*

271. In a report on UNEF covering the period from 2 April to 12 October (S/11536), submitted to the

Security Council in connexion with the expiration of the mandate of the Force, the Secretary-General presented a comprehensive picture of the activities of the Force in pursuance of the mandate laid down by the Security Council in resolutions 340 (1973) of 25 October and 341 (1973) of 27 October 1973, which had been extended by resolution 346 (1974) of 8 April 1974. He described the composition and deployment of the Force, its accommodation and logistics, its activities in pursuance of the functions and guidelines outlined in his report on the implementation of Security Council resolution 340 (1973) (S/11052/Rev.1), its humanitarian activities and co-operation with ICRC and, finally, the financial aspects of UNEF.

272. As of 12 October, the strength of the Force was 4,491 men. The Nepalese contingent, which had relieved the Irish contingent, had been repatriated during August and September, and its area of responsibility in the zone of disengagement had been assumed by the Swedish battalion. The functions and guidelines of UNEF had not changed, and the Force had continued to fulfil its tasks under the Agreement on the Disengagement of Forces, including carrying out inspections in the areas defined in the Agreement, with every effort being made to ensure its independent functioning in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council.

273. The Secretary-General pointed out that the problem of restriction of the freedom of movement of certain UNEF contingents still existed but that he continued to take the position that the Force must function as an integrated and efficient military unit, that its contingents must serve on an equal basis under the Commander of the Force and that no differentiation could be made regarding the United Nations status of the various contingents.

274. The Force Commander had continued his assistance and good offices in cases where one of the parties raised questions concerning the observance of the agreed limitation on armaments and forces. No significant incidents had been observed. In several cases there had been restriction of the Force's freedom of movement, and in each case official protests had been lodged.

275. With regard to humanitarian activities, the Secretary-General indicated that the Force had maintained close contact with the representatives of ICRC and had assisted in the negotiations conducted by the parties on humanitarian matters.

276. Under the family reunification and student exchange programmes, 2,363 persons had passed from Israel to Egypt and 7,097 from Egypt to Israel. The arrangements had been made through ICRC and had taken place in the zone of disengagement under UNEF supervision. Sixty-five other civilians had also been transferred to Egypt from Israel in the same zone.

277. Search operations for the recovery of bodies of soldiers killed during the hostilities in the Suez Canal area had terminated on 1 July. Since then 13 bodies had been turned over to the parties.

278. Regarding the financial aspects, the Secretary-General indicated that, in the course of consultations on the question of reimbursement, the troop-contributing countries had put forward an agreed proposal for the reimbursement of all contributing Governments on an equal basis at the rate of \$500 per man per month, with a proposed supplement of \$150 per man per month for a strictly limited number of specialized personnel.

On such a basis, it would be necessary to seek additional authority and financial provision from the General Assembly in the amount of approximately \$23.6 million<sup>4</sup> to cover the requirements of the period ending on 24 October 1974. On the basis of the same rate of obligations and reimbursement ceiling, the estimated cost for a further six-month period would be \$40 million, based on an over-all troop strength of 5,750, including 1,250 men in UNDOF.

279. Although the situation in the Egypt-Israel sector, with the exception of a few minor incidents, had remained quiet, largely because of the effective operation of UNEF, the Secretary-General observed that the situation in the Middle East would remain fundamentally unstable as long as the underlying problems were unsolved. He therefore considered that the operations of UNEF were essential to maintain the existing quiet and to assist, if required, in further efforts for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, and he recommended once again that the Security Council extend the mandate of UNEF for another period of six months.

280. Pointing out that the total troop strength of UNEF had been reduced from the 7,000 figure originally proposed to about 4,500 as a result of the withdrawal of two contingents and the transfer of other units to UNDOF, he stated that he did not anticipate a need for any increase under existing circumstances. Moreover, every effort would be made to achieve further reductions, if that could be done without affecting the effectiveness of the Force.

(ii) *Consideration at the 1799th meeting*  
(23 October 1974)

281. At its 1799th meeting on 23 October, the Security Council included the following item in its agenda without objection:

"The situation in the Middle East;

"Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Emergency Force (S/11536)."

282. The President announced that the Council had before it a draft resolution (S/11542) which had been drawn up during intensive consultations among all the members of the Council, who had agreed that it should be put to the vote immediately after a statement by the Secretary-General. The draft resolution read as follows:

"*The Security Council,*

"*Recalling its resolutions 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973, 340 (1973) of 25 October 1973, 341 (1973) of 27 October 1973 and 346 (1974) of 8 April 1974,*

"*Having examined the report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the United Nations Emergency Force (S/11536),*

"*Noting the opinion of the Secretary-General that 'although quiet now prevails in the Egypt-Israel sector, the over-all situation in the Middle East will remain fundamentally unstable as long as the underlying problems are unresolved',*

"*Noting also from the report of the Secretary-General that in the present circumstances the opera-*

tion of the United Nations Emergency Force is still required,

"1. *Decides* that the mandate of the United Nations Emergency Force should be extended for an additional period of six months, that is, until 24 April 1975, in order to assist in further efforts for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East;

"2. *Commends* the United Nations Emergency Force and those Governments supplying contingents to it for their contribution towards the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East;

"3. *Expresses its confidence* that the Force will be maintained with maximum efficiency and economy;

"4. *Reaffirms* that the United Nations Emergency Force must be able to function as an integral and efficient military unit in the whole Egypt-Israel sector of operations without differentiation regarding the United Nations status of the various contingents, as stated in paragraph 26 of the report of the Secretary-General (S/11536) and requests the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to that end."

283. The Secretary-General then spoke on two matters dealt with in his report. He stated that the proposal of the troop-contributing countries for an equal reimbursement formula had been submitted informally to other Member States, some of which had expressed reservations. Referring to the relationship between the costs of UNEF and those attributable to UNDOF, he explained that the ultimate size and costs would depend on a decision to be taken by the Council in November with respect to UNDOF and that as the two Forces had certain common services, it was difficult to separate their budgets completely. He assured the Council that he would continue to exercise the strictest economy whenever possible consonant with efficient operation. Finally, he informed the Council that the Government of Panama had communicated to him its decision to withdraw its contingent from UNEF at the end of the year.

**Decision:** *At the 1799th meeting, on 23 October 1974, the draft resolution (S/11542) was adopted by 13 votes to none as resolution 362 (1974). Two members (China and Iraq) did not participate in the vote.*

284. Following the voting, the Council heard statements in explanation of vote by the representatives of China, Iraq, Kenya, France, the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Austria, Costa Rica, Australia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Mauritania, Indonesia, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Peru and the President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon. The representatives of China and the USSR spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

(c) *Report of the Secretary-General dated*  
18 January 1975

285. In a further progress report on UNEF dated 18 January 1975 (S/11536/Add.1), the Secretary-General indicated that, since his previous report (S/11536), the military situation in the UNEF area of operations had remained stable and that the Force had continued to carry out its tasks effectively in pursuance of the Egyptian-Israeli Agreement of 18 January 1974 and in accordance with the mandate laid down by the relevant Security Council resolutions.

<sup>4</sup>At its twenty-ninth session, the General Assembly approved the amount of \$19.8 million as the actual amount of the additional expenditure for the first year of operation of the United Nations Emergency Force [General Assembly resolution 3211 B (XXIX)].

286. The Panamanian contingent, he reported, had been withdrawn by 25 November and had not been replaced. The current total troop strength of the Force was 4,044 men, not including the elements assigned to the UNDOF area of operations from the Canadian and Polish logistic components. On 24 December 1974, three members of the Canadian contingent had been killed in a motor-car accident. During the period under review, the Force had continued to carry out the tasks assigned to it, and arrangements had been made by the representatives of ICRC and UNEF officers for the transfer of 4,188 persons from Israeli-occupied territory to Egypt, and 1,309 persons from Egypt to Israeli-occupied territory under the family reunification and student exchange programmes.

(d) *Extension of the mandate of UNEF until  
24 July 1975*

(i) *Report of the Secretary-General dated  
12 April 1975*

287. In a report on UNEF covering the period from 13 October 1974 to 12 April 1975 (S/11670), submitted to the Security Council in connexion with the expiration of the mandate of the Force on 24 April 1975, the Secretary-General indicated that the troop strength of UNEF as of 12 April 1975 was 4,029 men, not including the Canadian and Polish logistic components detached to UNDOF, and described its deployment, rotation, accommodations and logistics. He stated that the activities, functions and guidelines of the Force, as well as the tasks assigned to it, had not changed and that the military situation in its area of operations had remained stable. The Force Commander, he reported, had continued to hold separate meetings with military representatives of both parties concerning its terms of reference and the inspections carried out in the areas of limited force and armaments. He pointed out that the problem of freedom of movement still existed with regard to certain contingents, despite his efforts and those of the Force Commander, and reiterated his opinion that the Force must function as an "integrated and equal military unit", that its contingents must serve on an equal basis under the command of the Force Commander and that no differentiation could be made regarding the United Nations status of various contingents. With regard to the implementation of the Agreement on the Disengagement of Forces, he indicated that no significant incidents had been observed but that overflights of the zone of disengagement had been made by both parties and penetrations into that zone and the buffer zone had been limited and minor. There had been also several cases of restriction of UNEF freedom of movement, as well as shooting in the areas of UNEF outposts and patrols. In each case, official protests had been lodged. The Force, however, continued to make every effort to maintain the integrity of the buffer zone.

288. Concerning humanitarian activities, the Secretary-General reported that during the period under review, 5,684 persons had passed from Israeli-occupied territory to Egypt and 2,165 from Egypt to Israeli-occupied territory under the family reunification and student exchange programmes. On 4 April, the Egyptian authorities had handed over 39 dead bodies of Israeli soldiers under UNEF auspices. The occasional discovery of bodies in the UNEF area had continued, with the remains of 14 soldiers having been found and handed over to the parties.

289. Concerning the financial aspects, the Secretary-General indicated that it had been possible to keep the rate of obligations and expenditures of the Force within the level of the appropriations authorized by the General Assembly and that he would continue to exert his best efforts to ensure that the Force functioned as economically as possible without impairing its efficiency.

290. In summary, the Secretary-General observed that the situation in the UNEF area of observation had remained quiet, that both parties had co-operated with UNEF and that there had been no significant incidents. He noted, however, that the situation as a whole remained fundamentally unstable, pending the conclusion of an over-all settlement. Whether it would be possible to maintain the prevailing quiet would depend on the prospects of maintaining progress in the search for a just and lasting settlement of the problem as called for by the Security Council. The Secretary-General expressed the opinion that the continued presence of UNEF was essential not only to maintain quiet in the Egypt-Israel sector but to provide an atmosphere conducive to further efforts towards the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and to assist if required in such efforts. In recommending, therefore, that the Security Council extend the mandate of UNEF, he pointed out that Egypt had indicated that, under the circumstances, it would not object to renewal of the mandate of the Force for an additional period of three months and that Israel had stated that it favoured a renewal period of no less than six months on the grounds that UNEF was an integral part of the Disengagement Agreement of 18 January 1974.

(ii) *Consideration at the 1821st meeting  
(17 April 1975)*

291. At the 1821st meeting on 17 April, the Security Council included the following item in its agenda without objection:

"The situation in the Middle East:

"Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Emergency Force (S/11670)."

The President of the Security Council invited the representatives of Egypt and Israel, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

292. The Council had before it a draft resolution (S/11675) which, the President stated, had been prepared in intensive consultations among all the members of the Security Council. It read as follows:

"*The Security Council,*

"*Recalling its resolutions 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973, 340 (1973) of 25 October 1973, 341 (1973) of 27 October 1973, 346 (1974) of 8 April 1974 and 362 (1974) of 23 October 1974,*

"*Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Emergency Force (S/11670),*

"*Having noted the developments in the situation in the Middle East,*

"*Expressing concern over the prevailing state of tension in the area,*

"*Decides:*

"(a) To call upon the parties concerned to implement immediately Security Council resolution 338 (1973);

"(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Emergency Force for a period of three months, that is, until 24 July 1975;

"(c) To request the Secretary-General to submit at the end of this period a report on the developments in the situation and the measures taken to implement Security Council resolution 338 (1973)."

293. As the members had agreed that the draft resolution should be put to the vote before statements were made, the Council proceeded to the voting.

**Decision:** *At the 1821st meeting, on 17 April 1975, the draft resolution (S/11675) was adopted by 13 votes to none as resolution 368 (1975). Two members (China and Iraq) did not participate in the vote.*

294. Following the vote, statements were made by the representatives of the USSR, the United States, Japan, Italy, the United Kingdom, China, Mauritania, Sweden, the United Republic of Tanzania, Iraq, Guyana, the Byelorussian SSR, Costa Rica, the United Republic of Cameroon, the President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of France and the representatives of Israel and Egypt. Statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of the USSR, Israel, China and Egypt.

## 2. THE OPERATIONS OF THE UNITED NATIONS DISENGAGEMENT OBSERVER FORCE IN THE ISRAEL-SYRIA SECTOR

### (a) *Reports of the Secretary-General issued between 18 June and 25 October 1974*

295. In further progress reports on UNDOF issued on 18 June (S/11310/Add.1), 27 June (S/11310/Add.2), 30 July (S/11310/Add.3) and 25 October (S/11310/Add.4), the Secretary-General informed the Council that since the signing of the Agreement on Disengagement, the military situation between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic had remained very calm and the Force had continued to carry out the tasks entrusted to it in supervision of the Agreement. By 18 June, the transfer of the Austrian and Peruvian contingents from UNEF to UNDOF had been practically completed (S/11310/Add.1), and the Force totalled 1,218 men. In his report of 27 June (S/11310/Add.2), the Secretary-General indicated that, on 25 June, the Force had completed the process of disengagement of forces between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic, in accordance with the time-table agreed to between the parties in Geneva, and that, on the evening of the same day, Syrian administration had been established in the specified area, which included the towns of Quneitra and Rafid and part of Mount Hermon. Between 25 and 27 June, 500 Syrian soldiers equipped with mine-clearing tanks had carried out mine-clearing operations under the close supervision of UNDOF observers. Delineation and marking of agreed lines was proceeding satisfactorily, and both sides had extended full co-operation, which had enabled the process of disengagement to be completed smoothly. However, that process had been marred by a serious accident on 25 June which caused the death of four Austrian soldiers when their vehicle ran over a mine on a road close to Mount Hermon. In that connexion, the report added, intensive measures had been taken by UNDOF to protect its soldiers from mine explosions.

296. In his progress report dated 30 July (S/11310/Add.3), the Secretary-General indicated that, as of 29 July, the strength of the Force was 1,191 men. The

presence of large and uncleared minefields within the area of separation presented a continuing hazard to the troops, and mine-clearing operations conducted by Syrian army units were far from complete. Negotiations were therefore under way for another large-scale mine-clearing operation in order to make the area safe for UNDOF personnel and for the civilian population. However, on 25 October (S/11310/Add.4), he reported that there had been no progress in those negotiations. In the meantime, the Force's own small mine-clearing unit was fully engaged in mine-clearing operations in areas near UNDOF positions.

297. Reviewing the activities of the Force in his further progress report of 25 October (S/11310/Add.4), the Secretary-General said that it had continued to implement the Agreement on Disengagement, carrying out regular bi-weekly as well as special inspections of the areas of limited armaments and forces, and receiving in the process the full co-operation of both parties. It had also received complaints from each party which had been investigated and reported to the party concerned. Furthermore, it had drawn the attention of the parties to violations it had itself observed, with a view to having corrective action taken. The task of marking the ground lines had been completed, but additional markers were being installed. On 29 July, an Austrian soldier had been seriously injured as a result of a mine accident on Mount Hermon and had been evacuated with the assistance of both parties. However, a helicopter which had been made available by the Syrian authorities to assist in his evacuation had crashed without causing injuries while attempting to land. The Interim Force Commander had convened a board of inquiry in connexion with the incident of 9 August in which a United Nations aircraft flying from Ismailia to Damascus had crashed as a result of anti-aircraft fire, killing all nine Canadians aboard. Efforts were being made in accordance with the Board's recommendations to work out procedures for avoiding the recurrence of such an incident.

298. In connexion with that crash, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, in a letter dated 9 August (S/11434), drew attention to a statement of the Syrian Civil Aviation Administration to the effect that during the course of an Israeli air force raid in southern Lebanon, when a formation had penetrated Syrian air space, contact had been lost with a United Nations plane in the same area. Subsequently, it had been discovered that the plane had crashed on Syrian territory, and Syrian rescue teams had rushed to the site. An investigation had been undertaken at once to determine the causes of the crash.

299. In a letter dated 12 August (S/11436), the representative of Israel protested Syria's effort to implicate Israel in the disaster for which Syria alone was responsible and declared that there had been no Israeli aerial activity in the area when the United Nations plane was shot down by Syrian armed forces.

300. In an addendum dated 9 July (S/11302/Add.3) to his report on UNDOF of 6 June, the Secretary-General recalled that the map showing the different phases of disengagement had been signed on 5 June 1974 by the military representatives of Israel and Syria at the meeting of the Military Working Group of the Geneva Peace Conference. The parties had subsequently agreed to the publication of that map and disengagement plan, reproductions of which were attached to the addendum.

(b) *Extension of the mandate of UNDOF until  
31 May 1975*

(i) *Report of the Secretary-General dated  
27 November 1974*

301. As the six-month mandate of UNDOF was due to expire on 30 November 1974, the Secretary-General submitted a comprehensive report on the operations of the Force from its inception on 3 June until 26 November (S/11563). During that period, UNDOF had co-operated with the parties in controlling the process of separation and disengagement of forces, which had been completed on 27 June, and had since been supervising the area of separation and inspecting the areas of limitation of armaments and forces. By these activities, UNDOF had contributed to the stabilization of the cease-fire called for in resolution 338 (1973). On 26 November, the report stated, the Force consisted of 1,224 men. The Secretary-General had been informed by the Peruvian Government of its intention to withdraw its contingent from UNDOF during the first half of 1975.

302. In connexion with the functions and guidelines of UNDOF as outlined in the Agreement on Disengagement and its Protocol, the Secretary-General indicated that discussions were underway at United Nations Headquarters between United Nations officials and officials of Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic, respectively, for the purpose of concluding agreements that would ensure the independent functioning of the Force in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council. Since its establishment, the Force, with the assistance of both parties, had overcome a number of difficulties in order to be in a position to carry out its tasks effectively. One remaining problem was that of restrictions on the freedom of movement and of some UNDOF personnel. On that matter, he had taken the position that UNDOF must function as an integrated and efficient military unit with the freedom of movement specified in the Protocol of the Disengagement Agreement, that its contingents must serve on an equal basis under the command of the Interim Force Commander and that no differentiation could be made regarding the United Nations status of various contingents. As in the case of UNEF, the matter was being actively pursued.

303. Regarding the activities of the Force, he indicated that UNDOF had assisted in the process of disengagement of forces in accordance with the agreed time-table. By carrying out on 26 and 27 June the inspection of the zones of limited armaments and forces, as well as the 25-kilometre zone, the implementation of the disengagement had been completed on schedule.

304. During the period under review, with the exception of three shooting incidents, the cease-fire had been maintained. A number of overflights by unidentified aircraft had been observed in the area of separation, and in that regard, both parties had been requested to observe the maximum restraint. The Force had continued to supervise the areas of separation and limitation of armaments and forces as provided for in the Agreement. There had been no progress in the negotiations to enable a large mine-clearing operation to be carried out, a problem he considered it important to resolve at an early date, as the return of civilians to the area of separation was being hampered by the presence of uncleared mines.

305. In connexion with the financial aspects of the Force, the Secretary-General recalled that, in his report on UNEF of 12 October (S/11536), he had estimated the total cost for a further six-month period of operations to be in the order of \$40 million, and that, in annex II of his report of 30 October to the General Assembly (A/9822), he had indicated the UNDOF share of that total cost to be approximately \$7.6 million.

306. In conclusion, the Secretary-General observed that, with the signing of the Agreement on Disengagement and the establishment of UNDOF, fighting between Israeli and Syrian forces had ended on 31 May and that, since then the situation in the Golan Heights had been quiet. Unlike previous peace-keeping forces, UNDOF had been set up for the purpose of supervising a specific Agreement, in accordance with the stipulations agreed to by the parties. It was specifically stated in the Agreement on Disengagement that it was not a peace agreement but a step towards a just and durable peace on the basis of Security Council resolution 338 (1973). He then warned that the situation would remain fundamentally unstable and potentially explosive so long as progress towards a settlement of the underlying problems was not achieved. Therefore, he considered that the continued operation of UNDOF was essential not only to maintain the prevailing quiet in the area but to assist any further efforts towards the establishment of a just and durable peace in the Middle East. Therefore, and in the light of discussions on the matter with the Governments concerned, he recommended that the Security Council extend the mandate of UNDOF for a further period of six months.

(ii) *Consideration at the 1809th meeting  
(29 November 1974)*

307. At its 1809th meeting on 29 November, the Security Council included the following item in its agenda without objection:

"The situation in the Middle East;

"Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (S/11563)."

308. At their request, the President invited the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The Secretary-General, in commenting on his report, stated that his recent visit to the area had left no doubt in his mind that all the Governments concerned were anxious to reach a settlement through negotiations. However, if progress were not made in the near future, tension would rise and the dangers of a new military confrontation would increase. The prolongation of the mandate of UNEF and, if the Council so decided, the extension of UNDOF were important factors in reducing tension in the area. However, those peace-keeping operations were not an end in themselves, and an indeterminate period could not be expected for the achievement of a settlement. He considered it vital that the next six months be used for redoubled efforts to reach political solutions and to that end had discussed with the three Governments the main aspects of the future negotiating process and the implementation of resolution 338 (1973).

309. The representative of Peru then introduced a draft resolution (S/11565) sponsored by Austria, Indonesia, Kenya, Mauritania, Peru and the United Republic of Cameroon. The draft resolution read as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Having considered the report of the Secretary-

General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (S/11563),

"Having noted the efforts made to establish a durable and just peace in the Middle East area and the developments in the situation in the area,

"Expressing concern over the prevailing state of tension in the area,

"Reaffirming that the two agreements on disengagement of forces are only a step towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973,

"Decides:

"(a) To call upon the parties concerned to implement immediately Security Council resolution 338 (1973);

"(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months;

"(c) That the Secretary-General will submit at the end of this period a report on the developments in the situation and the measures taken to implement resolution 338 (1973)."

**Decision:** *At the 1809th meeting, on 29 November 1974, the Security Council adopted the draft resolution (S/11565) by 13 votes to none as resolution 363 (1974). Two members (China and Iraq) did not participate in the vote.*

310. Following the vote, statements were made by the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic, Israel, the USSR, Mauritania, the United Republic of Cameroon, Austria, China, Indonesia, the United Kingdom, France, Iraq, Australia, the Byelorussian SSR, Kenya, Costa Rica and the President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of the United States.

(c) *Communications to the Council regarding the Agreement on Disengagement*

311. Between late July and November 1974, the Secretary-General received a number of communications from Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic in which each charged that the other had violated the provisions of the Agreement on Disengagement while claiming its own strict observance thereof.

312. In a letter dated 30 July (S/11395), the Syrian Arab Republic charged that, on 19 June, a detachment of Israeli forces had seized three Syrian citizens and stated that the operation had been witnessed by UNDOF. The Syrian Government asked the Secretary-General to intervene for their release and declared that measures should be taken to stop further breaches of the Agreement. In a letter dated 1 August (S/11406), Israel stated that the three persons mentioned had been detained on 16 June, when the area was under Israeli control, because of their active involvement in terror activities against Israel.

313. In a letter dated 5 August (S/11414), the Syrian Arab Republic charged that the Israeli air force had carried out several reconnaissance flights over the line of separation in violation of the Agreement. In a reply dated 8 August (S/11427), Israel denied the Syrian charges, noting that the procedure for lodging such complaints with UNDOF had not been followed, and added that Israel scrupulously observed the provisions of the Agreement. In a further letter dated 16 August (S/11455), the Syrian Arab Republic confirmed that its charges of 5 August had been submitted

to UNDOF in compliance with the Agreement and therefore it was clear that, in lodging its complaints, the Syrian Arab Republic had scrupulously observed the provisions of the Agreement on Disengagement.

314. In a letter dated 15 August (S/11451), the Syrian Arab Republic charged that, on 11 July, an Israeli patrol had crossed line A and ordered Syrian farm workers to evacuate the area. Furthermore, Israeli forces had established barriers, minefields, tank ditches and wire fences all along that line and were still occupying several posts east of the cease-fire line.

315. In a letter dated 16 August (S/11454), the Syrian Arab Republic complained that that morning Israeli forces had crossed the disengagement line and detained a Syrian citizen who was working as a civil guard. The incident, it added, had been witnessed by UNDOF. The Syrian Government requested the Secretary-General's intervention to secure the immediate release of the Syrian citizen. In a reply dated 19 August (S/11460), Israel rejected the Syrian complaints of 15 and 16 August, stating that a Syrian army sergeant dressed in mufti had crossed the disengagement line and had been detained on the Israeli side. The same incident was again referred to in a letter of 3 September (S/11483) from the Syrian Arab Republic which claimed that because of the presence of his parent on that line, the person in question, driven by emotion, had stepped towards the other and that they had met in the area of separation. Israel replied on 6 September (S/11497) that the person detained was a sergeant-major in the Syrian army who had crossed the separation line and had been captured on the Israeli side.

316. In a letter dated 3 September (S/11482), the Syrian Arab Republic stated that, on 22 August, an Israeli patrol had opened fire towards Syrian farmers irrigating their lands in the buffer zone and that a complaint on the incident had been submitted to UNDOF. The complaint was rejected as without foundation in a letter dated 6 September (S/11497) from Israel.

317. In a letter dated 11 September (S/11503), the Syrian Arab Republic reiterated its charges of violations by Israel of the Agreement on Disengagement in maintaining Israeli soldiers and vehicles in the areas between Lines A and A-1, the establishment of minefields, tank ditches and wire fences all along line A and the continued occupation by its forces of four posts east of the cease-fire line. Regarding Israel's allegations concerning artillery pieces, the Syrian Government stated that the number of pieces of artillery was identical to that stipulated in the Agreement and that mortars had not been mentioned in that Agreement. In a reply dated 16 September (S/11512), Israel again rejected the Syrian allegations and reiterated its claim that Syria was systematically, persistently and continuously violating the Agreement on Disengagement by maintaining artillery pieces over and above those permitted in the Agreement. In a letter dated 9 October (S/11534), the Syrian Arab Republic charged that, on 3 October, an Israeli bulldozer had crossed the Alpha line and started opening a road in the buffer zone under the protection of two armoured Israeli personnel carriers. In a reply dated 15 October (S/11538), Israel described the Syrian letter as another attempt by the Syrian Arab Republic to divert attention, by means of distortions and falsifications, from its own systematic and continuing violations of the Agreement on Disengagement.

318. In a letter dated 26 November (S/11561) the Syrian Arab Republic charged that, contrary to the Agreement on Disengagement, Israel was still keeping 51 tanks in the 10-kilometre zone in excess of the 75 tanks agreed upon and requested the Secretary-General to take the necessary measures to have those tanks withdrawn. In a reply dated 28 November (S/11564), Israel said that there was no foundation to the Syrian charge, as Israel was scrupulously observing the Agreement and did not maintain in the areas of limitation any tanks or other armaments in excess of those provided for in the Agreement.

(d) *Communications to the Council and reports of the Secretary-General issued between 10 January and 21 May 1975*

319. On 10 January 1975, the President of the Security Council issued a note (S/11595) in which, after recalling that the Secretary-General, in November 1974, had advised the Council of Peru's intention to withdraw its contingent from UNDOF during the first half of 1975, he stated that, on 18 December 1974, the Secretary-General had informed him that, at the request of the Government of Peru, he had agreed to release Brigadier-General Gonzalo Briceño Zavallos from his assignment as Interim Force Commander as of 15 December 1974 and that it was his intention to appoint, with the consent of the Council, a general officer from an appropriate Latin American country to succeed General Briceño. In the meantime, he had asked the Chief of Staff of UNDOF, Colonel Hannes Philipp of Austria, to act as officer-in-charge. On 8 January, the President of the Council, after consulting its members, had informed the Secretary-General that the Council had taken note of the intention of the Government of Peru to withdraw its contingent from UNDOF and would await a communication from the Secretary-General concerning which Latin American country would be able to replace the Peruvian contingent. On the same day, the President had informed the Secretary-General, after consultations with the members, that the Council had taken note of the Secretary-General's agreement to release General Briceño and had no objection to having Colonel Hannes Philipp of Austria carry out General Briceño's functions on a temporary basis. The Council was awaiting the Secretary-General's proposal to settle the question of the appointment of a Commander of UNDOF. The note indicated that the Chinese delegation dissociated itself from both matters.

320. In a further progress report on UNDOF dated 21 January (S/11563/Add.1), the Secretary-General indicated that the Force had continued to supervise the Agreement on Disengagement between Israeli and Syrian forces and the Protocol to that Agreement in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions. On 20 January, the strength of the Force was 1,202 men. The Interim Force Commander, Brigadier-General Gonzalo Briceño Zavallos, had relinquished his command on 15 December 1974 after having been recalled by his Government, and Colonel Hannes Philipp of Austria was the officer-in-charge of UNDOF until a new commander could be appointed.

321. In the same report, the Secretary-General said that some progress had been made regarding the issue of freedom of movement of the Force's personnel and that arrangements had been worked out to enable all personnel of UNDOF to enjoy the freedom of movement essential for the performance of their tasks. In

accordance with its mandate, the Force had continued to supervise the area of separation by means of static posts and mobile patrols. Unfortunately, there had been no progress in the clearing of the minefields in the area of separation, despite continuing efforts by General Siilasvuo with both parties. UNDOF had continued to receive complaints from the parties about failures to comply with the Agreement. The complaints had been investigated and the results reported to the party concerned, and the Force had continued to draw attention to violations it had itself observed. There had been a marked decrease in the number of overflights in the area of separation, and the Secretary-General expressed the hope that that trend would continue.

(e) *Extension of the mandate of UNDOF until 30 November 1975*

(i) *Report of the Secretary-General of 21 May 1975*

322. As the mandate of UNDOF was due to expire on 31 May, the Secretary-General issued a report on the Force on 21 May (S/11694) in order to provide the Security Council with an account of its activities during the period from 28 November 1974 to 21 May 1975. During that period, with the co-operation of both parties the Force had continued to carry out the tasks assigned to it and had been able to contribute to the maintenance of the cease-fire. As of 10 May, the strength of the Force totalled 1,198 men. After having discussed the deployment of the Force, its rotation, accommodations and logistics, the Secretary-General pointed out that its functions and guidelines had not changed, that it maintained close contact with the parties and that the Commander of UNEF had continued, as requested, to take part in high-level contacts concerning the functioning of the Force. With regard to the freedom of movement of the Force contingents, he indicated that arrangements worked out for that purpose fell short of what was required but that efforts were continuing to secure full acceptance of that principle.

323. As noted in previous reports, the continued existence of uncleared minefields within the area of separation constituted an ever present hazard to both UNDOF troops and the civilian population. He noted with regret that no progress had been made in the negotiations in that respect but that mine-clearing work in some areas had been carried out both by Syrian civilian authorities and by UNDOF mine-clearing teams.

324. The Force had continued to investigate complaints by the parties of alleged violations of the agreements and to draw the attention of the parties to violations it had itself observed, with a view to having corrective action taken. With regard to the financial aspects, the Secretary-General indicated that it had been thus far possible to keep the rate of obligations and expenditure of the Force within the level of the appropriations and authorizations provided by the General Assembly and expressed his belief that the cost for the contemplated extension would remain within that level of authorization.

325. The Secretary-General also reported that efforts had been made on several levels to advance the implementation of Security Council resolution 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973, and that in his contacts with the parties and with other Governments he had lost no opportunity to contribute to that process. Furthermore, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs had been sent to the area to make con-

tact with all the Governments concerned, as well as with the senior officers and officials of the United Nations operations in the area. The Secretary-General observed that in view of the current series of high-level meetings among those concerned, including the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East, it would be premature for him to comment further on the matter at that time.

326. In his concluding observations, the Secretary-General indicated that both parties had continued generally to comply with the Agreement on Disengagement. However, he cautioned that the prevailing quiet was a precarious one and reiterated that the Agreement on Disengagement was not a peace agreement but only a step towards a just and lasting peace on the basis of Security Council resolution 338 (1973). Until further progress could be made in that direction, the situation in the sector, and in the Middle East as a whole, would remain unstable and potentially dangerous. Therefore, the continued presence of UNDOF in the sector was essential not only to maintain quiet but to provide an atmosphere conducive to further efforts towards the achievement of a just and lasting peace. After indicating that he had been in contact with the Governments of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel, he stated that the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic had agreed to an extension of the mandate for a further period of six months and that the Government of Israel was also in favour of an extension for the same period. Therefore, he recommended that the Security Council extend the mandate of UNDOF for a further period of six months.

(ii) *Consideration at the 1822nd meeting  
(28 May 1975)*

327. At the 1822nd meeting on 28 May, the Security Council included the following item in its agenda without objection:

"The situation in the Middle East:

"Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (S/11694)."

328. The Council had before it a draft resolution (S/11700) which the President stated had been prepared in the course of consultations among all the members of the Security Council. It read as follows:

"*The Security Council,*

"*Having considered* the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (S/11694),

"*Having noted* the efforts made to establish a lasting and just peace in the Middle East area and the developments in the situation in the area,

"*Expressing concern* over the prevailing state of tension in the area,

"*Reaffirming* that the two agreements on disengagement of forces are only a step towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973,

"*Decides:*

"(a) To call upon the parties concerned to implement immediately Security Council resolution 338 (1973);

"(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months;

"(c) To request the Secretary-General to submit

at the end of this period a report on the developments in the situation and the measures taken to implement Security Council resolution 338 (1973)."

329. In accordance with the procedure agreed upon during consultations, the Council proceeded to vote on the draft resolution.

**Decision:** *At the 1822nd meeting, on 28 May 1975, the Security Council adopted the draft resolution (S/11700) by 13 votes to none as resolution 369 (1975). Two members (China and Iraq) did not participate in the vote.*

330. Following the vote, statements were made by the representatives of China, the United States, Japan, the United Republic of Cameroon, the United Kingdom, Italy, Iraq, Sweden, Mauritania, the USSR, Costa Rica, France, the Byelorussian SSR, the United Republic of Tanzania and by the President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of Guyana.

### 3. THE SITUATION IN THE ISRAEL-LEBANON SECTOR

#### (a) *Reports of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization*

331. During the period under review, the situation in the Israel-Lebanon sector continued to be the subject of reports on the status of the cease-fire in the sector submitted by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) and transmitted to the Security Council by the Secretary-General. From 15 June 1974 to 3 March 1975, the reports of the Chief of Staff covered developments a week at a time, assessing the rising or falling level of frequency of incidents, the number of incidents of firing across or of crossings of the armistice demarcation line, as reported by the UNTSO observation posts, the complaints submitted by the parties and the results of UNTSO investigations. Those weekly reports were issued in addenda to document S/11057, as were separate reports on individual incidents and complaints by the parties, when warranted.

332. The reports received between mid-June and 9 July (S/11057/Add.515-523) indicated ground and air activity consisting of mortar and artillery fire by Israeli forces across the armistice demarcation line, flights by Israeli jet aircraft over the territory of Lebanon, as well as attacks with bombs and rockets against targets, including refugee camps, inside Lebanon.

333. In the report dated 24 June (S/11057/Add.521), covering the period 17-23 June, the Chief of Staff of UNTSO indicated that the level of incidents had markedly increased on 18 and 20 June but had diminished as from the following day. He added, however, that the tension in the area had remained high during the period covered by that progress report.

334. In the reports issued later in July (S/11057/Add.524-528), the Chief of Staff indicated that the number of incidents in the sector had increased and the area remained tense. The incidents had involved mainly firing across the armistice demarcation line by Israeli forces and, occasionally, an exchange of fire between Israeli and unidentified forces. There had been also cases of crossing violations by Israel forces personnel, which had continued daily to occupy positions on the Lebanese side of the armistice demarcation line during daylight hours.

335. In a report dated 9 July (S/11057/Add.524), it was indicated that three unidentified warships had

been observed firing flares and naval guns at Lebanese territory. In complaints contained in that report, Lebanon charged that, on the night of 8/9 July, Israel marine forces had penetrated Lebanese territorial water at three ports, destroying several Lebanese fishing boats and injuring one Lebanese.

336. In a report dated 19 July (S/11057/Add.526), it was indicated that UNTSO military officers investigating a Lebanese complaint of 18 July concerning a penetration by Israel forces had confirmed the destruction of three houses in the village and had heard testimony of witnesses as to the abduction by those forces of the owners of two of the houses.

337. The reports of the Chief of Staff during the month of August (S/11057/Add.529-536) indicated that from 29 July to 11 August the level of incidents decreased slightly but the area remained tense following air attacks in Lebanon on 7 and 9 August. From 12 to 18 August, the number of ground incidents increased, owing to a greater number of Israeli machine-gun firings across the armistice demarcation line, but air activity decreased significantly, and the area was less tense. From 19 to 25 August, though ground activity decreased, overflights had increased, but there was generally less tension. From 26 August to 1 September, the number of ground incidents increased slightly, but tension remained low.

338. According to the reports submitted during the month of September (S/11057/Add.537-543), activity in the western sector increased between 1 and 4 September, and tension in the area continued high through 8 September, owing to Israeli mortar and machine-gun fire and overflights by jet aircraft and helicopters. From 9 to 15 September, ground activity decreased slightly and overflights remained at the same level, but tension increased following attacks by Israeli jets. From 16 to 22 September, there was a decrease in ground activity and overflights, but from 23 to 29 September such activity again increased, and tension was heightened by Israeli jet attacks on 24 and 25 September.

339. Reports relating to the month of October (S/11057/Add.544-547) indicated that ground and air activity remained at a high level from 30 September to 6 October, decreased from 7 to 13 October, increased slightly from 14 to 20 October and again from 21 to 27 October. In a separate addendum dated 31 October (S/11057/Add.548), the Chief of Staff of UNTSO reported that, on the night of 30 October, unidentified warships had been observed firing flares and naval guns into Lebanese territory.

340. During November, five periodic and four special reports (S/11057/Add.549-558) were issued. From 28 October to 3 November ground and air incidents decreased, but, on 4 November, Lebanon complained that Israeli forces had blown up a house in Lebanon and abducted its owner and two of his sons. From 4 to 10 November, ground activity increased, but air activity remained on about the same level as that of the previous week. On 12 and 14 November, Lebanon had submitted complaints to UNTSO concerning bomb rocket attacks by Israeli jet aircraft on several areas that had resulted in civilian casualties, Israeli forces penetrations of Lebanon during which houses had been destroyed and three Lebanese kidnapped, and artillery fire from Israeli territory that had caused death and injury to several people. From 11 to 17 November a marked increase in ground, naval and air activity was

reported, but from 18 to 24 November, such activity decreased noticeably, with no incidents at all being reported for 23 and 24 November. From 25 November to 1 December, however, all forms of military activity increased.

341. Reports from UNTSO during December (S/11057/Add.559-565) indicated a slight decrease in activity, mostly firing across the armistice demarcation line, from 2 to 8 December. On 12 December, the headquarters of the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission near Beirut had observed an attack by Israeli jet aircraft which, according to a subsequent Lebanese complaint, had been directed at refugee camps. A marked increase in tension attributed to heightened ground activity and the air attack near Beirut was reported for the period from 9 to 15 December. A Lebanese complaint submitted to UNTSO on 18 December concerned a helicopter incursion by Israeli forces, who blew up six houses and abducted four Lebanese. From 16 to 22 December, however a marked decrease in tension was reported, and, from 23 to 29 December, the number of incidents decreased to the lowest level since early July.

342. On 31 December 1974 and 1 January 1975, according to the reports submitted by UNTSO (S/11057/Add.566-567), there was increased ground activity and Lebanon submitted four complaints relating to injuries and damages caused by Israeli artillery fire and border penetrations which UNTSO investigated. During January, February and early March 1975, the Chief of Staff of UNTSO submitted eight periodic reports (S/11057/Add.568-576) on developments in the Israel-Lebanon sector. From 30 December 1974 to 5 January 1975, ground activity had at first increased markedly but decreased considerably after 3 January. From 6 to 11 January, activity remained at a low level but increased on 11 and 12 January. During the early part of the period from 13 to 19 January there was intense ground activity, consisting of artillery and mortar fire, but it decreased considerably after 16 January. From 20 to 26 January, activity decreased markedly and remained at a low level through 2 March.

343. Between 1 April and 5 June, the Chief of Staff submitted five reports (S/11663 and Add.1-4) on the status of the cease-fire in the sector. In the reports submitted on 1 April and 1 May (S/11663 and S/11663/Add.1), he indicated that, during March and April, military activity in the sector had remained at a low level. Israel forces personnel had continued the daily occupation during daylight hours of positions inside Lebanese territory, and several cases of firing across the armistice demarcation line and several crossing violations had occurred. He also reported overflights by Israeli jet aircraft, as well as by unidentified aircraft, in early March. Lebanon had lodged numerous complaints concerning such incidents and the penetration of Lebanese territorial waters by Israel naval vessels.

344. On 26 May (S/11663/Add.2), the Chief of Staff reported increased ground and air activity in the area on 24 and 25 May, including 84 overflights by Israeli jet aircraft. An Israeli force had been observed entering the Lebanese village of Aita Ech Chaab on the morning of 25 May and departing five hours later, during which time there had been an exchange of artillery and mortar fire. The parties had accepted a cease-fire proposed by the Chief of Staff of UNTSO. Lebanon

had lodged a complaint that Israeli forces had attacked a Lebanese outpost and killed seven soldiers. An inquiry conducted by UNTSO observers had confirmed that complaint.

345. In an additional special report dated 27 May (S/11663/Add.3) on the incidents of 25 May, the Chief of Staff of UNTSO stated that Lebanon had complained that Israel artillery fire and rockets and bombs from Israel jet aircraft had fallen on several Lebanese localities, wounding three soldiers and causing damage to material and cultivation. An inquiry conducted by UNTSO observers had confirmed the complaint in so far as damage to material and cultivation was concerned.

346. In a report dated 2 June (S/11663/Add.4), the Chief of Staff indicated that, except for the activity which had taken place on 25 May, the activity in the sector during the month of May had remained at a low level, with tension in the area rising in mid-May and again towards the end of the month.

(b) *Communications containing complaints by the parties*

347. During the period under review, the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council received several communications from Israel and Lebanon containing charges and countercharges of violations of the Armistice Agreement of 1949 and of United Nations resolutions.

348. In a letter dated 17 June (S/11320), Lebanon charged that Israel, in continuation of its acts of aggression against Lebanese territory, had penetrated Lebanese air space daily throughout the preceding month and had shelled and bombed towns and villages, causing 11 deaths and destruction among the civilian population. Lebanon charged that Israel was seeking to victimize Lebanon for harbouring 300,000 Palestinians on its soil and make it a scapegoat for acts committed by Palestinians operating from within Israel.

349. In letters dated 18 and 21 June (S/11321 and S/11324), Israel rejected the Lebanese charges and asserted that, under an agreement concluded in Cairo in 1969 between the Government of Lebanon and the terror organizations, Lebanon had facilitated the establishment on its territory by those organizations of a practically independent régime, contrary to its obligations under the Charter. Thus, it was from Lebanon that the terrorists set out on their murder missions in Israel and elsewhere. In support of its charges, Israel cited information media reports from Lebanon and around the world to indicate that Israel's actions had been aimed at bases used by terrorist organizations in Lebanon.

350. In a letter dated 25 June (S/11326), Israel charged that, on the previous night, terrorists who had come by boat from Lebanon had attacked a house in the coastal town of Naharia located about 10 kilometres south of the Lebanese border and that, in a subsequent clash with Israeli security forces, the three terrorists had been killed.

351. In a letter dated 10 July (S/11331), Israel reported that units of its naval forces had sunk about 10 boats in each of three harbours in southern Lebanon and that the Israeli commandos had left behind leaflets warning the population that they should not let terrorists operate from their fishing harbours and re-

calling that terrorists setting out from their harbours had conducted operations on the Israeli coast.

352. In a letter also dated 10 July (S/11332), Lebanon complained that, on 8 and 9 July, Israeli naval forces had attacked three ports in southern Lebanon, destroying 39 fishing boats. Those attacks, following assaults on Palestinian refugee camps between 18 and 20 June in which 73 persons had been killed and 159 wounded, could only serve to revive the cycle of violence in the area and were detrimental to the efforts for a peaceful settlement.

353. In a letter dated 9 August (S/11430), Israel charged that a three-man squad had infiltrated Israel from Lebanon on 6 August and kidnapped four workers, taking them to terrorist bases in Lebanese villages.

354. In letters dated 4 and 27 September (S/11487 and S/11520), Israel submitted further complaints regarding attempted penetrations of its coast and borders by terrorists coming from Lebanon on 9 August and on 3, 4 and 25 September, and charged that the Palestinian organizations in Lebanon had recently increased their activities and caused political instability in Lebanon. In further letters dated 15 and 26 November (S/11558 and S/11562), Israel complained of additional incidents of infiltration or firing across its frontier from Lebanon on 28 September, 1, 7, 28 and 29 October and 2, 8, 13, 17, 19 and 22 November.

355. In a letter dated 21 November (S/11560), Lebanon charged that its sovereignty had been violated on an almost daily basis by Israeli forces by air, land or sea or by a combination of those means. As a result, many peaceful civilians had been killed or wounded, much property had been destroyed, and the population of southern Lebanon lived in constant fear. The letter cited by way of example a number of incidents that had occurred between 18 July and 14 November.

356. During the month of December, Israel addressed to the Secretary-General six letters dated 2, 3, 9, 12, 16 and 19 December (S/11566, S/11567, S/11570, S/11571, S/11577 and S/11585) containing new charges of attacks on Israeli civilians by terrorists of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) coming from Lebanese territory or of firing on Israeli settlements from Lebanon. Israel stated that the news agency of PLO had published accounts of many of the cases cited, confirming PLO responsibility for the attacks.

357. In a letter dated 13 December (S/11572), Lebanon protested that, on 12 December, Israeli jets had attacked a Palestinian refugee camp near Beirut, wounding 10 persons, and that, on 13 December, Israeli artillery had shelled a town in southern Lebanon, wounding six.

358. In letters dated 2, 6, 17 and 22 January 1975 (S/11589, S/11591, S/11601 and S/11605), Israel continued to submit charges of attacks by PLO terrorists coming from Lebanese territory against the civilian population of Israel and of firing directed against Israeli territory from Lebanese border areas, where the Government appeared to have surrendered its authority to PLO.

359. In letters dated 4, 6 and 21 January (S/11590, S/11599 and S/11604), Lebanon listed alleged acts of

aggression committed against it between 12 December 1974 and 13 January 1975 which included penetration of Lebanese air space by Israeli warplanes breaking the sound barrier 61 times, 15 penetrations of Lebanese territorial waters by Israeli warships, 396 incidents of shelling or firing across the border and 12 frontier crossings by Israeli troops. Lebanon also charged that Israel, by means of heavy artillery and mortar shelling between 11 and 17 January, had almost demolished a village in southern Lebanon and transformed it into a deserted village.

360. In letters dated 6 and 10 March (S/11654 and S/11655), Israel presented detailed charges in connexion with an incident on the night of 5 March in which 11 civilians had been killed by PLO terrorists, who had come from Lebanon in a chartered boat and attacked a residential hotel, apartment houses and passers-by.

361. In a letter dated 14 May (S/11688), Lebanon complained that Israel had committed a series of aggressive actions in the period from 1 to 14 May, crossing the Lebanese frontier, flying over Lebanese territory with jet aircraft, penetrating Lebanese waters with a warship and kidnapping a number of civilians. Lebanon strongly protested those actions and called on the Security Council to note that they had been committed in defiance of Council resolutions warning Israel against such activity.

362. In a letter dated 14 May (S/11690), Israel charged that, in the preceding five weeks, more than 30 acts of aggression had been committed by Palestinian terror organizations from Lebanese territory against Israel and its citizens. It asserted that Lebanon's letter was another attempt to mislead public opinion with regard to a situation which the Government of Lebanon itself had created by refusing to enforce its sovereignty within its borders. It was common knowledge that PLO terrorist organizations were in virtual control of parts of Lebanon.

363. In a letter dated 20 May (S/11693), Lebanon charged that, on 17 May, a mortar shell fired by Israeli artillery had exploded and caused the deaths of nine children and injured three others. That tragic incident resulted from Israel's continual acts of aggression and demonstrated the difficulties endured by the innocent civilian population of Lebanon.

364. In letters dated 27 May and 6 June (S/11702 and S/11715), Israel complained of further attacks by PLO terrorists against Israel from Lebanese territory, charging that, on 26 and 27 May and 5 June, rockets had been fired at Israeli localities from terrorist positions in Lebanon, wounding one civilian and damaging residential houses. Israel held Lebanon responsible for the situation resulting from PLO domination over areas of Lebanese territory and would continue to exercise its international right and obligation to protect its citizens and territory against such attacks.

#### **B. Communications concerning other matters relating to the situation in the Middle East**

365. During the period under review, the Secretary-General received a number of other communications on the situation in the Middle East. They related to the situation in Jerusalem and its Holy Places, the situation in the occupied territories, terrorism and the treatment of prisoners of war.

366. In a letter dated 22 July 1974 (S/11360), Egypt charged that Israel was planning to connect all

Arab villages and quarters within the municipality of Jerusalem with the Israeli telephone network, an arrangement that would violate the relevant United Nations resolutions concerning measures and actions by Israel purporting to affect the character and status of Jerusalem. In a reply dated 26 July (S/11386), Israel stated that telephone connexions were being provided for the Arab villages at the express desire of their inhabitants.

367. By a letter dated 24 February 1975 (S/11639), the representative of Yemen, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab group, transmitted to the Secretary-General the text of resolutions adopted by the Moslem-Christian meeting on Jerusalem, held in Cairo on 16 January. In the resolutions, the meeting condemned Israeli measures aimed at changing the character of the Holy City and denounced the confiscation of Arab land by the occupation authorities, the evacuation of Arab inhabitants and the conduct of excavations that destroyed cultural property. It asked that the Security Council meet with a view to imposing appropriate sanctions against Israel under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and that the General Assembly freeze the membership of Israel at its forthcoming session, until the resolutions relating to Jerusalem had been implemented.

368. The sentencing by Israel of Archbishop Hilarion Capucci of Jerusalem was the subject of communications to the Security Council from Egypt and Israel.

369. In a letter dated 16 December (S/11578), the representative of Egypt transmitted to the Secretary-General the text of a statement made by his country's Foreign Minister, denouncing the 12-year sentence imposed on Archbishop Capucci by the Israeli occupation authorities. The Foreign Minister asserted that Israel had fabricated the charge against Archbishop Capucci while he was discharging his obligations towards his co-religionists. The Egyptian people, he added, saluted Archbishop Capucci as a living example of the struggle of free believers against repression, aggression and terrorism and called on the Governments of the world to protest that aggression against human rights.

370. In a reply dated 18 December (S/11581), Israel cited the court sentence indicating that the Archbishop had abused his ecclesiastical status and trust when he smuggled into Israel from Lebanon a large quantity of arms and sabotage material for the use of terrorist organizations. The letter termed the Egyptian Foreign Minister's statement an attempt to exploit the affair for propaganda purposes.

371. Several letters were addressed to the Secretary-General and circulated to the Security Council dealing with the situation in the occupied territories.

372. In a letter dated 1 July (S/11327), transmitting the text of a statement by an Israeli woman lawyer published in *The Times* of London on 17 June, the Syrian Arab Republic asserted that her statement provided proof that Israel violated fundamental rights in the occupied territories by imprisonment without trial, by torture and by failure to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949. The article indicated that the author was a member of the central committee of *Rakach*, the Israeli "New Communist" Party.

373. In a letter dated 10 July (S/11333), Israel stated that the Syrian letter and the article annexed to it reiterated the standard Arab propaganda distortions regarding the situation in the Israeli-administered territories. The Israeli letter contained the text of a reply to the article which had been written by the editor of the *Israel Yearbook on Human Rights* and chairman of the Israel national section of Amnesty International and published in *The Times* on 5 July.

374. In a letter dated 8 July (S/11330), the Syrian Arab Republic transmitted excerpts from an interview published in the United States magazine *Newsweek*, in which Israel's Prime Minister was quoted as having declared that Israel would never give up the Golan Heights and, with regard to Transjordan, would never return to the 1967 lines. The Syrian Arab Republic cited the interview as proof that Israel was violating the principles of the Charter and United Nations resolutions. In a second letter dated 13 August (S/11443), the Syrian Arab Republic charged that by recalling its reservists, mobilizing forces, building military roads and carrying out extensive military manoeuvres, Israel had continued to create an atmosphere of tension with a view to committing a new aggression and destroying the international efforts made for the establishment of a just peace in the area.

375. In a letter dated 15 August (S/11452), Israel replied that mobilization of reserves of the Israel Defence Forces was an exercise of a limited nature intended to test mobilization procedures and that an announcement to that effect had been transmitted to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force Commander in the area.

376. Following the signature of the Agreement on Disengagement between Israel and Syrian Forces on 31 May, the Secretary-General received a number of communications containing complaints concerning destruction in the city of Quneitra and other villages on Syrian territory in the Golan Heights formerly occupied by Israel.

377. In a letter dated 30 July (S/11396), the Syrian Arab Republic charged that during the implementation of the Agreement on Disengagement and before withdrawing, Israeli forces, using explosives and bulldozers, had destroyed Syrian villages, including the city of Quneitra, in violation of international law and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949. In a further letter dated 12 September (S/11506), the Syrian Arab Republic transmitted a report from the Directorate-General of Antiquities and Museums, charging that Israeli occupation authorities had destroyed and pillaged cultural property, including religious and historical buildings, as well as schools, mosques and churches. The Syrian Arab Republic charged that such actions were violations of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict of 14 May 1954, which both Israel and Syria had ratified.

378. In a letter dated 12 September (S/11507), the representative of Lebanon, as Chairman of the Arab group, transmitted the text of the "Quneitra Appeal", adopted on 5 September in Cairo by the Council of the League of Arab States concerning the destruction of Quneitra by Israeli forces before they withdrew. The appeal was addressed to the world public and to international organizations in order to

expose the acts committed by Israel in Quneitra during its occupation.

379. In a letter dated 13 September (S/11508), the representative of Algeria, in his capacity as Chairman of the group of non-aligned countries accredited to the United Nations, transmitted the text of a declaration adopted by the Co-ordinating Committee of the group, condemning the destruction by Israeli forces of the city of Quneitra and the village of Rafid, contrary to international law and international conventions.

380. In replies dated 2 August and 23 September (S/11408 and S/11516), Israel stated that it was a matter of common knowledge that the damage and destruction caused in front-line villages and in the town of Quneitra were the direct result of acts of aggression carried out by Syria in various periods since 1967, culminating in its war against Israel in 1973. Syria's claim that Quneitra had been destroyed on the eve of its evacuation by the Israeli forces was nothing but a propaganda fabrication, which had been reported and given verbal support in the communications from Lebanon and Algeria.

381. With regard to the question of an invitation by the General Assembly to the Palestine Liberation Organization, Israel warned, in a letter dated 4 October (S/11530), that such an invitation would be contrary to the Charter and the Assembly's rules of procedure and therefore illegal and not binding. Israel charged that the PLO objective was the destruction by armed force of a State Member of the United Nations, contrary to the Charter, and that PLO was thus totally different from movements for the liberation of subject peoples. The letter enclosed a list of alleged "principal crimes" perpetrated by PLO.

382. With regard to the question of the treatment of prisoners of war, the representative of Israel, in a letter dated 10 September (S/11502), transmitted a complaint lodged by his Government with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) against the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic concerning grave breaches of the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 committed against Israeli prisoners in the course of the Yom Kippur War and during the period of their captivity in Syria. In a letter dated 9 October (S/11533), the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic transmitted a statement made by his Government concerning the treatment of Syrian prisoners of war during their captivity in Israel and added that his Government had submitted an official complaint in that respect to ICRC.

383. By a letter dated 6 November (S/11554), the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic transmitted a document entitled "Israel and South Africa", describing the development of relations between 1967 and 1974, written by Peter Hellyer and previously issued as a document of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*.

384. In letters dated 16 and 20 January 1975 (S/11600 and S/11602), Israel charged that PLO terrorists had opened fire at an El Al Israel Airlines plane as it was about to take off from the Paris Orly Airport on 13 January. The terrorists had missed their target but had hit a Yugoslav airliner and injured several Yugoslav crew members and airport personnel. In a second incident in which an El Al plane was fired at, terrorists had thrown hand grenades at innocent people in the terminal and taken 10 bystanders hostage.

Such acts, for which PLO was responsible, endangered international civil aviation. Despite its disclaimers, PLO could not evade responsibility for those acts in view of the fact that it was the umbrella for all Arab terrorist groups. There could be no doubt that the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session in connexion with the question of Palestine had given encouragement to the campaign of murder carried out by PLO against Israeli and non-Israeli civilians.

385. In a letter dated 10 April (S/11669), Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had been advised by ICRC that, on 30 March, the Israel navy had seized an Egyptian fishing boat that had had mechanical trouble while on the high seas sailing from Port Said to Beirut and had towed it into the port of Ashdod. As of 10 April, Egypt had not received any information from ICRC regarding the release of the crew. Egypt further complained that, on 21 March, the Israel navy had stopped an Egyptian fishing boat sailing in the Red Sea and confiscated quantities of the fish on board and the personal belongings of the crew before permitting it to continue its voyage. Later, the same boat had been fired on by another Israeli boat when the fishermen had resisted arrest, and five Egyptian fishermen had been wounded. The fishing boat

had then been forced to proceed to the port of El Tor, where one of the fishermen had died from his wounds. The other four had been released after having been interrogated for four days. Such acts of piracy, Egypt stated, increased tension and endangered human life.

386. In a reply dated 21 April (S/11676), Israel stated that, on 29 March, its navy had given assistance to a Lebanese boat that had drifted close to the Israeli coast because of engine breakdown. The boat had been towed to Haifa for engine repair and had resumed its voyage with its crew to Lebanon on 16 April. The letter further stated that, on 21 March, an unidentified boat had entered Israeli-controlled waters in the Gulf of Suez. When the boat ignored orders to halt and warning shots and even tried to escape, the Israeli vessel had fired in its direction. Four members of the crew had been wounded and given medical care, but one of them had died from his wounds. Following an investigation, the vessel had been identified as an Egyptian fishing boat, and it had been released with its crew on 26 March. Israel charged that PLO regularly used boats in its attacks against Israeli civilians, as had been demonstrated by its attack against the Savoy Hotel in Tel Aviv. Under those circumstances Israel was obliged to take all the precautionary measures necessary to prevent attacks from the sea.

## Chapter 4

### THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA

#### A. Communications to the Security Council and request for a meeting

387. By a letter dated 26 September 1974 (S/11519), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa transmitted to the Secretary-General the text of a statement issued at Windhoek on 24 September by the Executive of the National Party of South West Africa, composed of the leaders of the white majority party in South West Africa that controlled all the seats in the White Legislative Assembly in the Territory. According to the statement, the Executive of the National Party had unanimously decided that it was opportune for the whites of South West Africa, acting in a more positive and practical manner, to undertake discussions with representatives of the other population groups of the Territory, particularly on South West Africa's future pattern of constitutional development. It was the Party's intention to approach the proposed consultations in a spirit of goodwill in terms of which standpoints would be weighed against each other and misconceptions eradicated, with the object of finding a solution which would, to the greatest possible extent, enjoy the support of the various population groups of South West Africa and ensure security and prosperity. The dispute over South West Africa, which had dragged on for almost three decades, was not in the interest of progress, and was to the disadvantage of all the people of South West Africa.

388. By a letter dated 1 October (S/11526), the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia transmitted to the Secretary-General the text of a statement issued in Lusaka on 26 September by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) concerning the proposed multiracial talks on the constitutional

future of Namibia. In it, SWAPO stated that the announced plan of the racist régime of South Africa to hold so-called multiracial talks on Namibia's constitutional future at that time was a well-calculated and deliberate political manoeuvre aimed at misleading world public opinion, entrenching Bantustans and eventually annexing Namibia to white-minority-ruled South Africa. Emphasizing that South Africa was currently illegally occupying Namibia, SWAPO cited General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and subsequent decisions of the United Nations, together with the 1971 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, which had declared that South Africa's presence in Namibia constituted a flagrant violation of international law. In conclusion, SWAPO expressed its determination to continue and intensify the armed national liberation struggle until freedom and genuine national independence under one central government had been achieved.

389. By a letter dated 23 October (S/11544), the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia transmitted the text of a statement adopted that day by that Council in which it categorically rejected the statement recently issued by the so-called Executive of the National Party of South West Africa, according to which that Party had decided to hold discussions on the constitutional development of Namibia with "representatives" of the other population groups. The Council charged that the statement was simply the continuation of a long-standing allegation that Namibia was not one country but consisted of various so-called population groups. The Council declared its full support of the statement issued by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) on the matter (S/11526). In the view of the United Nations Council

for Namibia, the road ahead for South Africa was clear: it must state in unequivocal terms that it accepted the decisions of the United Nations and respected the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 1971 and that it would immediately terminate its illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia.

390. In a letter dated 13 December (S/11575), the representative of Upper Volta referred to General Assembly resolution 3295 (XXIX) of 13 December 1974 and requested the President to convene, on behalf of the African group, a meeting of the Security Council at the earliest possible date to consider the question of Namibia.

391. By a letter dated 13 December (S/11576), the Secretary-General transmitted to the President of the Security Council the text of General Assembly resolution 3295 (XXIX), adopted on that date, and drew attention to section II, whereby the Assembly urged the Security Council to convene urgently in order to take effective measures without delay, in accordance with the relevant Chapters of the Charter and with the resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly regarding Namibia, to put an end to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia.

#### **B. Consideration at the 1811th and 1812th meetings (17 December 1974)**

392. At its 1811th meeting on 17 December, the Security Council adopted the following agenda without objection:

"The situation in Namibia:

"Letter dated 13 December 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Upper Volta to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11575)".

At the same meeting, the President, with the consent of the Council, invited the representatives of Morocco, Upper Volta, Nigeria and Somalia, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. Also at the same meeting, the President informed the Council of a letter dated 16 December from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, requesting that an invitation be extended to a delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia composed of its President (the representative of Guyana) and the representatives of India, Romania and Zambia. In accordance with previous practice, the President proposed that the Council extend an invitation, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to the President and the other members of the United Nations Council for Namibia. In the absence of objection, it was so decided. The President also drew the Council's attention to a letter dated 17 December (S/11580) from the representatives of Kenya, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon, requesting that an invitation, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, be extended to Mr. Peter Mueshahange of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). In the absence of objection, the Council decided to extend the invitation as requested.

393. The President then drew attention to a draft resolution before the Council (S/11579) sponsored by Kenya, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon. The draft resolution read as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Recalling General Assembly resolution 2145

(XXI) of 27 October 1966, by which the Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia, and resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, by which it established a United Nations Council for Namibia, as well as all subsequent General Assembly resolutions on Namibia, in particular resolution 3295 (XXIX) of 13 December 1974,

"Recalling Security Council resolutions 245 (1968) of 25 January 1968 and 246 (1968) of 14 March 1968, 264 (1969) of 20 March 1969 and 269 (1969) of 12 August 1969, 276 (1970) of 30 January 1970, 282 (1970) of 23 July 1970, 283 (1970) and 284 (1970) of 29 July 1970, 300 (1971) of 12 October 1971 and 301 (1971) of 20 October 1971 and 310 (1972) of 4 February 1972, which confirmed the General Assembly decisions,

"Recalling the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 that South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its presence from the Territory,

"Concerned about South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its persistent refusal to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice,

"Gravely concerned at South Africa's brutal repression of the Namibian people and its persistent violation of their human rights, as well as its efforts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia,

"1. *Condemns* the continued illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa;

"2. *Condemns* the illegal and arbitrary application by South Africa of racially discriminatory and repressive laws and practices in Namibia;

"3. *Demands* that South Africa make a solemn declaration that it will comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 in regard to Namibia and that it recognizes the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia as a nation, such declaration to be addressed to the Security Council;

"4. *Demands* that South Africa take the necessary steps to effect the withdrawal, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 264 (1969) and 269 (1969), of its illegal administration maintained in Namibia and to transfer power to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations;

"5. *Further demands* that South Africa, pending the transfer of power provided for in paragraph 4 above:

"(a) Comply fully, in spirit and in practice, with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

"(b) Release all Namibian political prisoners, including those imprisoned or detained in connexion with offences under so-called internal security laws, whether such Namibians have been charged or tried or are held without charge and whether held in Namibia or South Africa;

"(c) Abolish the application in Namibia of all racially discriminatory and politically repressive laws and practices, particularly Bantustans and homelands;

“(d) Accord unconditionally to all Namibians currently in exile for political reasons full facilities for return to their country without risk of arrest, detention, intimidation or imprisonment;

“6. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter and to meet on or before 30 May 1975 for the purpose of reviewing South Africa’s compliance with the terms of the present resolution and, in the event of non-compliance by South Africa, for the purpose of considering the appropriate measures to be taken under the Charter of the United Nations.”

394. The President said that, in the course of the consultations which had been held on the question prior to the meeting, the common wish had been expressed that the Council should proceed first to the vote on the draft resolution before hearing any statements.

**Decision:** *At the 1811th meeting, on 17 December 1974, the draft resolution (S/11579) was adopted unanimously as resolution 366 (1974).*

395. Following the voting, statements were made by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in accordance with the decision taken at the same meeting, and by the representatives of Upper Volta, Nigeria, Morocco and Somalia. Also, in accordance with the decision taken at the same meeting, a statement was made by Mr. Muesihange.

396. At the 1812th meeting, also held on 17 December, the Council heard statements by the representatives of Mauritania, the United Republic of Cameroon, China, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Indonesia, Costa Rica, France, Peru, Iraq, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Austria, the United States of America, Kenya and by the President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of Australia.

397. Statements in exercise of the right of reply were then made by the representatives of the USSR and the United Kingdom.

398. The President made a concluding statement.

### **C. Communications to the Security Council received between December 1974 and June 1975**

399. By a letter date 25 April 1975 (S/11709), the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia transmitted to the Security Council the text of a press statement issued by the Council for Namibia following its meeting on that date. In that statement, the Council for Namibia expressed shock and dismay over an incident that had taken place on 23 April in the black township of Katutura (Windhoek), when the South African police had opened fire on unarmed workers, killing one Namibian and seriously wounding 10 others. The Council for Namibia demanded the immediate and unconditional release of another 295 Africans arrested in connexion with the incident.

400. By a letter dated 27 May (S/11701), the representative of South Africa transmitted the text of a letter of the same date to the Secretary-General from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa in response to the telegram of 17 December 1974, by which the Secretary-General had transmitted to the Foreign Minister the text of Security Council resolution 366 (1974). Annexed to the letter were excerpts from a speech made at Windhoek by Prime Minister

Vorster on 20 May. In both the letter from the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister’s speech, it was stated that the basis of the South African Government’s approach to the question of South West Africa was that it was for the peoples of South West Africa themselves to determine their own political and constitutional future in accordance with their own freely expressed wishes, without interference from South Africa, the United Nations or any other outside entity. Both made the point that all options were therefore open to them—including that of independence as one State, if that was what they should choose—and that accordingly, any political group in the Territory was free to campaign for and propagate any constitutional changes that it liked and to participate without hindrance in any peaceable political activities within the requirements of law and order, including the election of representatives to the proposed conference on the constitutional future of the Territory.

401. With regard to the question of South Africa’s withdrawal from the Territory and arrangements for the transfer of power, South Africa would, in keeping with its policy, remain in and continue to administer the Territory only as long as the inhabitants so desired. It had repeatedly stated that it recognized the distinct international status of South West Africa and that it did not claim one inch of the Territory for itself. Its sole concern had been to develop the Territory in the best interests of all its inhabitants and to prepare them for the orderly exercise of their right of self-determination. The Foreign Minister charged that, despite his Government’s efforts to co-operate with the United Nations in finding an acceptable basis for negotiation on the issue of South West Africa, the attitude of the United Nations towards South Africa had become increasingly hostile and uncompromising and had culminated in the illegal suspension of its participation in the proceedings of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly. Nevertheless, although the South African Government was unable to accept United Nations supervision in respect of South West Africa, it remained prepared to negotiate with the Secretary-General’s personal representative or to welcome leaders of Africa, either personally or through their representatives, who might wish to visit South West Africa in order to acquaint themselves at first hand with conditions in the Territory. Furthermore, if the African Chairman of the United Nations Council for South West Africa and the Special Committee of the Organization of African Unity were interested in discussing the progress and developments in the Territory with the Prime Minister of South Africa, they were welcome to do so. The Prime Minister would, in that case, also be prepared to request the true leaders in the Territory to talk with them. On the other hand, should the Chairman and members of the Special Committee wish to receive those leaders in their own countries in order to obtain from them first-hand information on conditions and the progress of self-determination in the Territory, the South African Government would do all that it could to make such visits possible.

### **D. Consideration at the 1823rd to 1829th meetings (30 May–6 June 1975)**

402. At its 1823rd meeting on 30 May, the Security Council, without objection, adopted an agenda item reading “The situation in Namibia”.

403. It considered the item at seven meetings held between 30 May and 6 June.

404. In the course of the discussion, the representatives of Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cuba, Dahomey, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Liberia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, the United Arab Emirates, Yugoslavia and Zambia were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

405. At the 1823rd meeting, the President informed the Council of a letter dated 29 May from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, requesting that an invitation be extended to a delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia composed of its President (the representative of Zambia) and the representatives of Bangladesh, Colombia, Finland and Yugoslavia. In accordance with previous practice, the President proposed that the Council extend an invitation, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to the President and other members of the United Nations Council for Namibia. In the absence of objection, it was so decided. At the same meeting, the President also drew the Council's attention to a letter dated 30 May (S/11705) from the representatives of Mauritania, the United Republic of Cameroon and the United Republic of Tanzania, requesting that an invitation, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, be extended to Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and other members of his delegation. In the absence of objection, the Council decided to extend the invitation as requested.

406. The Security Council began its consideration of the item at its 1823rd meeting on 30 May and heard statements by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in accordance with the decision taken at the same meeting, and by the representatives of Somalia and Burundi. The Council also heard a statement by Mr. Nujoma, in accordance with the decision taken at the same meeting.

407. At the 1824th meeting on 2 June, statements were made by the representatives of Liberia, Zambia, Ghana, India and France.

408. At the 1825th meeting on 3 June, the Council heard statements by the representatives of Dahomey, Romania, Yugoslavia, China and the United States.

409. At the 1826th meeting on 4 June, statements were made by the representatives of Sierra Leone, Nigeria, the United Arab Emirates, Italy, the United Republic of Tanzania and Saudi Arabia.

410. At the 1827th meeting on 5 June, the President drew the Council's attention to a letter dated 4 June (S/11710) from the representatives of the United Republic of Cameroon and the United Republic of Tanzania, requesting that an invitation be extended, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, to the Reverend Canon Burgess Carr of the All-Africa Conference of Churches. In the absence of objection, the Council decided to extend the invitation as requested. It then continued its discussion with statements by the representatives of Bulgaria, Cuba, Japan and the USSR. The Council also heard a statement by the Reverend Canon Burgess Carr, in accordance with the decision taken at the same meeting.

411. The Council continued its consideration of the item at its 1828th meeting on 5 June with statements by the representatives of Senegal, Pakistan, the German Democratic Republic, Algeria, Sweden and Guyana.

412. At the 1829th meeting on 6 June, the President drew the Council's attention to a letter of the same date from the representatives of the United Republic of Cameroon and the United Republic of Tanzania (S/11712), requesting that an invitation, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, be extended to Mr. Abdul Minty of the Anti-Apartheid Movement of London. In the absence of objection, the Council decided to extend the invitation as requested.

413. At the same meeting, the President drew attention to a draft resolution (S/11713), sponsored by Guyana, Iraq, Mauritania, the United Republic of Cameroon and the United Republic of Tanzania, the text of which read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling* General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, by which the Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia, and resolution 2248 (S-V), of 19 May 1967, by which it established the United Nations Council for Namibia, as well as all subsequent resolutions on Namibia, in particular resolution 3295 (XXIX) of 13 December 1974,

*"Recalling* its resolutions 245 (1968) of 25 January 1968 and 246 (1968) of 14 March 1968, 264 (1969) of 20 March 1969 and 269 (1969) of 12 August 1969, 276 (1970) of 30 January 1970, 282 (1970) of 23 July 1970, 283 (1970) and 284 (1970) of 29 July 1970, 300 (1971) of 12 October 1971 and 301 (1971) of 20 October 1971, 310 (1972) of 4 February 1972 and 366 (1974) of 17 December 1974, which confirmed General Assembly decisions,

*"Recalling* the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 that South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its presence from the Territory,

*"Taking note* of the letter dated 27 May 1975, addressed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa to the Secretary-General (see S/11701),

*"Having heard* the statement by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia,

*"Having considered* the statement by Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization,

*"Gravely concerned* about South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its persistent refusal to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice,

*"Gravely concerned* at South Africa's brutal repression of the Namibian people and its persistent violations of their human rights, as well as its efforts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia,

*"Reaffirming* the inalienable and imprescriptible rights of the people of Namibia to self-determination, national independence and the preservation of their territorial integrity,

*"Noting with concern* that South Africa has not made the declaration demanded in paragraph 3 of resolution 366 (1974) of the Security Council,

*"Further noting with the deepest concern* that the demands in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the aforementioned resolution have been totally ignored by South Africa,

"1. *Condemns* South Africa's failure to comply with the terms of Security Council resolution 366 (1974);

"2. *Condemns once again* the continued illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa;

"3. *Further condemns* the illegal and arbitrary application by South Africa of racially discriminatory and repressive laws and practices in Namibia;

"4. *Demands* that South Africa put an end forthwith to its policy of Bantustans and the so-called homelands aimed at violating the national unity and the territorial integrity of Namibia;

"5. *Further demands* that South Africa proceed urgently with the necessary steps to withdraw from Namibia and, to that end, to implement the measures stipulated in resolution 366 (1974);

"6. *Reaffirms* the legal responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia and demands that South Africa take appropriate measures to enable the United Nations Council for Namibia to establish its presence in the Territory with a view to facilitating the transfer of power to the people of Namibia;

"7. *Declares* that, in order for the people of Namibia to determine freely their own future, it is imperative that free elections be organized under the supervision and control of the United Nations as soon as possible and, in any case, not later than 1 July 1976;

"8. *Affirms* its support for the struggle of the people of Namibia for self-determination and independence;

"9. *Acting* under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter:

"(a) Determines that the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security;

"(b) Decides that all States shall prevent:

"(i) Any supply of arms and ammunition to South Africa;

"(ii) Any supply of aircraft, vehicles and military equipment for use of the armed forces and paramilitary organizations of South Africa;

"(iii) Any supply of spare parts for arms, vehicles and military equipment used by the armed forces and paramilitary organization of South Africa;

"(iv) Any activities in their territories which promote or are calculated to promote the supply of arms, ammunition, military aircraft and military vehicles to South Africa and equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition in South Africa and Namibia;

"10. *Decides* that all States shall give effect to the decision set out in paragraph 9 (b) above, notwithstanding any contract entered into or licence

granted before the date of the present resolution, and that they notify the Secretary-General of the measures they have taken to comply with the aforementioned provision;

"11. *Decides* that the provisions of paragraph 9 (b) above shall remain in effect until it has been established, to the satisfaction of the Security Council, that the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa has been brought to an end;

"12. *Requests* the Secretary-General, for the purpose of the effective implementation of the present resolution, to arrange for the collection and systematic study of all available data concerning international trade in the items which should not be supplied to South Africa under paragraph 9 (b) above;

"13. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council concerning the implementation of paragraph 7 and other provisions of the present resolution;

"14. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter and to meet on or before 30 September 1975 for the purpose of reviewing South Africa's compliance with the terms of the relevant paragraphs of the present resolution and, in the event of non-compliance by South Africa, taking further appropriate measures under the Charter."

414. In the course of the discussion at the 1829th meeting, the Council heard statements by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United Republic of Cameroon (who introduced the draft resolution contained in document S/11713), the Byelorussian SSR, Costa Rica, Mauritania and by the President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of Iraq. The Council also heard a statement by Mr. Abdul S. Minty, in accordance with the decision taken at the 1829th meeting.

415. The representatives of China and Sweden made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

416. The Council then proceeded to vote on the draft resolution (S/11713) sponsored by Guyana, Iraq, Mauritania, the United Republic of Cameroon and the United Republic of Tanzania.

**Decision:** *The draft resolution (S/11713) received 10 votes in favour, 3 against (France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America) and 2 abstentions (Italy, Japan), and was not adopted, owing to the negative votes of three permanent members of the Council.*

417. Statements in explanation of vote were then made by the representatives of Japan, Italy, the United States, Guyana, France and the United Republic of Tanzania.

418. The representatives of the United Kingdom and the United Republic of Tanzania spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

419. The President of the Council made a statement.

## Part II

# OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE SECURITY COUNCIL

## Chapter 5

### ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

#### A. Application of Grenada

420. At its 1777th meeting on 17 June 1974, the Security Council considered the application of Grenada for admission to membership in the United Nations (S/11311) submitted on 30 May 1974. The President of the Council referred the application to the Committee on the Admission of New Members for examination and report, in accordance with rule 59 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council.

421. At its 1778th meeting on 21 June, the Council considered the report of the Committee on the application of Grenada (S/11322). In its report, the Committee recommended the adoption of the following draft resolution:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having examined the application of Grenada for admission to membership in the United Nations (S/11311),*

*"Recommends to the General Assembly that Grenada be admitted to membership in the United Nations."*

**Decision:** *At the 1778th meeting, on 21 June 1974, the Security Council adopted unanimously the draft resolution as resolution 352 (1974).*

#### B. Application of Guinea-Bissau

422. In a letter dated 16 July (S/11393), the Chief Commissioner of the Council of State Commissioners of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau submitted the application of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau for membership in the United Nations and declared that his Government accepted the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations and solemnly undertook to fulfil them.

423. Letters in support of the application of Guinea-Bissau were addressed to the President of the Security Council on 31 July by the representative of Swaziland on behalf of the African group (S/11407), on 7 August by the representative of Algeria on behalf of the group of Non-aligned Countries (S/11431), on 8 August by the representatives of the 20 Arab delegations to the United Nations (S/11426), on 8

August by the representative of Yemen on behalf of the Asian group (S/11432) and on 12 August by the representative of Brazil (S/11440). In a letter dated 11 August (S/11438), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal stated that Portugal had expressed its unequivocal willingness to recognize the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and that the Portuguese Government, in agreement with the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC), had addressed a request to all friendly and allied countries to proceed to the immediate recognition of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and facilitate its admission to the United Nations.

424. At the 1790th meeting on 8 August, the President of the Security Council referred the application of Guinea-Bissau to the Committee on the Admission of New Members for examination and report, in accordance with rule 59 of the Security Council's provisional rules of procedure.

425. At its 1791st meeting on 12 August, the Council considered the Committee's report on the application of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau (S/11437). In its report, the Committee recommended the adoption of the following draft resolution:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having examined the application of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau for admission to membership in the United Nations (S/11393),*

*"Recommends to the General Assembly that the Republic of Guinea-Bissau be admitted to membership in the United Nations."*

426. The Council decided to extend an invitation, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, to the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It also invited the representatives of Portugal, Algeria, Togo, Guinea, Yugoslavia, Somalia, Morocco and Cyprus, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

**Decision:** *At the 1971st meeting, on 12 August 1974, the Security Council adopted unanimously the draft resolution as resolution 356 (1974).*

## **Part III**

### **THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE**

#### *Chapter 6*

#### **WORK OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE**

427. The Military Staff Committee functioned continuously under the draft rules of procedure during the period under review and held a total of 26 meetings without considering matters of substance.

## Part IV

# MATTERS BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL BUT NOT DISCUSSED IN THE COUNCIL DURING THE PERIOD COVERED

### Chapter 7

#### REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA

428. By a letter dated 20 December 1974 (S/11588), the Secretary-General drew the attention of the Security Council to paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 3280 (XXIX) of 10 December 1974, in which the Assembly again urged effective measures by United Nations bodies, in particular the Security Council, to associate more closely with the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in all their work concerning Africa, especially the activities of the Council's Committee on sanctions.

429. On 9 January 1975, the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968 concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia submitted its seventh report (S/11594) covering its work during the period from 16 December 1973 to 15 December 1974. The Committee reported that it had held 45 meetings in that period, during which it had continued consideration of 71 cases of possible violations of sanctions carried over from previous reports and 54 new ones. The report contained an account of the actions taken by Governments to ensure implementation of sanctions and of the action taken by the Committee, by the Secretary-General and by States in implementation of the relevant provisions of Security Council resolution 333 (1973) of 22 May 1973. According to the report, the Committee had also considered matters relating to consular, sporting and other representation in Southern Rhodesia and representation of the illegal régime abroad, as well as the questions of airlines operating to and from Southern Rhodesia, immigration and tourism, and the measures taken to foster closer co-operation with OAU.

430. In conclusion, the Committee reported that it had unanimously agreed on the need to effect stricter observance of mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia during 1975, but that, owing to insufficiency of time, it had been unable to consider in detail specific conclusions and recommendations submitted by various delegations, which were circulated as annex I in an addendum to the report (S/11594/Add.1).

431. On 15 January, the Committee submitted a special report (S/11597) to the Security Council on external participation in the expansion of the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation (RISCO). According to information obtained from published sources, from documents and memoranda submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, from a memorandum submitted by the Research Group for

Inter-parliamentary Questions, Bonn, and from Governments in response to the Committee's inquiries, a consortium of 13 financial institutions and companies from Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Switzerland and Bermuda (a Territory for whose external relations the United Kingdom was responsible) had been collectively involved in a scheme, drawn up in 1972, for the expansion of steel production by RISCO from 400,000 to 1 million tons per year. The scheme, reported to have been at least partially completed, was estimated to cost \$R 63.5 million, of which \$R 42.5 million was to be derived from external sources. The Committee had taken the gravest view of the operation, which it characterized as a serious breakdown in the implementation of mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, in particular, of paragraphs 3 and 4 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). Accordingly, the Committee had considered it necessary to refer the matter to the Security Council.

432. The report included a summary of the information received and listed the conclusions reached and the recommendations adopted by the Committee after consideration of that information. The Committee had concluded that the type and content of the basic documentation that it had received on the case were the most comprehensive, detailed and technical ever presented to it, and there had been no reason to doubt the authenticity of that documentation. Consequently, the Committee recommended that the Council should call upon the Governments concerned to co-operate effectively and positively with it to provide detailed information on the investigations they had undertaken and to exercise special vigilance in the future, in particular, to ensure that no RISCO steel was imported into their territories; the Committee also recommended that the Security Council should invite it to keep the matter under review and to keep the Council informed.

433. In four annexes to the report on RISCO, the Committee listed a detailed account of the press reports it had received on the matter, a summary of the documents submitted by the United Kingdom, with a selection of the most important of those documents, the memorandum by the Research Group for Inter-parliamentary Questions, Bonn, and substantive parts of notes addressed to Governments and communications received from them.

434. By a letter dated 29 January (S/11614), the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council

the text of General Assembly resolution 3298 (XXIX) of 13 December 1974 concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, drawing particular attention to its paragraphs 6, 7 and 8, by which the General Assembly reaffirmed its conviction of the need to expand sanctions to include all the measures envisaged by Article 41 of the Charter, appealed to those permanent members of the Council concerned to reconsider their negative use of the veto, which frustrated the Committee's efforts with regard to that Territory, and called upon the Special Committee with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to follow the implementation of the resolution and invited continued co-operation between the Security Council Committee on sanctions and the Special Committee.

435. On 2 April, the Security Council Committee issued a second addendum to its seventh report (S/11594/Add.2), containing six annexes. Annexes II-V contained reports on new cases and correspondence conducted with Governments, non-governmental organi-

zations and individuals concerning all the cases considered. Annex VI contained further replies received from Governments, pursuant to implementation of paragraph 21 of the Committee's second special report as approved by the Security Council in resolution 333 (1973), relating to the discrepancies between the reported quantities of certain commodities imported from South Africa, Mozambique and Angola and the quantities reported to have been exported by those countries. Annex VIII contained a list of experts and relevant institutions drawn up by the Committee, as indicated in the Committee's sixth report (S/11178 and Rev.1, paras. 57-61)

436. On 7 May, the third addendum (S/11594/Add.3) to the seventh report of the Committee was issued. It contained Annex VII and reproduced a note and statistical data prepared by the Secretariat on Southern Rhodesian trade for the year 1973. According to the note, it appeared that some \$470 million of Southern Rhodesian exports had not been reflected in the corresponding 1973 figures of world trade.

### Chapter 8

## REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF RACE CONFLICT IN SOUTH AFRICA RESULTING FROM THE POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

437. By a letter dated 2 July 1974 (S/11328), the Chairman of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* transmitted for the attention of the Security Council a report adopted by the Special Committee on 26 June on the killing of two African mine workers and the wounding of five others by the police during a demonstration on 28 May 1974 at the Lorraine Gold Mine in South Africa. The Special Committee also reported having received information that four workers had been killed and six injured at the Harmony Gold Mines during the week-end of 8 and 9 June. The Committee recalled that on 31 May, during its special session in Europe, it had issued a statement condemning the killings as another crime by the South African régime in support of economic interests engaged in the brutal exploitation of African workers and calling for speedy action by the international community and Governments to sign and ratify the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*. The Special Committee expressed its grave concern over the repeated killing of African miners and declared that that development could no longer be viewed in isolation from the entire deteriorating situation in South Africa resulting from the inhumanity of the policy of *apartheid*.

438. By a letter dated 19 July (S/11383), the representative of South Africa transmitted to the Secretary-General a memorandum concerning the disturbances that had occurred at the Lorraine and Harmony Gold Mines on 28 May and 9 June. According to the memorandum, the riot at the Lorraine Gold Mine had started without warning when some 1,500 to 2,000 mine workers left their hostel and began throwing stones, smashing windows, setting fire to the beer hall and other buildings and ransacking the liquor stores. The South African police had been summoned by the management after mine officials had tried without suc-

cess to stop the rioting with tear gas. The following day, pay increases had been negotiated and the dispute thereby immediately settled. With respect to the riots at the Harmony Gold Mine, the memorandum stated that in the week prior to the riots, an across-the-board increase of 10 per cent had been granted to the workers. However, on 9 June, without any warning, riots had broken out and become uncontrollable. Efforts by the management to calm the rioters had failed, and the police had been summoned. After investigation of grievances the following day, an offer of a further increase in pay was made, which was accepted by the miners. In both cases, it appeared that had the management been approached about grievances through established channels, the riots and unfortunate deaths which resulted could have been avoided.

439. Mines in South Africa, the memorandum concluded, employed approximately half a million persons, of whom something less than 10 per cent were white and three quarters of the remainder voluntarily came to work from countries beyond South Africa's borders. It asserted that over many years those miners had not found the conditions of employment offered them so unattractive as to keep them away; on the contrary, South Africa had the problem of discouraging many thousands who sought to enter the country illegally. Moreover, it maintained that the rates of pay for underground workers in the mines had risen repeatedly and spectacularly as the price of gold on the free market had risen in recent years.

440. By a note dated 30 September (S/11522), the Secretary-General informed the Security Council that the Chairman of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* had addressed a letter to him on 27 September transmitting the report adopted unanimously by the Special Committee on that date, which was submitted to the General Assembly and the Security Council in accord-

ance with the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 2671 (XXV) of 8 December 1970 and 3151 (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973.<sup>5</sup>

441. By a letter dated 11 October (S/11537), the Chairman of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* transmitted for the attention of the Security Council the special report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* on violations of the Charter of the United Nations and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council by the South African régime (A/9780).

442. By a letter dated 19 December (S/11587), the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council resolution 3324 B (XXIX), adopted by the General Assembly on 16 December, entitled "Arms embargo against South Africa". The Secretary-General drew particular attention to the operative paragraph of the resolution, in which the General Assembly requested the Security Council urgently to resume consideration of the item entitled "The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa" with a view to taking action under Chapter VII of the Charter to ensure the complete cessation by all States of the supply of any arms, ammunition, military vehicles, spare parts thereof, and any other military equipment whatsoever to South Africa, as well as any military co-operation with South Africa.

<sup>5</sup> Circulated as *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 22 (A/9622)*.

443. By a letter dated 29 May 1975 (S/11708), the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, in accordance with a decision taken by the Special Committee on 27 May, transmitted for the information of the Security Council the Declaration and recommendations of the seminar on South Africa held at UNESCO headquarters in Paris between 28 April and 2 May 1975. The seminar had been organized by the Special Committee in pursuance of the request contained in paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 3324 D (XXIX) of 16 December 1974.

444. In the Declaration, it was specifically stated that the Security Council should:

(a) Meet urgently to adopt mandatory sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to ensure the complete cessation by all States of the supply and licensing for manufacture of any arms, ammunition, military vehicles, spare parts and any other military equipment;

(b) Take effective action against Governments that continued to violate the arms embargo or countries that assisted the South African régime to develop its military arsenal;

(c) Impose an effective economic and oil embargo on South Africa.

445. In its recommendations, the seminar called upon the Security Council to adopt urgently a mandatory arms embargo under Chapter VII of the Charter.

## Chapter 9

### COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN TERRITORIES UNDER PORTUGUESE ADMINISTRATION

446. By a note dated 6 August 1974 (S/11419), the Secretary-General communicated to the members of the General Assembly and of the Security Council the text of a memorandum dated 3 August which had been handed to him at the end of talks with the Government of Portugal. The memorandum elaborated the position of the Portuguese Government on the question of African Territories under its administration. That position included: a pledge of full co-operation with the United Nations in the implementation of the provisions of the Charter, of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and of relevant General Assembly resolutions; recognition of the right of self-determination and independence for all overseas Portuguese Territories and full support for the territorial unity and integrity of each; and statements of the plans of the Government of Portugal for arranging and implementing the independence of Guinea-Bissau, the Cape Verde Islands, Mozambique, Angola and São Tomé and Príncipe. The memorandum also expressed the hope of the Portuguese Government that the General Assembly would reconsider its previous decisions and enable Portugal to participate fully in the programmes and activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

## Chapter 10

### COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

447. By a letter dated 19 February 1975 (S/11598), the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania transmitted to the Secretary-General the text of an address delivered on 8 January by the President of the United Republic of Tanzania to the twenty-fourth session of the Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). In that address, the President

had stated that during 1974 the cause of freedom in Africa had made very important advances, as a result of which the liberation struggle in southern Africa had been completely transformed. Portuguese colonialism had been defeated, and the need to fight Portugal with arms no longer existed. Inevitably, therefore, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia must be given priority in the

effort to liberate the African continent. Whether the objective was achieved by peaceful means or by armed struggle depended not on the African nationalists but on the minority régimes.

448. With respect to Namibia, the African objective was the achievement of independence on the basis of majority rule for the whole of Namibia, in complete rejection of all plans for dividing it into Bantustans or making certain areas part of South Africa. With respect to Southern Rhodesia, its people, together with all Africa, also demanded independence on the basis of majority rule for Zimbabwe. No other basis was acceptable. Recent developments in southern Africa, including the release by the Smith régime of some of the African nationalist leaders and the discussions regarding the convening of a constitutional conference in the near future, could mean that the Government of South Africa and the ruling minority in Southern Rhodesia were beginning to take free Africa more seriously. Free Africa would prefer to have Rhodesia granted independence without any further delay; however, if Rhodesians agreed upon an interim period before independence that was a matter for themselves only: the one thing Africa was quite determined upon was that the transfer of power to the majority in Rhodesia must be completed before independence and prior to the lifting of the sanctions. The Liberation Committee of OAU had not finished its tasks, the President concluded; nor could the free States of Africa relax their efforts, inasmuch as colonialism and racism in Africa had not yet been defeated.

449. By a letter dated 19 February 1975 (S/11638), the representative of Liberia transmitted to the Secretary-General a message from the President of Liberia concerning the 24-hour visit to Liberia on 11 February of Prime Minister John Vorster of South Africa, accompanied by his Foreign Minister and a delegation of high-ranking officials, and their talks with him on matters relating to South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Namibia. In his statement, the President emphasized Liberia's opposition to: (a) the South African Government's policy of *apartheid*; (b) South Africa's refusal as Mandatory Power to grant independence to Namibia; and (c) South Africa's support and encouragement of colonialism and alien minority rule in

southern Africa. Nonetheless, he maintained his Government remained unrelenting in its efforts to help find a solution to the distressful situation in southern Africa based on mutual respect, justice, equality and human dignity. In order that he and his Government might be fully and accurately informed about the situation as it existed in South Africa and Namibia, Liberia had been host in January and February to the Chief Executive Councillor and leader of more than 4 million Zulus of South Africa and to the President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) both of whom had provided first-hand information. So that both sides might be heard, the Prime Minister of South Africa had also been received. The President of Liberia had discussed extensively with the Prime Minister the situation in South Africa and the need to find a solution to its problems.

450. By a letter dated 24 February (S/11641), the representative of Guinea transmitted the text of a telegram to the Secretary-General from the President of the Republic of Guinea concerning his Government's position with regard to *apartheid*. The President noted that since the establishment of OAU, African States and peoples had been firmly determined to put an end to the indignity and irresponsibility of foreign domination. Worse even than foreign domination, however, was *apartheid*, which disqualified a whole race by reducing Africans to the level of beasts and had been imposed on Africans by a fascist clique. Those, then, were two degrading factors whose final elimination was essential if both Africa and the modern world were to be rehabilitated. For the Government of Guinea, to speak of a dialogue with the supporters of *apartheid* was to add to the injury done to Africa by the racists that done by Africa to itself. No Government worthy of the African continent would abdicate its responsibilities to continue to give unconditional support to the struggle of the African peoples for the elimination of all the causes of the historical backwardness of Africa. The Government of Guinea believed that it was time for each African Government to reaffirm vigorously its fidelity to the African homeland and to OAU by rejecting all proposals for a dialogue with South Africa until such time as the indignity of *apartheid*, which dishonoured the African continent, had finally disappeared in the interests of Africa and universal progress.

## Chapter 11

### COMMUNICATION CONCERNING DEVELOPMENTS IN WESTERN SAHARA

451. By a letter dated 30 May 1975 (S/11707), the representative of Mauritania transmitted to the Secretary-General the text of a letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mauritania in connexion with a statement of the Spanish Government dated 23 May circulated in document A/10095.<sup>6</sup> The Government of Mauritania, it was stated, welcomed the intention expressed by the Spanish Government to decolonize the Mauritanian Territory of Sahara as quickly as possible, a logical step in the general process of liberation that coincided perfectly with the wishes of the Mauritanian Government and people. If carried out within the framework of the United Nations and in close consultation with the parties concerned, it would contribute to the maintenance of peace and stability in the area. If, on the other hand, it resulted from a unilateral decision taken by

<sup>6</sup> Further communications on the same subject were addressed to the Secretary-General on 27 May by the representative of Morocco (A/10097) and on 2 June by the representative of Spain (A/10104).

Spain in contempt of its responsibilities, confusion would result and peace and stability would be compromised. Therefore, Mauritania called on Spain to face up to its responsibilities under the decisions of the General Assembly and not according to a procedure imposed by itself. In any event, the statement concluded, Mauritania would take all necessary steps to safeguard its interests and its legitimate rights over Mauritanian Sahara.

## *Chapter 12*

### **COMMUNICATIONS FROM GREECE AND TURKEY CONCERNING DEVELOPMENTS IN THE AREA OF THE AEGEAN SEA**

452. During the months of March and April 1975, the representative of Greece addressed five letters to the Secretary-General dated, respectively, 24 and 27 March and 3 and 14 April, which were circulated in documents S/11660, S/11661, S/11665, S/11671 and S/11672.

453. In the first three letters, the representative of Greece charged that on 20 and 27 March and on 3 April Turkish war planes had repeatedly violated Greek air space over Greek islands in the Aegean Sea. The Greek Government had lodged strong protests with the Turkish Government, accompanied by a declaration that in case of repetition the Greek military authorities would have to take all measures provided for by international law in such cases. Such incidents, Greece maintained, might not only lead to a dangerous situation but could jeopardize all efforts to resolve the difficulties created by Turkey's policy of provocation.

454. On 8 April, the representative of Turkey addressed three letters to the Secretary-General (S/11666, S/11667 and S/11668) in reply to the above communications. In the first letter, the representative of Turkey cited a statement by the Defence Minister of Turkey to the effect that a careful and thorough investigation of the Greek allegations had established that they had been totally unfounded and that the Greek Government, after unilaterally militarizing the islands of the Aegean in contravention of relevant international treaties, was fabricating allegations to deny Turkish aircraft access to the Aegean and overflight of international waters. The Minister stressed that Turkish aircraft would continue to exercise over the Aegean the rights recognized by international law.

455. In his second letter, the representative of Turkey charged that on 22 March a Greek patrol boat

shadowing Turkish naval manoeuvres had violated Turkish territorial waters, and he warned that if such an act were to be repeated the military authorities of Turkey would be forced to take appropriate measures.

456. In his third letter, the representative of Turkey recalled that under article 14 of the Peace Treaty signed in Paris on 10 February 1947, the Dodecanese islands had been turned over to Greece on condition that they remain demilitarized. He charged that Greece had clearly contravened that provision by establishing troop concentrations and permanent military installations in those islands and modifying their airports for military use. The Government of Turkey considered those unlawful and unilateral actions by Greece as tending to compromise the balance in the Aegean, thus constituting a threat to the security of Turkey and increasing tension in the region. It was the earnest hope of Turkey that Greece would recognize her obligation to return the islands to their demilitarized status.

457. In a letter dated 14 April (S/11671), the representative of Greece transmitted a note from the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs addressed to the Turkish Embassy stating that an inquiry conducted by the competent Greek authorities had established that no violation of Turkish territorial waters could have taken place on 22 March, as the Greek vessel in question had not been in the area mentioned in the Turkish complaint. In a further letter (S/11672), the representative of Greece quoted a communiqué issued by the Greek Ministry of National Defence to the effect that no Greek island had any means of attacking Turkish territory. Any offensive action was unthinkable, and Greece had the power and the desire only to defend effectively any part of its continental or insular territory that might be attacked.

## *Chapter 13*

### **COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE COMPLAINT BY IRAQ CONCERNING INCIDENTS ON ITS FRONTIER WITH IRAN**

458. During the period under review, the President of the Security Council received a number of communications from Iran and Iraq containing charges and countercharges of acts of violence.

459. By a letter dated 25 June 1974 (S/11325), the representative of Iran referred to Iraq's letter of 14 June (S/11323) and stated that, contrary to the analysis given by Iraq, the Security Council consensus of 28 February 1974 had dealt with a situation of military confrontation that took place at that time and

not with the substance of the dispute between Iraq and Iran. Furthermore, Security Council resolution 348 (1974) of 28 May 1974 had not made any recommendation to the parties; it merely welcomed the bilateral step that had been taken by both of them.

460. In a letter dated 5 July (S/11329), the representative of Iraq replied that the decisions of the Security Council were very clear and unambiguous and that all efforts should be directed towards their implementation.

461. In a letter dated 27 August (S/11472), the representative of Iraq stated that, although his Government had expressed its sincerity by accepting Security Council resolution 348 (1974) and by taking the initiative to negotiate with Iran with a view to setting up an agenda for the consideration of the outstanding problems, the Iranian Government had continued to increase its troop concentration along the frontiers. In addition, on 22 August, Iranian air force fighters had violated Iraqi air space, and, on 23/24 August, Iranian armed forces, supported by mortars, had launched a premeditated attack on an Iraqi border post, during which one Iraqi guard was killed and several others were wounded.

462. In a letter dated 27 August (S/11476), the representative of Iran charged that Iraq was massing armed troops in ever greater strength along the Iranian border and that Iraqi armed elements had perpetrated a number of acts of hostility and provocation against Iran, details of which were set out in an annex to his letter. He added that notes of protest had been sent to the Iraqi Embassy in Teheran and that the Secretary-General had been informed personally and regularly of those incidents.

463. In a letter dated 3 September (S/11486), the representative of Iran rejected the charges contained in the Iraqi letter of 27 August and stated that Iraq was trying to divert attention from the movements of its armed forces towards Iran's borders. The Iraqi letter, he added, reported the death of one Iraqi but had not mentioned the Iranian civilians who had been the victims of Iraqi acts of aggression. The Iraqi authorities had also forgotten the problems that they had created for Iran as a result of the influx of over 72,000 Iraqi Kurds, who were fleeing to Iran from Iraq's military operations against them.

464. In a letter dated 4 September (S/11494), the representative of Iraq denied any violation on the part of Iraq and reiterated his charges against Iran. The Iraqi representative enclosed an annex containing details of incidents attributed to Iranian violations of Iraq's frontiers during the month of August.

465. In a letter dated 6 September (S/11498), the representative of Iran charged that on the same day four Iraqi military aircraft had violated Iran's air space, but had been forced back. Two of the aircraft had bombed an Iranian village, killing 15 civilians and injuring 3 others. He protested that a continuation of such acts could only lead to a highly dangerous situation.

466. In a letter dated 11 September (S/11504), the representative of Iran rejected charges made by

Iraq in its letter of 4 September, adding that Iraq was trying to convince the Security Council of its peaceful intentions while its troops were bombing Iranian villages and shelling Iranian posts. Iraq's habit of duplicity was exemplified by its misrepresentation of Security Council resolution 348 (1974) and its efforts to mislead the Council by misusing the Iraqi initiative for the Istanbul talks for propaganda purposes.

467. In a letter dated 20 September 1974 (S/11518), the representative of Iraq stated that although Iraq's territory had been the scene of almost daily violations by Iran, Iraq had informed the Iranian authorities of its readiness to establish a joint commission for the withdrawal of their respective troop concentrations from the border areas. The Iranian Government had not yet replied to Iraq's proposal.

468. In a reply dated 1 October (S/11527), the representative of Iran stated that Iraq's charges against Iran were unfounded, and added that Iraqi troops along the frontiers had stepped up their provocation and violation of Iranian territory.

469. In a letter dated 18 December (S/11582), the representative of Iraq stated that on 14 and 15 December, two Iraqi planes, flying at a high altitude within Iraqi air space, had been shot down by Iranian armed forces using United States-made missiles. In addition to previous acts of aggression that had been reported to the Security Council, Iranian forces on 29, 30 and 31 October had shelled Iraqi territory with heavy artillery. Ever since its unilateral abrogation of the Boundary Treaty of 1937, Iran, backed by the forces of imperialism, had resorted to acts of infringement, violation and encroachment against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq.

470. In a letter dated 18 December (S/11584), the representative of Iran stated that the Iraqi Government, in disregard of the provisions of the bilateral agreement reached between Iran and Iraq and reflected in Security Council resolution 348 (1974), had continued to pursue its policy of armed provocation against Iranian territory by various means. The latest violations had occurred on 14 and 15 December, when several Iraqi military aircraft had penetrated Iranian air space and Iranian anti-aircraft units had forced them to retreat, though two of the planes were reported to have been shot down. He added that Iran would not allow such actions to be taken with impunity and would hold Iraq responsible for the consequences.

## *Chapter 14*

### **COMMUNICATION CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF VIET-NAM**

471. By a note dated 1 April 1975 (S/11664), the Secretary-General circulated the text of a letter dated 27 March from the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Viet-Nam, to which was annexed a Declaration dated 24 March of his Ministry of Foreign Affairs concerning "the general offensive by communist North Viet-Nam". In the Declaration, it was charged that during the preceding three weeks North Viet-Nam had unleashed a general offensive throughout the territory of the Republic of Viet-Nam, which constituted another grave step in its process of sabotaging the Paris Agreement of 27 January 1973 on ending the war and restoring peace in Viet-Nam and the Geneva Agreements of 20 July 1954 on Viet-Nam.

## Chapter 15

### COMMUNICATION CONCERNING THE INDIA-PAKISTAN QUESTION

472. By a letter dated 24 February 1975 (S/11642), the representative of Pakistan transmitted to the President of the Security Council the text of a statement issued on the same date by the Prime Minister of Pakistan in response to an announcement of the Government of India dated 24 February regarding the agreement reached between the Prime Minister of India and Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah about certain political arrangements in Indian-occupied Jammu and Kashmir.

473. The statement emphasized that the exercise of the right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to self-determination had been specifically pledged to them by the United Nations and that both India and Pakistan had accepted the principle that the question of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan should be decided by its people through a free and impartial plebiscite. No agreement between the Government of India and one or more individuals in Jammu and Kashmir could resolve the issue concerning the status of the State or deprive its people of the exercise of their inherent right of self-determination in accordance with the United Nations resolutions accepted by both India and Pakistan. The Prime Minister of Pakistan had called on the people of Jammu and Kashmir, whether in the Indian-occupied part of the State or in Azad Kashmir, in Pakistan, or abroad, to protest against the agreement and to indicate their determination to continue the struggle for self-determination by observing a one-day *hartal* (strike) on 28 February, together with their brothers in Pakistan, who would join in observing the *hartal*.

## Chapter 16

### REPORT ON THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

474. The report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, covering the period from 23 June 1973 to 14 June 1974, was circulated as document S/11415 (*Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-ninth Year, Special Supplement No. 1*).

## Chapter 17

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CONCERNING AN INCIDENT IN THE GULF OF SIAM

475. In a letter dated 14 May 1975 (S/11689), addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the United States of America stated that a grave and dangerous situation had been brought about by the illegal and unprovoked seizure of the United States merchant vessel *S.S. Mayaguez* in international waters in the Gulf of Siam. The letter stated that on 12 May the unarmed commercial vessel had been fired on and halted by Cambodian gunboats and forcibly boarded while on the high seas. The United States Government had immediately taken steps to recover the vessel and arrange for the return of the crew through diplomatic channels. The letter asserted that, as no response had been forthcoming, the United States Government had taken certain appropriate measures under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations designed to achieve the release of the vessel and its crew.

## Chapter 18

### COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING BILATERAL RELATIONS BETWEEN MEMBER STATES

476. By a joint letter dated 8 August 1974 (S/11428), the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America

transmitted the text of a joint US-Soviet communiqué relating to the negotiations held from 27 June to 3 July 1974 between the President of the United States and

the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR.

477. In the communiqué, both sides noted with satisfaction that, since their summit meeting in May 1972, a fundamental turn towards peaceful relations and broad, mutually beneficial co-operation in the interests of the peoples of both countries and of all mankind had been brought about, and they emphasized the special importance of meetings of their leaders at the highest level, which were becoming established practice. They confirmed their mutual determination to continue actively to reshape United States-Soviet relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence and equal security and were convinced of the imperative necessity of making the process of improving their relations irreversible. Guided by those worthy goals, they had decided to continue their joint efforts in such important fields as removing the danger of war, particularly that involving nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction; limiting and eventually ending the arms race, especially in strategic weapons; contributing to the elimination of sources of international tension and military conflict, and strengthening and extending the process of relaxation of tensions throughout the world. After having thoroughly reviewed all aspects of the problem of limitation of strategic arms, they had concluded that a new agreement between them on the limitation of strategic arms should follow the Interim Agreement on offensive strategic weapons, as such a new agreement would serve not only their own interests but those of a further relaxation of international tensions and of world peace.

478. With regard to progress in the settlement of international problems, both sides proceeded from the assumption that such progress required active and purposeful efforts to overcome obstacles and resolve difficulties that remained from the past. With regard to Europe, they welcomed the major contribution which the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe was making and expressed their conviction that its successful completion would be an outstanding event in the establishment of a lasting peace. They therefore favoured the final stage of the Conference taking place at an early date and being concluded at the highest level. In the same context, they attached great importance to the negotiations on the mutual reduction of forces and armaments in central Europe and expressed the hope that those negotiations would result in concrete decisions ensuring the undiminished security of all parties and preventing unilateral military advantage.

479. With respect to the situation in the Middle East, both sides believed the removal of the danger of war and tension to be a task of paramount importance and urgency, and therefore the only course was the achievement of a just and lasting peace settlement on the basis of Security Council resolution 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973, which should take into account the legitimate interests of all peoples in the area, including the Palestinian people, and the right of all States in the area to existence. As Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Peace Conference, they considered it important that it resume its work as soon as possible, with the question of other participants from the area to be discussed at the Conference.

480. As for the situation in Indo-China, both sides noted certain further improvements in that situation and emphasized that peace and stability in the region could be preserved and strengthened only on the basis

of strict observance of the Paris Agreement of 27 January 1973 and the Act of the International Conference on Viet-Nam of 2 March 1973. They also noted progress in the normalization of the situation in Laos as a result of the formation of coalition governmental bodies and stressed the need for an early and just settlement of the problem of Cambodia based on respect for the sovereign rights of its people to free and independent development without outside interference.

481. Finally, the two sides expressed the great importance they attached to the United Nations as an instrument for maintaining peace and security and for the expansion of international co-operation and reiterated their intention to continue their efforts to increase the effectiveness of the Organization in every possible way, including its peace-keeping capabilities, on the basis of strict observance of the Charter.

482. By a joint letter dated 21 March 1975 (S/11659), the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland transmitted to the Secretary-General the text of a joint statement relating to the negotiations held from 13 to 17 February 1975 between the British Prime Minister and the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR.

483. The statement took note of the important and positive changes in Europe and in international relations as a whole in recent years, which had significantly improved the prospects for deepening détente in Europe. Anglo-Soviet negotiations had marked the opening of a new phase in their relations and would make a positive contribution towards consolidating international peace and security, especially in Europe. Both sides declared their adherence to the principles of peaceful coexistence. A Protocol on Consultations had been signed, the implementation of which would give a new impetus to the development of political co-operation between the two countries. Mutually beneficial economic links were also an important element in Anglo-Soviet relations, and two long-term programmes on economic and industrial co-operation and on scientific and technological co-operation had been signed. The Permanent Anglo-Soviet Inter-Governmental Commission for Co-operation in the Fields of Applied Science, Technology, Trade and Economic Relations was expected to promote further progress in the field of economic co-operation during its fourth meeting in Moscow in May 1975. Further efforts would be made to increase the volume of trade in both directions on the basis of mutual benefit, and agreement had been reached on credits for a five-year period. The two sides resolved to continue to promote scientific and technological co-operation and noted with satisfaction the extent of Anglo-Soviet co-operation in the field of nuclear energy. An Agreement on Co-operation in the Field of Medicine and Public Health had been signed, and further development of Anglo-Soviet co-operation in the fields of agriculture and protection of the environment was favoured. Cultural links between the two countries were also important, and an Anglo-Soviet round table of distinguished representatives of public life, science, culture, commerce, the press and other fields would be set up, with its first meeting to be held in Britain in 1975. Possibilities of extending bilateral contacts into other fields were reviewed, including an exchange of visits between representatives of the armed forces.

484. On international questions, both sides emphasized the importance of détente and peaceful co-operation throughout the world and expressed agreement with regard to certain international issues, such as the importance of Soviet-American agreements and understandings; the positive trends towards the establishment of co-operation and good relations in Europe and the important role of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe in that process; the importance of complementing measures of political détente with those of military détente; the necessity of achieving as soon as possible a just and lasting settlement in the Middle East on the basis of Security Council resolution 338 (1973); support for the principle of preserving the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and for the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations on Cyprus; strict observance of the Paris Agreements on ending the war and restoring peace in Viet-Nam and achieving national accord in Laos and Cambodia; support for the prohibition of biological, toxic and chemical weapons; the need to achieve general and complete disarmament and the contribution which the convocation of a world disarmament conference might make to that end; and the importance of the Conference on the Law of the Sea. The two sides had also signed a Declaration on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and, finally, declared their determination to work for the strengthening of the United Nations and their support for the work of the United Nations in promoting international détente and peaceful co-operation.

485. By a joint letter dated 29 April (S/11680), the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and Romania transmitted the text of the joint declaration signed on the occasion of the visit of the President of Romania to the Federal Republic of Germany from 26 to 30 June 1973.

486. In the declaration, the two States emphasized the contribution made by the expanding bilateral relations between them to the cause of peace and security in Europe and in the world and proclaimed their joint determination to expand their relations of friendship and co-operation in all areas of mutual interest. Their mutual relations and their relations with other States should be based on the principles of sovereignty, self-determination, equal rights, international co-operation, non-interference, non-threat or use of force against any other State, peaceful settlement of disputes and the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The two States also declared their joint determination to co-operate with other States with a view to strengthening the role of the United Nations in safeguarding the independence and sovereignty of all States, in consolidating international peace and security and in promoting inter-State co-operation in conformity with the principles and rules of international law.

487. In a letter dated 5 June (S/11721) addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of the USSR noted the reissue "for technical reasons" of document S/11680 and lodged a protest against the distorted translation into Russian of the name of the Federal Republic of Germany. The letter charged that that distortion had resulted from arbitrary action of certain members of the Secretariat and of the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations, contrary to the established international practice followed in translating that name into Russian, particularly in documents signed by leaders of the USSR and the Federal Republic of Germany, as well as in international agreements, including the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. The Permanent Mission of the USSR strongly objected to such attempts to change the existing procedure and insisted that steps be taken by the Secretary-General to prevent a recurrence of such cases.

## Chapter 19

### COMMUNICATION CONCERNING THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

488. By a joint letter dated 20 May 1975 (S/11697), the representatives of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics transmitted the text of the appeal to the parliaments of Europe, made at the twentieth anniversary meeting of the representatives of parliaments of States members of the Warsaw Treaty, held in Warsaw on 14 and 15 May.

489. The appeal, entitled "For peace, security, co-operation and closer relations among nations of Europe", cited the convening of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe as evidence of the trend towards détente and called for the development of co-operation between the parliaments of the European States, including the possibility of convening a conference of representatives of all European parliaments to discuss the problems of the peaceful development of Europe. It called also for military détente, the reduction in military confrontation between NATO and Warsaw Treaty States, and progress in talks on the limitation of armed forces and arms in central Europe

in accordance with the principle of not prejudicing the security of any one party to the talks and taking account of the security of all States in Europe. It supported the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of European States, the elimination of foreign military bases, the creation of nuclear-free zones and other measures intended to reduce arms and armed forces in Europe. The appeal reaffirmed the willingness of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty to dissolve the Warsaw Treaty Organization simultaneously with the dissolution of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and noted with concern that the forces of the "cold war" were striving to slow down the process of détente. The appeal called for concerted action to accelerate the successful conclusion of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe; to limit and halt the arms race and to hold constructive and effective talks on disarmament; to strengthen détente and to use peaceful means of settling international disputes; to develop economic, scientific, cultural and other links to bring the European peoples closer together; and to make Europe a continent of peace, friendship and co-operation.

COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTING RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TWENTY-NINTH SESSION

**A. Resolution 3280 (XXIX) on co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity**

490. In a letter dated 20 December 1974 (S/11588) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General stated that, at its 2312th plenary meeting on 10 December 1974, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 3280 (XXIX) entitled "Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity". The Secretary-General drew particular attention to paragraph 4 of the resolution, whereby the General Assembly had once again drawn the attention of United Nations bodies, in particular, the Security Council, to the need to take effective measures to associate more closely the Organization of African Unity regularly with all their work concerning Africa, including especially the activities of the Committee on sanctions of the Council.

**B. Resolution 3282 (XXIX) on strengthening the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security**

491. In a letter dated 20 January 1975 (S/11606) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General stated that, at its 2316th plenary meeting on 12 December 1974, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 3282 (XXIX), entitled "Strengthening of the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, the development of co-operation among all nations and the promotion of the rules of international law in relations between States". The Secretary-General drew particular attention to paragraph 4, by which the General Assembly had drawn the attention of the other principal organs of the United Nations to the views, suggestions and proposals of Member States contained in the relevant sections of the report of the Secretary-General, so that they might be taken into consideration in the process of improving the activities and functioning of those organs, and had also invited the latter to keep the General Assembly informed of that subject.

**C. Resolution 3283 (XXIX) on the peaceful settlement of international disputes**

492. By a letter dated 20 January (S/11607), the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council

the text of General Assembly resolution 3283 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, entitled "Peaceful settlement of international disputes". He drew particular attention to paragraph 5, by which the General Assembly had invited the attention of the Security Council to that resolution.

**D. Resolution 3314 (XXIX) on the definition of aggression**

493. In a letter dated 31 January (S/11613) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General stated that, at its 2319th plenary meeting on 14 December 1974, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 3314 (XXIX), entitled "Definition of Aggression". The Secretary-General drew particular attention to paragraph 4, by which the General Assembly had called the attention of the Security Council to the Definition of Aggression as set out in that resolution and recommended that the Council should take account of that Definition as guidance in determining, in accordance with the Charter, the existence of an act of aggression.

**E. Resolution 3333 (XXIX) on the question of Korea**

494. In a letter dated 18 March (S/11658) addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General stated that, at its 2322nd plenary meeting on 17 December 1974, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 3333 (XXIX), entitled "Question of Korea". The Secretary-General drew particular attention to paragraph 2, by which the General Assembly had expressed the hope that the Security Council, bearing in mind the need to ensure continued adherence to the Armistice Agreement and the full maintenance of peace and security in the area, would, in due course, give consideration, on consultation with the parties directly concerned, to those aspects of the Korean question which fell within its responsibilities, including the dissolution of the United Nations Command in conjunction with appropriate arrangements to maintain the Armistice Agreement, which was calculated to preserve peace and security in the Korean peninsula, pending negotiations and conciliation between the two Korean Governments leading to a lasting peace between them.

## *Chapter 21*

### **THE FORMAT OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL**

495. On 20 December 1974, the President of the Security Council issued a note (S/11586) regarding the format of the annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly submitted in accordance with Article 24, paragraph 3, of the Charter. The note stated that, on various occasions in 1972 and 1973, and again in 1974, members of the Security Council had exchanged views on the subject, and several suggestions had been put forward with a view to achieving a shorter and more concise report without changing its basic structure. At the 1805th meeting of the Council, held on 29 October 1974, a concrete proposal in that respect had been circulated to all members. The proposal specified that, henceforth, the report would not contain the usual summaries of statements.

496. The President's note stated that all members of the Council had now indicated their agreement with that proposal; consequently, the next annual report of the Security Council would be prepared accordingly.

## APPENDICES

### I. Membership of the Security Council during the years 1974 and 1975

1974	1975
Australia	Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic
Austria	China
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	Costa Rica
China	France
Costa Rica	Guyana
France	Iraq
Indonesia	Italy
Iraq	Japan
Kenya	Mauritania
Mauritania	Sweden
Peru	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	United Republic of Cameroon
United Republic of Cameroon	United Republic of Tanzania
United States of America	United States of America

### II. Representatives and deputy, alternate and acting representatives accredited to the Security Council

The following representatives and deputy, alternate and acting representatives served on the Security Council during the period covered by the present report

#### *Australia*<sup>a</sup>

Sir Laurence McIntyre  
Mr. A. Duncan Campbell  
Mr. H. C. Mott  
Mr. R. Douglas Sturkey  
Mr. R. Hugh Wyndham  
Mr. J. B. Campbell  
Mr. A. C. Kevin

#### *Austria*<sup>a</sup>

Mr. Peter Jankowitsch  
Mr. Wolfgang Wolte  
Mr. Georg J. Lennkh  
Mr. Alexander Christiani

#### *Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic*

Mr. Vitaly Stepanovich Smirnov  
Mr. Guerodot Gavrilovich Tchernouchtchenko  
Mr. Oleg Nikolaevich Pashkevich  
Mr. Boris V. Kudryavtsev

#### *China*

Mr. Huang Hua  
Mr. Chuang Yen  
Mr. Chou Nan  
Mr. Wu Miao-fa

#### *Costa Rica*

Mr. Gonzalo J. Facio  
Mr. Fernando Salazar Navarrete  
Mr. Fernando Del Castillo  
Mr. D. Bernal Vargas Saborio

<sup>a</sup> Term of office ended on 31 December 1974.

<sup>b</sup> Term of office began on 1 January 1975.

#### *France*

Mr. Louis de Guiringaud  
Mr. Jacques Lecompt  
Mr. Guy Scalabre  
Mr. André Travert  
Mr. Henri Servant

#### *Guyana*<sup>b</sup>

Mr. Shridath S. Ramphal  
Mr. Frederick Wills  
Mr. Rashleigh E. Jackson  
Mr. Miles Stoby  
Mr. Joseph A. Sanders  
Mr. Noel G. Sinclair

#### *Indonesia*<sup>b</sup>

Mr. Chaidir Anwar Sani  
Mr. Yoga Soegomo  
Mr. August Marpaung  
Mr. Raden Kusumasmoro  
Mr. Djoko Juwono  
Mr. Prayitno Singgih

#### *Iraq*

Mr. Abdul Karim Al-Shaikhly  
Mr. Wissam Zahawie  
Mr. Hisham Al-Khudhairi  
Mr. Riyadh Al-Qaysi  
Mr. Amer Salih Araim  
Mr. Sa'ad Nouri Al-Khayat

#### *Italy*<sup>b</sup>

Mr. Eugenio Plaja  
Mr. Alberto Cavaglieri  
Mr. Giovanni Migliuolo

*Japan*<sup>b</sup>

Mr. Shizuo Saito  
Mr. Masao Kanazawa  
Mr. Tadashi Ohtaka

*Kenya*<sup>a</sup>

Mr. Charles Gatere Maina  
Mr. Omar Ahmed Fakihi  
Mr. Japhet Gideon Kiti  
Mr. Ochieng Adala  
Mr. Peter Joseph Ndung'u  
Mr. Frank X. J. C. Njenga  
Mr. Donald Wacieni Kaniaru

*Mauritania*

Mr. Moulaye El Hassen  
Mr. Ismael Ould Mouloud  
Mr. Mamadou Kane  
Mr. Ahmed Ould Sid'Ahmed

*Peru*<sup>a</sup>

Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar  
Mr. Ricardo Walter Stubbs  
Mr. Alvaro de Soto

*Sweden*<sup>b</sup>

Mr. Olof Rydbeck  
Mr. Kaj Sundberg  
Mr. Rolf Ekéus  
Mr. Jan Ståhl

*Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

Mr. Yakov Aleksandrovich Malik

Mr. Vasily Stepanovich Safronchuk  
Mr. Richard Sergeevich Ovinnikov

*United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*

Mr. Ivor Richard  
Mr. K. D. Jamieson  
Mr. John Oscar Moreton  
Mr. J. Murray  
Mr. J. C. Thomas  
Mr. Henry Steel

*United Republic of Cameroon*

Mr. Michel Njiné  
Mr. Léopold Ferdinand Oyono  
Mr. Jacques-Roger Booh-Booh  
Mr. Ambroise Mvogo  
Mr. Johnson Ndimbie  
Mr. Souaibou Hayatou  
Mr. Gustave Hond  
Mr. Jean-Marc Mpay

*United Republic of Tanzania*<sup>b</sup>

Mr. John Malecela  
Mr. Salim A. Salim  
Mr. Sebastian Chale  
Mr. Paul Rupia

*United States of America*

Mr. John Scali  
Mr. W. Tapley Bennett, Jr.  
Mr. William E. Schaefele, Jr.  
Mr. John M. Howison

### III. Presidents of the Security Council

The following representatives served as President of the Security Council during the period covered by the present report

*Mauritania*

Mr. Moulaye El Hassen (16 to 30 June 1974)

*Peru*

Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar (1 to 31 July 1974)

*Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

Mr. Yakov Aleksandrovich Malik (1 to 31 August 1974)

*United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*

Mr. Ivor Richard (1 to 30 September 1974)

*United Republic of Cameroon*

Mr. Michel Njiné (1 to 31 October 1974)

*United States of America*

Mr. John Scali (1 to 30 November 1974)

*Australia*

Sir Laurence McIntyre (1 to 31 December 1974)

*Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic*

Mr. Guerodot Gavrilovich Tchernouchchenko  
(1 to 31 January 1975)

*China*

Mr. Huang Hua (1 to 28 February 1975)

*Costa Rica*

Mr. Gonzalo J. Facio  
Mr. Fernando Salazar Navarrete } (1 to 31 March 1975)

*France*

Mr. Louis de Guiringaud (1 to 30 April 1975)

*Guyana*

Mr. Shridath S. Ramphal  
Mr. Rashleigh E. Jackson } (1 to 31 May 1975)

*Iraq*

Mr. Abdul Karim Al-Shaikhly (1 to 15 June 1975)

### IV. Meetings of the Security Council during the period from 16 June 1974 to 15 June 1975

Meeting	Subject	Date	Meeting	Subject	Date
1777th	Admission of new Members: Application of Grenada	17 June 1974		for admission to membership in the United Nations (S/11311)	

<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Date</i>
1778th	Admission of new Members: (a) Application of Grenada for admission to membership in the United Nations (S/11311) (b) Report of the Committee on the Admission of New Members concerning the application of Grenada for admission to membership in the United Nations (S/11322)	21 June 1975		ident of the Security Council (S/11334) (b) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11335) (c) Letter dated 20 July 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11348) (d) Letter dated 28 July 1974 from the Acting Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11389)	
1779th	The situation in Cyprus: (a) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11334) (b) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11335)	16 July 1974	1787th	Ditto	29 July 1974
1780th	Ditto	19 July 1974	1788th	The situation in Cyprus: (a) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11334) (b) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11335) (c) Letter dated 20 July 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11348) (d) Letter dated 28 July 1974 from the Acting Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11389) (e) Letter dated 30 July 1974 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11398)	31 July 1974
1781st	The situation in Cyprus: (a) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11334) (b) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11335) (c) Letter dated 20 July 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11348)	20 July 1974			
1782nd	Ditto	22 July 1974			
1783rd	Ditto	23 July 1974			
1784th (private)	Ditto	24 July 1974			
1785th	Ditto	27 July 1974			
1786th	The situation in Cyprus: (a) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Secretary-General addressed to the Pres-	28 July 1974	1789th	Ditto	1 August 1974

<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Date</i>
1790th	Admission of new Members: Application of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau for admission to membership in the United Nations (S/11393)	8 August 1974		sentative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11445)	
1791st	Admission of new Members: (a) Application of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau for admission to membership in the United Nations (S/11393) (b) Report of the Committee on the Admission of New Members concerning the application of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau to membership in the United Nations (S/11437)	12 August 1974	1793rd	Ditto	15 August 1974
			1794th	Ditto	16 August 1974
			1795th	The situation in Cyprus: (a) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11334) (b) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11335) (c) Letter dated 20 July 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11348) (d) Letter dated 28 July 1974 from the Acting Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11389) (e) Letter dated 13 August 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11444) (f) Letter dated 13 August 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11445) (g) Letter dated 27 August 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11471)	30 August 1974
1792nd	The situation in Cyprus: (a) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11334) (b) Letter dated 16 July 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11335) (c) Letter dated 20 July 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11348) (d) Letter dated 28 July 1974 from the Acting Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11389) (e) Letter dated 13 August 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11444) (f) Letter dated 13 August 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11445)	14 August 1974			

<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Date</i>
1796th	Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa: (a) Letter dated 30 September 1974 from the President of the General Assembly addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11525) (b) Letter dated 9 October 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11532)	18 October 1974		addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11525) (b) Letter dated 9 October 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11532)	
1797th	Ditto	21 October 1974	1807th	Ditto	30 October 1974
1798th	Ditto	22 October 1974	1808th	Ditto	30 October 1974
1799th	The situation in the Middle East: Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Emergency Force (S/11536)	23 October 1974	1809th	The situation in the Middle East: Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (S/11563)	29 November 1974
1800th	Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa: (a) Letter dated 30 September 1974 from the President of the General Assembly addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11525) (b) Letter dated 9 October 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11532)	24 October 1974	1810th	The situation in Cyprus: Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (S/11568)	13 December 1974
1801st	Ditto	24 October 1974	1811th	The situation in Namibia: Letter dated 13 December 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Upper Volta to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11575)	17 December 1974
1802nd	Ditto	25 October 1974	1812th	Ditto	17 December 1974
1803rd	Ditto	25 October 1974	1813th	The situation in Cyprus: Letter dated 17 February 1975 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11625)	20 February 1975
1804th	Ditto	28 October 1974	1814th	Ditto	21 February 1975
1805th (private)	Consideration of the report of the Security Council to the General Assembly	29 October 1974	1815th	Ditto	24 February 1975
1806th	Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa: (a) Letter dated 30 September 1974 from the President of the General Assembly	29 October 1974	1816th	Ditto	25 February 1975
			1817th	Ditto	27 February 1975
			1818th	Ditto	4 March 1975
			1819th	Ditto	5 March 1975
			1820th	Ditto	12 March 1975
			1821st	The situation in the Middle East: Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Emergency Force (S/11670)	17 April 1975

<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Date</i>
1822nd	The situation in the Middle East: Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (S/11694)	28 May 1975	1826th	Ditto	4 June 1975
			1827th	Ditto	5 June 1975
			1828th	Ditto	5 June 1975
			1829th	Ditto	6 June 1975
1823rd	The situation in Namibia	30 May 1975	1830th	The situation in Cyprus: Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (S/11717)	13 June 1975
1824th	Ditto	2 June 1975			
1825th	Ditto	3 June 1975			

## V. Resolutions adopted by the Security Council during the period from 16 June 1974 to 15 June 1975

<i>Resolution No.</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>	<i>Subject</i>
352 (1974)	21 June 1974	Admission of new Members to the United Nations (Grenada)
353 (1974)	20 July 1974	The situation in Cyprus
354 (1974)	23 July 1974	The situation in Cyprus
355 (1974)	1 August 1974	The situation in Cyprus
356 (1974)	12 August 1974	Admission of new Members to the United Nations (Republic of Guinea-Bissau)
357 (1974)	14 August 1974	The situation in Cyprus
358 (1974)	15 August 1974	The situation in Cyprus
359 (1974)	15 August 1974	The situation in Cyprus
360 (1974)	16 August 1974	The situation in Cyprus
361 (1974)	30 August 1974	The situation in Cyprus
362 (1974)	23 October 1974	The situation in the Middle East
363 (1974)	29 November 1974	The situation in the Middle East
364 (1974)	13 December 1974	The situation in Cyprus
365 (1974)	13 December 1974	The situation in Cyprus
366 (1974)	17 December 1974	The situation in Namibia
367 (1975)	12 March 1975	The situation in Cyprus
368 (1975)	17 April 1975	The situation in the Middle East
369 (1975)	28 May 1975	The situation in the Middle East
370 (1975)	13 June 1975	The situation in Cyprus

## VI. Meetings of subsidiary bodies of the Security Council during the period from 16 June 1974 to 15 June 1975

### 1. Committee on the Admission of New Members

<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
45th	19 June 1974
46th	12 August 1974

### 2. Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia

<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
200th	20 June 1974
201st	27 June 1974
202nd	10 July 1974
203rd	7 August 1974
204th	21 August 1974
205th	28 August 1974
206th	4 September 1974
207th	12 September 1974
208th	19 September 1974
209th	26 September 1974
210th	2 October 1974
211th	10 October 1974
212th	17 October 1974
213th	6 November 1974
214th	13 November 1974

<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>
215th	20 November 1974
216th	27 November 1974
217th	4 December 1974
218th	10 December 1974
219th	18 December 1974
220th	19 December 1974
221st	20 December 1974
222nd	23 December 1974
223rd	27 December 1974
224th	30 December 1974
225th	30 December 1974
226th	31 December 1974
227th	31 December 1974
228th	13 February 1975
229th	13 March 1975
230th	20 March 1975
231st	27 March 1975
232nd	3 April 1975
233rd	10 April 1975
234th	24 April 1975
235th	30 April 1975
236th	8 May 1975
237th	15 May 1975
238th	22 May 1975
239th	29 May 1975
240th	12 June 1975

## VII. Representatives, Chairmen and Principal Secretaries of the Military Staff Committee

### A. REPRESENTATIVES

(16 June 1974 to 15 June 1975)

#### *Chinese delegation*

Mr. Lin Fang, Army representative and head of delegation	16 June 1974 to present
Mr. Chang Wu-tang, Air Force representative	16 June 1974 to present
Mr. Yang Ming-liang, Naval representative	16 June 1974 to present
Mr. Chi Shu-jang, Assistant to the head of delegation	16 June 1974 to present

#### *French delegation*

Major General E. de Grasset, French Army	16 June 1974 to present
Colonel M. J. Espieux, French Air Force	16 June 1974 to 11 July 1974
Lieutenant Colonel C. Cholin, French Air Force	11 July 1974 to present
Commander A. Sauvage, French Navy	16 June 1974 to present
Lieutenant Colonel R. F. Hervé, French Army	16 June 1974 to present
Lieutenant Colonel C. C. Courtet, French Army	16 June 1974 to present
Lieutenant Colonel J. L. Crespín, French Army	16 June 1974 to present

#### *USSR delegation*

Major General V. S. Tovma, USSR Armed Forces	16 June 1974 to present
Colonel V. I. Linkevitch, USSR Armed Forces	16 June 1974 to present
Lieutenant Colonel V. N. Chernyshev, USSR Armed Forces	18 December 1974 to present
Captain 3rd Rank A. P. Koval, USSR Armed Forces	16 June 1974 to present

#### *United Kingdom delegation*

Vice Admiral I. Easton, Royal Navy	16 June 1974 to present
Rear Admiral L. R. Bell-Davies, Royal Navy	16 June 1974 to present
Brigadier H. G. Woods, British Army	16 June 1974 to 14 March 1975
Brigadier A. L. Watson, British Army	14 March 1975 to present
Air Commodore W. Harbison, Royal Air Force	16 June 1974 to 18 February 1975
Air Commodore N. S. Howlett, Royal Air Force	18 February 1975 to present
Group Captain A. D. A. Honley, Royal Air Force	16 June 1974 to present
Captain K. C. D. Watson, Royal Navy	16 June 1974 to 25 October 1974
Captain W. E. B. Godsal, Royal Navy	25 October 1974 to present
Colonel D. A. Bayly, British Army	16 June 1974 to present
Colonel J. C. C. Richards, Royal Marines	16 June 1974 to September 1974
Colonel J. F. Mottram, Royal Marines	September 1974 to present
Squadron Leader P. J. Anstee, Royal Air Force	16 June 1974 to present

#### *United States delegation*

Lieutenant General D. H. Cowles, US Army	16 June 1974 to present
Vice Admiral J. P. Moorer, US Navy	16 June 1974 to present
Lieutenant General D. L. Crow, US Air Force	16 June 1974 to 1 August 1974
Lieutenant General M. L. Boswell, US Air Force	1 August 1974 to present
Colonel R. E. Sheridan, US Air Force	16 June 1974 to 9 June 1975
Colonel N. A. Gallagher, US Air Force	9 June 1975 to present
Colonel W. R. D. Jones, US Army	16 June 1974 to present
Commander E. J. Melanson, Jr., US Navy	16 June 1974 to 7 March 1975

### B. CHAIRMEN AND PRINCIPAL SECRETARIES AT MEETINGS

(16 June 1974 to 15 June 1975)

<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Chairman and Principal Secretary</i>	<i>Delegation</i>
757th	27 June 1974	Colonel J. C. C. Richards, Royal Marines Colonel D. A. Bayly, British Army	UK
758th	11 July 1974	Vice Admiral J. P. Moorer, US Navy Colonel R. E. Sheridan, US Air Force	USA

<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Chairman and Principal Secretary</i>	<i>Delegation</i>
759th	25 July 1974	Vice Admiral J. P. Moorer, US Navy Commander E. J. Melanson, Jr., US Navy	USA
760th	8 Aug. 1974	Mr. Chang Wu-tang, Air Force representative Mr. Chi Shu-jang, Assistant to the head of delegation	China
761st	22 Aug. 1974	Mr. Chang Wu-tang, Air Force representative Mr. Chi Shu-jang, Assistant to the head of delegation	China
762nd	5 Sept. 1974	Commander A. Sauvage, French Navy	France
763rd	19 Sept. 1974	Lieutenant Colonel C. Cholin, French Air Force	France
764th	3 Oct. 1974	Colonel V. I. Linkevitch, USSR Armed Forces Captain 3rd Rank A. P. Koval, USSR Armed Forces	USSR
765th	17 Oct. 1974	Colonel V. I. Linkevitch, USSR Armed Forces Captain 3rd Rank A. P. Koval, USSR Armed Forces	USSR
766th	31 Oct. 1974	Major General V. S. Tovma, USSR Armed Forces Captain 3rd Rank A. P. Koval, USSR Armed Forces	USSR
767th	14 Nov. 1974	Brigadier H. G. Woods, British Army Captain W. E. B. Godsal, Royal Navy	UK
768th	27 Nov. 1974	Rear Admiral L. R. Bell-Davies, Royal Navy Colonel D. A. Bayly, British Army	UK
769th	12 Dec. 1974	Colonel W. R. D. Jones, US Army Commander E. J. Melanson, Jr., US Navy	USA
770th	23 Dec. 1974	Vice Admiral J. P. Moorer, US Navy Colonel R. E. Sheridan, US Air Force	USA
771st	9 Jan. 1975	Mr. Lin Fang, Army representative and head of delegation Mr. Chi Shu-jang, Assistant to the head of delegation	China
772nd	23 Jan. 1975	Mr. Lin Fang, Army representative and head of delegation Mr. Chi Shu-jang, Assistant to the head of delegation	China
773rd	6 Feb. 1975	Major General E. de Grasset, French Army	France
774th	20 Feb. 1975	Lieutenant Colonel R. F. Hervé, French Army	France
775th	6 Mar. 1975	Major General V. S. Tovma, USSR Armed Forces Captain 3rd Rank A. P. Koval, USSR Armed Forces	USSR
776th	20 Mar. 1975	Colonel V. I. Linkevitch, USSR Armed Forces Captain 3rd Rank A. P. Koval, USSR Armed Forces	USSR
777th	3 Apr. 1975	Group Captain A. D. A. Honley, Royal Air Force Squadron Leader P. J. Anstee, Royal Air Force	UK
778th	17 Apr. 1975	Air Commodore N. S. Howlett, Royal Air Force Colonel J. F. Mottram, Royal Marines	UK
779th	1 May 1975	Colonel R. E. Sheridan, US Air Force	USA
780th	15 May 1975	Colonel R. E. Sheridan, US Air Force	USA
781st	29 May 1975	Lieutenant General M. L. Boswell, US Air Force Colonel W. R. D. Jones, US Army	USA
782nd	12 June 1975	Mr. Yang Ming-liang, Naval representative	China

### VIII. List of matters of which the Security Council is seized

The complete list of items of which the Security Council is seized, issued pursuant to rule 11 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, is published at the beginning of each calendar year. The list issued on 5 January 1974 was contained in document S/11185, and that issued on 7 January 1975 was contained in document S/11593.

A. As of 15 June 1975, the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized is as follows:

1. The Iranian question.
2. Special agreements under Article 43 of the Charter and the organization of the armed forces to be made available to the Security Council.
3. Rules of procedure of the Security Council.
4. Statute and rules of procedure of the Military Staff Committee.
5. The general regulation and reduction of armaments and information on the armed forces of the United Nations.
6. Appointment of a Governor for the Free Territory of Trieste.
7. The Egyptian question.
8. Voting procedure in the Security Council.
9. Reports on the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the resolution of the Security Council of 7 March 1949.
10. Admission of new Members.
11. The Palestine question.
12. The India-Pakistan question.
13. The Czechoslovak question.
14. The question of the Free Territory of Trieste.
15. The Hyderabad question.
16. Identical 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.
17. International control of atomic energy.
18. Complaint of armed invasions of Taiwan (Formosa).
19. Complaint of bombing by air forces of the territory of China.
20. 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.
21. 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.
22. Question of a request for investigation of alleged bacterial warfare.
23. Letter dated 29 May 1954 from the acting representative of Thailand to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.
24. Cablegram dated 19 June 1954 from the Minister of External Relations of Guatemala addressed to the President of the Security Council.
25. Letter dated 8 September 1954 from the representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council.
26. 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.
27. 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.
28. 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.
29. The situation in Hungary.
30. Military assistance rendered by the Egyptian Government to the rebels in Algeria.
31. Letter dated 30 October 1956 from the representative of Egypt addressed to the President of the Security Council.
32. 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".
33. 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 persons and property of French nationals".
34. Letter dated 20 February 1958 from the representative of the Sudan addressed to the Secretary-General.
35. Complaint of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics 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 with atomic and hydrogen bombs in the direction of the frontiers of the Soviet Union".
36. 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".
37. 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 33 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".
38. Report of 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. Letter dated 25 March 1960 from the representatives of Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, the Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Republic and Yemen addressed to the President of the Security Council.
40. 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.

41. Letter dated 23 May 1960 from the representatives of Argentina, Ceylon, Ecuador and Tunisia addressed to the President of the Security Council.
42. Letter dated 13 July 1960 from the Secretary-General of the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.
43. Letter dated 11 July 1960 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cuba addressed to the President of the Security Council.
44. Letter dated 31 December 1960 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Minister for External Affairs of Cuba.
45. Letter dated 20 February 1961 from the representative of Liberia addressed to the President of the Security Council.
46. Letter dated 26 May 1961 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, the Congo (Brazzaville), the Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, the Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, the Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab Republic, the Upper Volta, Yemen and Yugoslavia.
47. 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.
48. 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.
49. Letter dated 21 November 1961 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba addressed to the President of the Security Council.
50. 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.
51. Complaints by Senegal.
52. Telegram dated 5 May 1963 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Haiti to the President of the Security Council.
53. Reports of the Secretary-General to the Security Council concerning developments relating to Yemen.
54. Question concerning the situation in Territories under Portuguese administration.
55. The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa.
56. Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia.
57. Letter dated 10 January 1964 from the Permanent Representative of Panama addressed to the President of the Security Council.
58. 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.
59. Complaint concerning acts of aggression against the territory and civilian population of Cambodia.
60. Letter dated 4 August 1964 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council.
61. Letter dated 3 September 1964 from the Permanent Representative of Malaysia addressed to the President of the Security Council.
62. 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.
63. Letter dated 6 September 1964 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey addressed to the President of the Security Council.
64. Letter dated 1 December 1964 addressed to the President of the Security Council from the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cambodia, the Central African Republic, the Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Somalia, the Sudan, Uganda, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia.
65. Letter dated 9 December 1964 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the President of the Security Council.
66. Letter dated 1 May 1965 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council.
67. Letter dated 31 January 1966 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council.
68. Letter dated 2 August 1966 from the Deputy Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom addressed to the President of the Security Council.
69. Complaints by the Democratic Republic of the Congo.
70. The situation in the Middle East.
71. The situation in Namibia.
72. Letter dated 25 January 1968 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council.
73. Letter dated 21 May 1968 from the Permanent Representative, *a.i.*, of Haiti addressed to the President of the Security Council.
74. Letter dated 12 June 1968 from the Permanent Representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council.
75. Letter dated 21 August 1968 from the representatives of Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council.
76. Complaints by Zambia.
77. Letter dated 18 August 1969 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council.
78. Complaints by Guinea.
79. The question of initiating periodic meetings of the Security Council in accordance with Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Charter.
80. The situation created by increasing incidents involving the hijacking of commercial aircraft.
81. The situation in the India-Pakistan subcontinent.
82. Letter dated 3 December 1971 from the Permanent Representatives of Algeria, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Re-

public and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

83. Request of the Organization of African Unity concerning the holding of meetings of the Council in an African capital (operative paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 2863 (XXVI)).
84. Consideration of questions relating to Africa with which the Security Council is currently seized and implementation of its relevant resolutions.
85. Consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America in conformity with the provisions and principles of the Charter.
86. Complaint by Cuba.
87. Arrangements for the proposed Peace Conference on the Middle East.
88. Complaint by Iraq concerning incidents on its frontier with Iran.
89. The situation in Cyprus.
90. Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa.

B. Between 16 June 1974 and 15 June 1975, items 89 and 90 above were added to the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized and the following other alterations occurred:

(a) At its 1810th meeting on 13 December 1974, the Security Council, after discussing the item "The situation in Cyprus", decided, at the suggestion of the President, to have the former item entitled "Letter dated 26 December 1963 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the President of the Security Council" deleted from the list;

(b) Following a request from the Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations contained in a letter dated 19 December 1974 addressed to the Secretary-General, the Secretary-General, with the consent of the Security Council, removed from the list the item entitled "Letter dated 18 December 1961 from the Permanent Representative of Portugal addressed to the President of the Security Council";

(c) Following a request from the Permanent Representative of Bahrain to the United Nations contained in a letter dated 20 December 1974 to the Secretary-General, the Secretary-General, with the consent of the Council, removed from the list the item entitled "The question of Bahrain".

---

## كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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

---