

- J. Request to the Secretary-General to arrange with the parties for adoption of measures which would reduce existing tension along armistice lines.  
Palestine question :  
Decision of 4 April 1956 (S/3575), para. 3.
- K. Expression of concern over non-implementation of specific measures requested by the Security Council.  
Palestine question :  
Decision of 4 April 1956 (S/3575), preamble, para. 3.  
Decision of 4 June 1956 (S. 3605), preamble, para. 5.
- L. Noting assurances given by the parties unconditionally to observe cease fire.  
Palestine question :  
Decision of 4 June 1956 (S/3605), preamble, para. 3.
- M. Noting progress made toward the adoption of measures requested by the Security Council.  
Palestine question :  
Decision of 4 June 1956 (S/3605), preamble, para. 4.
- N. Endorsement of views of the Secretary-General :  
Palestine question :  
Decision of 4 June 1956 (S. 3605), para. 4.
- O. Invitation to the parties to co-operate with the President in examination of proposals for the settlement.  
India-Pakistan question :  
Decision of 21 February 1957 (S/3793), para. 2.
- P. Request to the Secretary-General and to the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan to render to the President such assistance as he might request.  
India-Pakistan question :  
Decision of 21 February 1957 (S/3793), para. 3.
- Q. Directive to the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Organization in Palestine to regulate activities within the zone between the armistice demarcation lines.  
Palestine question :  
Decision of 22 January 1958 (S, 3942), para. 1.
- R. Directive to the Chief of Staff to conduct survey of property records.  
Palestine question :  
Decision of 22 January 1958 (S/3942), para. 2.
- S. Noting of the intention of the Secretary-General to take up the situation for consideration.  
Palestine question :  
Decision : President's statement of 15 December 1958.
- VIII. Measures to ensure further consideration and to ascertain compliance**
- A. Request for information on the progress of settlement.  
1. From the Secretary-General.
- Palestine question :  
Decision of 4 April 1956 (S/3575), para. 5.  
Decision of 4 June 1956 (S/3605), para. 7.
2. From the subsidiary organs.  
(i) Palestine question :  
Decision of 19 January 1956 (S/3538), para. 7.  
Decision of 4 June 1956 (S/3605), para. 5.  
Decision : President's statement of 28 May 1957.  
Decision : President's statement of 6 September 1957.  
Decision of 22 January 1958 (S/3942), para. 7.  
(ii) India-Pakistan question :  
Decision of 2 December 1957 (S/3922), para. 4.  
(iii) Lebanon question :  
Decision of 11 June 1958 (S/4023), operative para. 3.
3. From the President.  
India-Pakistan question :  
Decision of 21 February 1957 (S/3793), para. 1.
- B. Provision by express decision to consider the matter further.  
India-Pakistan question :  
Decision of 24 January 1957 (S/3779), para. 4.
- C. Statement by the President that the Council would remain seized of the question.  
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 :  
Decision : President's statement of 21 May 1957.
- IX. Measures in connexion with the inability of the Security Council to exercise its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security**
- A. Convocation of an emergency special session of the General Assembly under the provisions of General Assembly resolution 377 (V) of 3 November 1950.  
(i) Letter dated 30 October 1956 from the representative of Egypt addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/3712) :  
Decision of 31 October 1956 (S/3721).  
(ii) The situation in Hungary :  
Decision of 4 November 1956 (S/3733).  
(iii) Lebanon question :  
Decision of 7 August 1958 (S/4083).

## Part II

### THE PALESTINE QUESTION

*Decision of 19 January 1956 (715th meeting) :*

- (i) *Condemning the attack of 11 December 1955 by Israel armed forces in the area east of Lake Tiberias as a flagrant violation of the cease-fire provisions of the Security Council resolution of 15 July 1948, of the terms of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria, and of Israel's obligation under the Charter ;*

- (ii) *Calling upon Israel to comply with its obligations in the future, in default of which the Council would consider further measures under the Charter to maintain or restore peace ;*
- (iii) *Calling upon the parties to comply with their obligations under the General Armistice Agreement, and requesting the Chief of Staff to pursue his suggestions for improving the situation in the area ;*

- (iv) *Calling upon the parties to arrange with the Chief of Staff for an immediate exchange of all military prisoners, and to co-operate with the Chief of Staff in this and all other respects, to carry out the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement in good faith, and in particular to make full use of the Mixed Armistice Commission's machinery in the interpretation and application of its provisions*

By letter<sup>1</sup> dated 13 December 1955, the permanent representative of Syria informed the President of the Security Council that, on the night of 11-12 December 1955, Israel armed forces had launched a concentrated large-scale attack along the whole area lying to the east of Lake Tiberias. After a fierce fight, they had occupied four observation posts parallel to the eastern shores of Lake Tiberias and lying on Syrian territory. As a result of the planned attack, five officers, thirty-two soldiers, and twelve civilians, including three women, had been killed; eight other soldiers had been wounded and thirty taken prisoner. In the course of the attack, a large number of houses belonging to Syrian villages had been destroyed and the occupants killed under the debris. The whole series of attacks constituted a most flagrant violation of the Syrian-Israel General Armistice Agreement and an act of open aggression and provocation. Accordingly, Syria requested the Security Council to meet as soon as possible to take the measures necessary to meet that serious situation.

At the 707th meeting of the Security Council on 16 December 1955, the provisional agenda<sup>2</sup> listed under the general heading, "The Palestine question":

"Letter dated 13 December 1955 from the representative of Syria addressed to the President of the Security Council."

The agenda was adopted<sup>3</sup> and the Security Council considered the question at its 707th, 709th, 710th, 711th, 712th, 713th, 714th and 715th meetings between 16 December 1955 and 19 January 1956. The representatives of Israel and Syria were invited to take part in the discussions.

At the 709th meeting on 22 December 1955, the Council had before it a report<sup>4</sup> dated 15 December 1955 from the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization concerning the incidents in the area east of Lake Tiberias. In a supplementary report<sup>5</sup> dated 30 December 1955, the Chief of Staff dealt with additional evidence regarding the Lake Tiberias incidents.

At the same meeting, the representative of Syria submitted a draft resolution<sup>6</sup> under which the Security

Council would have: (1) condemned Israel for the attack carried out by its military forces on 12 December 1955; (2) decided that this action was a violation of the resolution of 15 July 1948, the Syrian-Israel Armistice Agreement and Israel's obligations under the Charter; (3) decided that the armed attack constituted an aggression under the provisions of Article 39 of the Charter; (4) called upon the Members of the United Nations to adopt the necessary measures for applying economic sanctions against Israel; (5) decided to expel Israel from the United Nations under Article 6 of the Charter for persistent violation of the Charter; (6) decided that Israel should pay adequate compensation for the loss of and damage to life and property caused by the attack; and (7) requested the Secretary-General to render to the Security Council progress reports on the implementation of this resolution.

At the same meeting, the representative of Israel\*, after referring to captured Syrian documents which Israel had communicated to the Council on 21 December 1955,<sup>7</sup> expressed the hope that the Council would include in its resolution on this question a clear injunction to Syria to avoid interfering with Israel's activity on Lake Tiberias and Israel territory surrounding the Lake; and also a clear statement forbidding Syria from exercising illegal control on Lake Tiberias or its shores.<sup>8</sup>

By letter<sup>9</sup> dated 29 December 1955, the representative of Israel transmitted to the Council certain observations by the Government of Israel on the report of the Chief of Staff on the Lake Tiberias incidents.

At the 710th meeting on 12 January 1956, the Council had before it a letter<sup>10</sup> dated 9 January 1956 from the representative of the USSR to the President of the Council requesting that, in accordance with rule 38 of the provisional rules of procedure, the Syrian draft resolution be put to a vote, with an amendment proposed by the USSR. The amendment would have deleted operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the Syrian draft resolution and replaced them by two operative paragraphs which would have: (1) called upon Israel to take all necessary measures to prevent such actions; and (2) warned Israel that any future recurrence of such actions would bring about a situation requiring the Council to consider the question of the application of Article 39 of the Charter.

At the same meeting, the Council also had before it a joint draft resolution<sup>11</sup> which had been circulated on 11 January 1956 by France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

<sup>1</sup> S/3505, O.R., 10th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1955, p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> 707th meeting: preceding para. 1.

<sup>3</sup> 707th meeting: preceding para. 1.

<sup>4</sup> S/3516, O.R., 10th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1955, pp. 24-33.

<sup>5</sup> S/3516/Add.1, O.R., 10th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1955, pp. 33-36.

<sup>6</sup> S/3519, O.R., 10th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1955, pp. 41-42.

<sup>7</sup> S/3519, O.R., 10th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1955, pp. 36-41.

<sup>8</sup> 709th meeting: paras. 73-74.

<sup>9</sup> S/3524, O.R., 10th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1955, pp. 42-47.

<sup>10</sup> S/3528, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1956, pp. 1-2.

<sup>11</sup> S/3530 and Corr.1, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1956, pp. 2-3.

At the 711th meeting on 12 January 1956, the representative of Iran introduced several amendments<sup>12</sup> to the joint draft resolution.

At the 713th meeting on 17 January 1956, the representative of the United Kingdom, on behalf of the three sponsoring Powers, introduced a revised text<sup>13</sup> of the joint draft resolution.

At the 714th meeting on 18 January 1956, the representative of Yugoslavia submitted a draft resolution<sup>14</sup> described as a compromise text which he hoped would render possible a unanimous decision.<sup>15</sup>

At the same meeting, the representative of Iran replaced his original amendments by new ones.<sup>16</sup> The representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States accepted some parts of the Iranian amendments to the joint draft resolution.<sup>17</sup>

At the 715th meeting on 19 January 1956, after a brief discussion, the Council decided, by 8 votes in favour and 2 against, with 1 abstention, to vote first on the three-Power draft resolution, as revised on 18 January 1956.<sup>18</sup>

At the same meeting, the revised joint draft resolution<sup>19</sup> was adopted unanimously.<sup>20</sup> The resolution<sup>21</sup> read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling its resolutions of 15 July 1948, 11 August 1949, 18 May 1951, 24 November 1953, and 29 March 1955,*

*"Taking into consideration the statements of the representatives of Syria and Israel and the reports of the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization on the Syrian complaint that an attack was committed by Israel regular army forces against Syrian regular army forces on Syrian territory on 11 December 1955,*

*"Noting the report of the Chief of Staff that this Israel action was a deliberate violation of the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement, including those relating to the demilitarized zone, which was crossed by the Israel forces which entered Syria,*

*"Noting also, without prejudice to the ultimate rights, claims and positions of the parties, that according to the reports of the Chief of Staff there has been interference by the Syrian authorities with Israel activities on Lake Tiberias, in contravention*

<sup>12</sup> S/3532, 711th meeting: paras. 48-55.

<sup>13</sup> S/3530/Rev.2, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1956, pp. 3-4.

<sup>14</sup> S/3536, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1956, pp. 4-5.

<sup>15</sup> 714th meeting: para. 29.

<sup>16</sup> S/3537, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1956, pp. 5-6.

<sup>17</sup> 714th meeting: paras. 70, 78-80, 85-87, 99, 102.

<sup>18</sup> 715th meeting: para. 130. For the procedural discussion, see chapter I, Case 23.

<sup>19</sup> S/3530/Rev.3, 715th meeting: paras. 108, 130, 141.

<sup>20</sup> 715th meeting: para. 141.

<sup>21</sup> S/3538, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1956, pp. 6-7.

of the terms of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria,

"1. *Holds* that this interference in no way justifies the Israel action;

"2. *Reminds* the Government of Israel that the Council has already condemned military action in breach of the general armistice agreements, whether or not undertaken by way of retaliation, and has called upon Israel to take effective measures to prevent such action;

"3. *Condemns* the attack of 11 December 1955 as a flagrant violation of the cease-fire provisions of its resolution of 15 July 1948, of the terms of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria, and of Israel's obligations under the Charter;

"4. *Expresses its grave concern* at the failure of the Government of Israel to comply with its obligations;

"5. *Calls upon* the Government of Israel to do so in the future, in default of which the Council will have to consider what further measures under the Charter are required to maintain or restore the peace;

"6. *Calls upon* the parties to comply with their obligations under article V of the General Armistice Agreement to respect the armistice demarcation line and the demilitarized zone;

"7. *Requests* the Chief of Staff to pursue his suggestions for improving the situation in the area of Lake Tiberias without prejudice to the rights, claims and positions of the parties and to report to the Council as appropriate on the success of his efforts;

"8. *Calls upon* the parties to arrange with the Chief of Staff for an immediate exchange of all military prisoners;

"9. *Calls upon* both parties to co-operate with the Chief of Staff in this and all other respects, to carry out the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement in good faith, and in particular to make full use of the Mixed Armistice Commission's machinery in the interpretation and application of its provisions."

*Decision of 4 April 1956 (722nd meeting):*

- (i) *Considering that the situation prevailing between the parties is such that its continuance is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security;*
- (ii) *Requesting the Secretary-General to survey, as a matter of urgency, the various aspects of enforcement of and compliance with the four Armistice Agreements and the Council's resolution under reference, and to arrange for the adoption of measures which he considers would reduce the existing tensions along the Armistice Demarcation Lines*

By letter<sup>22</sup> dated 20 March 1956, the representative of the United States requested the President of the

<sup>22</sup> S/3561, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1956, p. 20.

Security Council to call an early meeting of the Council to consider the following agenda item:

“The Palestine question: status of compliance given to the general armistice agreements and the resolutions of the Security Council adopted during the past year.”

The representative of the United States expressed his Government's concern over recent developments in the Palestine area which might well endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. Information relating to the build-up of armed forces on either side of the armistice demarcation lines had led the United States to believe that the parties might not be fully complying with the provisions of their armistice agreements. Despite the earnest efforts of the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization, the parties had not agreed to the proposals which he had put forward to them on his own initiative, or as a result of the Security Council's resolutions of 3 March and 8 September 1955, and 19 January 1956. These resolutions had been adopted unanimously by the Council, and it should be a matter of concern to each of its members to ascertain the extent of compliance with them.

At the 717th meeting on 26 March 1956, the Security Council included<sup>23</sup> the item in the agenda and considered it at its 717th-722nd meetings, between 26 March and 4 April 1956. The representatives of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria were invited to participate in the discussion.

At the 717th meeting on 26 March 1956, the representative of the United States submitted a draft resolution.<sup>24</sup>

At the 718th and 719th meetings on 28 March and 3 April 1956, the representatives of Egypt\*, Lebanon\* and Syria\* raised questions and requested clarifications concerning paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 of the United States draft resolution.<sup>25</sup>

At the 719th meeting, the President, speaking as the representative of the United States, declared that his Government saw no way of preventing further deterioration of the situation except by providing for strict compliance with the General Armistice Agreements and the resolutions of the Security Council mentioned in the draft resolution. Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution envisaged that the Secretary-General should arrange, after discussion with the parties and the Chief of Staff, for measures which were entirely within the framework of the General Armistice Agreements and the relevant resolutions of the Council. Such measures would be applicable wherever the Secretary-General and the parties agreed that conditions warranted them. The demilitarized zones and defensive areas referred to in the draft resolution were those defined in the Armistice Agreements. The various aspects of compliance with

the Armistice Agreements, which the Secretary-General was requested in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution to survey, referred only to measures which would come within the natural purview of the armistice machinery and the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization. The arrangements referred to in paragraph 3(c) would be those agreed between the parties and the Secretary-General. In adopting the United States draft resolution, the Council would not of course relinquish its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The phrase “in his discretion” in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution meant that the Secretary-General would, if he considered it desirable, report sooner than one month from the date of the adoption of the draft resolution. He submitted a corrigendum<sup>26</sup> to capitalize the initial letters of the words “Defensive Areas” in operative paragraph 3(b).<sup>27</sup>

At the 720th meeting on 3 April 1956, the representative of the USSR, in introducing amendments<sup>28</sup> to the United States draft resolution, observed that all measures adopted in the Palestine area to relieve the existing tensions should be carried out only by agreement with the parties concerned and with due regard to their interests. The adoption of the first operative paragraph in the United States draft resolution would force the Council to decide prematurely that the situation prevailing between the parties was likely to endanger international peace and security. The Council should first hear the reports of the Secretary-General and the Chief of Staff before stating its conclusions with respect to the situation. The USSR amendments to the draft resolution were the following: (1) in the first paragraph of the preamble to add mention of the Security Council resolutions of 24 November 1953 and 29 March 1953; (2) inoperative paragraph 1 to replace the words “such that its continuance is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security” by the word “unsatisfactory”; and (3) in operative paragraph 3 to replace the words “after discussion” by the words “after concordance” and, in sub-paragraph 3(b), to delete the words “and in the Defensive Areas”.<sup>29</sup>

The sponsor of the draft resolution declared that he could not accept the USSR amendments.<sup>30</sup>

At the 722nd meeting on 4 April 1956, the USSR amendments were rejected as follows: the amendment to paragraph 1 of the preamble by 1 vote in favour and 2 against, with 8 abstentions; the amendment to operative paragraph 1 by 2 votes in favour and 3 against, with 6 abstentions; the first part of the amendment to operative paragraph 3 by 1 vote in favour and 2 against, with 8 abstentions. The second part of the last amendment was not voted upon.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>23</sup> 717th meeting: para. 3.

<sup>24</sup> S/3562, *O.R.*, 11th year, *Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1956*, p. 21; 717th meeting: para. 12.

<sup>25</sup> 718th meeting: paras. 23-28, 39-40; 719th meeting: paras. 25-26.

<sup>26</sup> S/3562, *O.R.*, 11th year, *Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1956*, p. 21.

<sup>27</sup> 719th meeting: paras. 38-42.

<sup>28</sup> S/3574, 720th meeting: paras. 17-21.

<sup>29</sup> 720th meeting: paras. 17-20.

<sup>30</sup> 720th meeting: paras. 43-50.

<sup>31</sup> 722nd meeting: paras. 36, 44-46.

The United States draft resolution was adopted unanimously.<sup>32</sup> The resolution<sup>33</sup> read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling its resolutions of 30 March 1955, 8 September 1955, and 19 January 1956,*

*"Recalling that in each of these resolutions the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and the parties to the general armistice agreements concerned were requested by the Council to undertake certain specific steps for the purpose of ensuring that the tensions along the armistice demarcation lines should be reduced,*

*"Noting with grave concern that despite the efforts of the Chief of Staff the proposed steps have not been carried out,*

*"1. Considers that the situation now prevailing between the parties concerning the enforcement of the armistice agreements and the compliance given to the above-mentioned resolutions of the Council is such that its continuance is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security;*

*"2. Requests the Secretary-General to undertake, as a matter of urgent concern, a survey of the various aspects of enforcement of and compliance with the four general armistice agreements and the Council's resolutions under reference;*

*"3. Requests the Secretary-General to arrange with the parties for the adoption of any measures which, after discussion with the parties and with the Chief of Staff, he considers would reduce existing tensions along the armistice demarcation lines, including the following points:*

*"(a) Withdrawal of their forces from the armistice demarcation lines;*

*"(b) Full freedom of movement for observers along the armistice demarcation lines, in the demilitarized zones and in the defensive areas;*

*"(c) Establishment of local arrangements for the prevention of incidents and the prompt detection of any violations of the armistice agreements;*

*"4. Calls upon the parties to the general armistice agreements to co-operate with the Secretary-General in the implementation of this resolution;*

*"5. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Council in his discretion but not later than one month from this date on the implementation given to this resolution in order to assist the Council in considering what further action may be required."*

*Decision of 4 June 1956 (728th meeting):*

*(i) Commending the Secretary-General and the parties on the progress already achieved;*

*(ii) Declaring that the parties should speedily carry out measures agreed upon with the Secretary-General, and should co-operate with him and the*

*Chief of Staff to effectuate further practical proposals, pursuant to the resolution of 4 April 1956, towards full implementation of that resolution and full compliance with armistice agreements; that full freedom of movement of United Nations observers must be respected;*

*(iii) Endorsing the Secretary-General's view that re-establishment of full compliance with armistice agreements represented a stage which had to be passed in order to make progress on main issues between the parties;*

*(iv) Requesting the Chief of Staff to continue to carry out his observation of the cease-fire, and the Secretary-General to continue his good offices with the parties with a view to full implementation of the resolution of 4 April 1956 and full compliance with the armistice agreements, and to report to the Council as appropriate*

On 9 May 1956, the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report<sup>34</sup> on the results of his mission to the Middle East undertaken pursuant to the Council's resolution of 4 April 1956. The Council considered the report at its 723rd to 728th meetings, between 29 May and 4 June 1956. The representatives of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria were invited to participate in the discussion.

At the 723rd meeting on 29 May 1956, the representative of the United Kingdom submitted a revision<sup>35</sup> of a draft resolution<sup>36</sup> which he had circulated on 25 May 1956. The discussions in the Council touched upon the following paragraphs of the draft resolution: preambular paragraph 3, noting those passages of the Secretary-General's report which referred to the assurances given to him by all the parties to the armistice agreements to unconditionally observe the cease-fire; preambular paragraph 6, expressing awareness of the need to create conditions in which a peaceful settlement of the dispute between the parties could be made on a mutually acceptable basis; operative paragraph 3, declaring that full freedom of movement of United Nations observers must be respected in all areas along the armistice demarcation lines, in the demilitarized zones and in the defensive areas as defined in the armistice agreements; operative paragraph 4, endorsing the Secretary-General's view that the re-establishment of full compliance with armistice agreements represented a stage which had to be passed in order to make progress possible on the main issues between the parties; and operative paragraph 7, requesting the Secretary-General to continue his good offices with the parties, and to report to the Security Council as appropriate.

At the 725th meeting on 31 May 1956, the representatives of Egypt\*, Jordan\*, Lebanon\* and Syria\*

<sup>34</sup> S/3596, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Apr.-June 1956, pp. 30-66.

<sup>35</sup> S/3600 Rev.1, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Apr.-June 1956, pp. 68-69; 723rd meeting: para. 36.

<sup>36</sup> S/3600, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Apr.-June 1956, pp. 66-67.

<sup>32</sup> 722nd meeting: para. 46.

<sup>33</sup> S/3575, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Apr.-June 1956, pp. 1-2.

maintained that, although their Governments had accepted the Secretary-General's original mandate as entirely within the scope of the General Armistice Agreements, the United Kingdom draft resolution would extend the mission of the Secretary-General beyond that scope. In this connexion, they raised questions concerning preambular paragraphs 3 and 6, and operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 7 of the draft resolution.<sup>37</sup>

At the 726th meeting on 1 June 1956, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that, while his delegation could not agree to amend or omit paragraph 6 of the preamble, it was prepared to amend operative paragraphs 3 and 7 in line with the suggestions which had been made. He submitted revisions of those paragraphs.<sup>38</sup>

The representative of Iran stated that the apprehensions which the representatives of the Arab States had expressed before the Council concerning certain paragraphs of the United Kingdom draft resolution were well founded. He considered that the objective of paragraph 6 of the preamble would exceed the scope of the draft resolution which the Council ought to adopt on the question, and that the inclusion of the paragraph might compromise previous United Nations resolutions on the question. He moved an amendment<sup>39</sup> to delete the paragraph.<sup>40</sup>

At the 728th meeting on 4 June 1956, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that, in the interest of unanimity, he would accept the amendment submitted by the representative of Iran. He made a further consequential revision in the seventh paragraph of the preamble.<sup>41</sup> At the same meeting, the United Kingdom draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.<sup>42</sup> The resolution<sup>43</sup> read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling its resolutions of 4 April 1956 [S/3575] and 11 August 1949,*

*"Having received the report of the Secretary-General on his recent mission on behalf of the Security Council [S/3596],*

*"Noting those passages of the report (section III and annexes 1-4) which refer to the assurances given to the Secretary-General by all the parties to the general armistice agreements unconditionally to observe the cease-fire,*

*"Noting also that progress has been made towards the adoption of the specific measures set out in*

operative paragraph 3 of the Security Council's resolution of 4 April 1956,

*"Noting, however, that full compliance with the general armistice agreements and with the Council's resolutions of 30 March 1955, 8 September 1955 and 19 January 1956 is not yet effected, and that the measures called for in operative paragraph 3 of its resolution of 4 April 1956 have been neither completely agreed upon nor put fully into effect,*

*"Believing that further progress should now be made in consolidating the gains resulting from the Secretary-General's mission and towards full implementation by the parties of the armistice agreements,*

*"1. Commends the Secretary-General and the parties on the progress already achieved;*

*"2. Declares that the parties to the armistice agreements should speedily carry out the measures already agreed upon with the Secretary-General, and should co-operate with the Secretary-General and the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization to put into effect their further practical proposals, pursuant to the resolution of 4 April 1956, with a view to full implementation of that resolution and full compliance with the armistice agreements;*

*"3. Declares that full freedom of movement of United Nations observers must be respected along the armistice demarcation lines, in the demilitarized zones and in the defensive areas, as defined in the armistice agreements, to enable them to fulfil their functions;*

*"4. Endorses the Secretary-General's view that the re-establishment of full compliance with the armistice agreements represents a stage which has to be passed in order to make progress possible on the main issues between the parties;*

*"5. Requests the Chief of Staff to continue to carry out his observation of the cease-fire pursuant to the Security Council's resolution of 11 August 1949 and to report to the Council whenever any action undertaken by one party to an armistice agreement constitutes a serious violation of that agreement or of the cease-fire, which in his opinion requires immediate consideration by the Council;*

*"6. Calls upon the parties to the armistice agreement to take the steps necessary to carry out this resolution, thereby increasing confidence and demonstrating their wish for peaceful conditions;*

*"7. Requests the Secretary-General to continue his good offices with the parties, with a view to full implementation of the Council's resolution of 4 April 1956 and full compliance with the armistice agreements, and to report to the Security Council as appropriate."*

*Decision of 25 October 1956 (745th meeting): Statement by the President adjourning the discussion*

By letter<sup>44</sup> dated 15 October 1956, the representative of Jordan informed the President of the Security Council

<sup>37</sup> 725th meeting: paras. 6-19, 89-98, 114-120, 123, 127, 129, 134-135, 166, 169.

<sup>38</sup> S/3600 Rev.2, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Apr.-June 1956, pp. 69-70. 726th meeting: paras. 6-19.

<sup>39</sup> S/3602, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Apr.-June 1956, p. 70.

<sup>40</sup> 726th meeting: paras. 21-25.

<sup>41</sup> 728th meeting: paras. 3-6.

<sup>42</sup> 728th meeting: para. 38.

<sup>43</sup> S/3605, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Apr.-June 1956, pp. 72-73.

<sup>44</sup> S/3678, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1956, p. 53.

that on 11 October the Israel army had launched a major military attack against the Jordanian villages of Qalqiliya, Sufin, Hablah and Habi Ilyas. The Israel attacking force had used heavy arms and equipment including bombers. Twenty-five Jordanian soldiers and national guards had been killed and thirteen wounded. The police post of Qalqiliya had been demolished and the villages had been shelled. A similar attack had been launched on the night of 25-26 September against the Jordanian territory in the area of Husan where twenty-five Jordanians had been killed and six others wounded. These acts of aggression were a flagrant violation of the Armistice Agreement between Jordan and Israel and of the principles of the United Nations Charter, and constituted a threat to peace and security. He requested an early meeting of the Council to consider the situation.

By letter<sup>45</sup> dated 17 October 1956, the representative of Israel requested the President of the Security Council to include the following complaint against Jordan in the agenda of the Council for urgent consideration:

"Persistent violations by Jordan of the General Armistice Agreement and of the cease-fire pledge made to the Secretary-General on 26 April 1956."

At the 744th meeting on 19 October 1956, the Security Council had before it the provisional agenda which, under the general heading: "The Palestine question", listed as sub-items (a) and (b) the complaints submitted by Jordan and Israel, respectively.<sup>46</sup>

The agenda was adopted,<sup>47</sup> and the Security Council considered the question at its 744th and 745th meetings, held on 19 and 25 October 1956, respectively. The representatives of Israel and Jordan were invited to take part in the discussion.

At the 744th meeting on 19 October 1956, the representative of Jordan\*, after outlining the events complained of, requested the Council to apply the terms of Article 41 of the Charter against Israel in order to put an end to its aggression in Palestine.<sup>48</sup>

At the 745th meeting on 25 October 1956, the representative of Israel\* stated that Israel would observe all the provisions of the Armistice Agreement, if all its provisions were carried out by the other side. In particular, Israel would observe the cease-fire so long as it was faithfully observed by Jordan.<sup>49</sup>

The representative of Iran suggested that the Council should hear the views and suggestions of the Secretary-General who had been acting in previous months as mediator. He therefore proposed an adjournment for a few days.<sup>50</sup>

At the conclusion of the meeting, the President (France) stated:

<sup>45</sup> S/3682, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1956, p. 60.

<sup>46</sup> 744th meeting: preceding para. 1.

<sup>47</sup> 744th meeting: para. 1.

<sup>48</sup> 744th meeting: para. 44.

<sup>49</sup> 745th meeting: paras. 74-75.

<sup>50</sup> 745th meeting: para. 102.

"I hope I am expressing the views of all my colleagues when I recall that the role of the Security Council, as defined by the Charter, is not only to determine responsibilities but also to maintain or restore peace. Therefore, one of its most important tasks in the present crisis is to try to prevent what it should be powerless to cure, to strive constructively towards a solution of the problem of maintaining peace along the armistice demarcation lines in Palestine.

"...

"It has been suggested that the Secretary-General should also be asked to turn his attention to this problem. The other day, the Iranian representative outlined a programme, which he mentioned again today and which seems to me to have the tacit support of the Council..."

After stating that he would leave the Council time for an exchange of views, the President, in the absence of objection, adjourned the meeting.<sup>51</sup>

The Council has held no further meeting on these complaints.

*Decision of 30 October 1956 (749th meeting):  
Rejection of the United States draft resolution*

In a letter<sup>52</sup> dated 29 October 1956 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the United States of America stated that his Government had received information to the effect that, in violation of the Armistice Agreement between Israel and Egypt, the armed forces of Israel had penetrated deeply into Egyptian territory in a military action begun on 29 October which was continuing in the Sinai area. This situation made imperative a meeting of the Council as soon as possible to consider the following item:

"The Palestine question: steps for the immediate cessation of the military action of Israel in Egypt."

At the 748th meeting on 30 October 1956, the item was included<sup>53</sup> in the agenda. It was discussed at the 748th, 749th and 750th meetings held on 30 October 1956. The representatives of Egypt and Israel were invited to take part in the discussions.

At the 748th meeting on 30 October 1956, the representative of the United States stated that it was imperative that the Council act in the promptest manner to determine that a breach of the peace had occurred, to order that the military action undertaken by Israel cease immediately and that the Israel armed forces should be immediately withdrawn behind the established armistice lines. He noted further that the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine had already issued a cease-fire order on his own authority which Israel had so far ignored and that military observers of the United Nations Truce Super-

<sup>51</sup> 745th meeting: paras. 107-111.

<sup>52</sup> S/3706, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1956, p. 108.

<sup>53</sup> 748th meeting: para. 2.

vision Organization had been prevented by Israel authorities from performing their duties.<sup>54</sup>

The Secretary-General informed the Council of the main points of certain messages received from the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine.<sup>55</sup>

At the 749th meeting on 30 October 1956, the representative of the United Kingdom quoted from the statement made that day in the House of Commons by the British Prime Minister after consultation with the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister of France. The Prime Minister had informed the House of Commons that the United Kingdom and French Governments had addressed urgent communications to the Governments of Egypt and Israel to stop all war-like action by land, sea and air forthwith and to withdraw their military forces a distance of ten miles from the Canal. Further, in order to separate the belligerents and to guarantee freedom of transit through the Canal by the ships of all nations, the Egyptian Government had been asked to agree that Anglo-French forces should move temporarily into key positions at Port Said, Ismailia and Suez. The Governments of Egypt and Israel had been asked to answer the communication within twelve hours. It had been made clear to them that if at the expiration of that time one or both had not undertaken to comply with these requirements, British and French forces would intervene in whatever strength might be necessary to obtain compliance with the above-mentioned requirements.<sup>56</sup>

At the same meeting, the representative of the United States submitted a draft resolution<sup>57</sup> according to which the Security Council would: (1) call upon Israel immediately to withdraw its armed forces behind the established armistice lines; (2) call upon all Members (a) to refrain from the use of force or threat of force in the area in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations; (b) to assist the United Nations in ensuring the integrity of the armistice agreements; (c) to refrain from giving any military, economic or financial assistance to Israel so long as it had not complied with this resolution; and (3) request the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council informed on compliance with this resolution and to make whatever recommendations he deemed appropriate for the maintenance of international peace and security in the area by the implementation of this and prior resolutions.

The representative of Egypt\* drew the attention of the Council to the fact that he had submitted a request<sup>58</sup> dated 30 October 1956 for the inclusion on the agenda of a new item concerning the ultimatum addressed to Egypt.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>54</sup> 748th meeting: paras. 3, 8-10.

<sup>55</sup> 748th meeting: paras. 13-19.

<sup>56</sup> S/3711; 749th meeting: paras. 3-11.

<sup>57</sup> S/3710, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1956, p. 110.

<sup>58</sup> S/3712, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1956, pp. 111-112.

<sup>59</sup> 749th meeting: paras. 112-113.

The representative of the United States, in order to meet the suggestion made by several members of the Council, inserted in the draft resolution a new operative paragraph 1 calling upon Israel and Egypt to cease fire immediately.<sup>60</sup>

At the same meeting, the draft resolution, as amended, was put to the vote and failed of adoption. There were 7 votes in favour and 2 against, with 2 abstentions, the negative votes being those of permanent members of the Council.<sup>61</sup>

*Decision of 30 October 1956 (750th meeting): Rejection of the USSR draft resolution*

At the 749th meeting on 30 October 1956, the representative of the USSR submitted a draft resolution<sup>62</sup> consisting of the preamble and paragraph 2 of the operative part of the revised United States draft resolution.<sup>63</sup>

Considering that a cease-fire and withdrawal of armed forces were inseparable, the representative of China submitted an amendment<sup>64</sup> to the USSR draft resolution calling upon Israel and Egypt to cease fire immediately. The Soviet representative accepted this amendment and an Iranian amendment<sup>65</sup> to include in the USSR text the last paragraph of the United States draft resolution.

At the 750th meeting on 30 October 1956, the representative of the USSR explained that paragraph 1 of the revised draft resolution<sup>66</sup> introduced by his delegation had been reworded as a matter of drafting to read: "Calls upon all the parties concerned immediately to cease fire".

At the same meeting, the representative of the USSR, in view of doubt expressed by four members of the Council concerning the new wording of operative paragraph 1 of the USSR draft resolution, reverted to the earlier version of that paragraph, which read: "Calls upon Israel and Egypt immediately to cease fire".

At the same meeting, the revised draft resolution, as amended, was put to the vote and not adopted. There were 7 votes in favour and 2 against, with 2 abstentions, the negative votes being those of permanent members of the Council.<sup>67</sup>

The Security Council then proceeded to the next item on its agenda, the letter dated 30 October 1956 from the representative of Egypt.<sup>68</sup>

<sup>60</sup> 749th meeting: para. 125.

<sup>61</sup> 749th meeting: para. 186.

<sup>62</sup> S/3713, 749th meeting: para. 188.

<sup>63</sup> S/3710, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1956, p. 110.

<sup>64</sup> 749th meeting: paras. 191-192.

<sup>65</sup> 749th meeting: para. 199.

<sup>66</sup> S/3713/Rev.1, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1956, p. 112, and 750th meeting: para. 15.

<sup>67</sup> 750th meeting: para. 23.

<sup>68</sup> S/3712, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1956, pp. 111-112; See in this chapter, p. 111, below.



*Decision of 28 May 1957 (782nd meeting): Noting statement by the Secretary-General that he would request, in the light of the Council's discussion, the Acting Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine to present an additional report within a month*

By letter<sup>69</sup> dated 13 May 1957, the representative of Syria requested the President of the Security Council to convene a meeting for the purpose of examining the question of the construction of a bridge by Israel at the southern end of Lake Huleh in the demilitarized zone, which he stated to be a violation of the Israel-Syrian General Armistice Agreement, likely to give the Israel authorities a military advantage, and to constitute a threat to peace. He stated further that the Acting Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine had been requested by the Syrian delegation to the Israel-Syria Mixed Armistice Commission to order the dismantling of the bridge on the grounds that its construction constituted a military activity and was likely to give the Israel authorities a military advantage. While the Syrian Government was able to subscribe to most of the statements in the report<sup>70</sup> of the Acting Chief of Staff, particularly with regard to the powers of the Mixed Armistice Commission and the functions of United Nations Military Observers, it could not concur in his conclusions which were not in accordance with facts and did not represent a strict application of the provisions of the Israel-Syrian General Armistice Agreement. In view of the fact that the retention of the bridge constituted a violation of the General Armistice Agreement and a threat to peace, the representative of Syria requested a meeting of the Security Council to consider the question.

At the 780th meeting on 23 May 1957, the Security Council had before it the following provisional agenda:

"The Palestine question

"Letter dated 13 May 1957 from the permanent representative of Syria to the United Nations, addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning the construction of a bridge in the demilitarized zone established by the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria (S/3827)."

<sup>69</sup> S/3827, O.R., 12th year, Suppl. for Apr.-June 1957, pp. 19-20.

<sup>70</sup> In a report (S/3815) dated 20 April 1957, the Acting Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine stated that although the bridge could be used for military purposes, he was nevertheless satisfied that it had been erected in connexion with the Huleh Reclamation project. Accordingly, he did not think that he would be justified in asking for its removal since such a request would have to be based on the assumption that a party would use the bridge for military purposes in violation of the armistice agreement, an assumption he was not entitled to consider. The Acting Chief of Staff also suggested that, in view of the difficulties which had occurred in the investigation, it would be advisable to re-affirm the special powers of the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission and of the United Nations Military Observers in the demilitarized zone (O.R., Suppl. for Apr.-June 1957, pp. 4-7).

The agenda was adopted,<sup>71</sup> and the Security Council considered the question at its 780th, 781st and 782nd meetings on 23 and 28 May 1957. The representatives of Israel and Syria were invited to take part in the discussion.

At the 780th meeting on 23 May 1957, the representative of Syria\* requested the Council to condemn Israel for violations of the General Armistice Agreement and of the Security Council's resolution of 18 May 1951, to order the removal of the bridge, to affirm the special powers of the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission and United Nations Military Observers and to reaffirm the right of the United Nations observers to freedom of movement and access in all the sectors of the demilitarized zone.<sup>72</sup>

The representative of Israel\* stated that in 1951 the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine had categorically declared that the invocation of military advantage was inadmissible under the armistice agreement since the relationship between Israel and Syria, after the signing of this agreement, was no longer based on purely military considerations. Moreover, the bridge in question had been constructed by Israel for the sole purpose of transporting earth-moving and dredging machinery for the completion of the canal system to the Jordan river. He stated further that Israel had consistently refused to entertain Syrian complaints regarding the demilitarized zone, and did not agree to investigations in the demilitarized zone which had their basis in the Syrian complaints. No difficulty, however, had been encountered in the case of requests for investigations conducted by or on behalf of the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission in pursuance of his functions under article V of the General Armistice Agreement.<sup>73</sup>

At the 782nd meeting on 28 May 1957, the President (United States), no draft resolution having been introduced, in summing up the proceedings of the Council, made the following statement:

"All members of the Council appear to agree that the authority of the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization should be respected and that the parties should co-operate with him. It was noted that in the instance before us he was delayed in his inspection of the bridge and in discharging other duties.

"Some members of the Council made it clear that they did not agree with the decision of the Acting Chief of Staff on the right of Israel to build the bridge. However, the majority have pointed out that the Chief of Staff is the proper authority for ensuring full implementation of the provisions of article V of the Armistice Agreement and have supported his decision. The parties have been asked to co-operate fully with the Acting Chief of Staff and to assist in any practical arrangements that he might feel are necessary in carrying out his responsibilities.

<sup>71</sup> 780th meeting: preceding para. 1.

<sup>72</sup> 780th meeting: para. 25.

<sup>73</sup> 780th meeting: paras. 128, 141-142.

"Note has also been taken of references in the report by the Acting Chief of Staff to other problems in the demilitarized zone, and the majority of the members have suggested that the Acting Chief of Staff submit an additional report at the proper time concerning conditions in the zone, including his freedom of access to the zone. Various inquiries have been made which might be covered in such a report. In this case, it is clear that the achievement of better conditions in the Near East is the Council's overriding objective. The United Nations and its representatives can continue to make an important contribution to this end. To do so, it needs the full co-operation of the Governments concerned."<sup>74</sup>

Following discussion of the question of time-limit for the supplementary report,<sup>75</sup> the Secretary-General stated that in the light of the discussion and without any formal decision, he would request the Chief of Staff to present a report on the situation in the demilitarized zone and would indicate to him the desirability of presenting it within a month.<sup>76</sup>

The President stated that there being no objections, the Council would proceed on this basis.<sup>77</sup>

On 27 June 1957, the Acting Chief of Staff submitted his additional report.<sup>78</sup>

The Council has not held any further meetings on this question.

*Decision of 22 January 1958 (810th meeting):*

- (i) *Directing the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine to regulate activities within the zone between the armistice demarcation lines around the Government House area in Jerusalem, subject to certain provisions and principles referred to in the resolution;*
- (ii) *Directing the Chief of Staff to conduct a survey of property records with a view to determining property ownership in the zone;*
- (iii) *Endorsing the recommendations of the Acting Chief of Staff to the effect that the parties should discuss through the Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission the suspension of civilian activities in the zone while provisions are made to regulate such activities, and that within a period of two months such discussions should be completed and their result advised to the Security Council;*
- (iv) *Calling upon the parties to co-operate with the Chief of Staff and in the Mixed Armistice Commission in carrying out the recommendations of the resolution and to observe the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement as regards pre-*

*vention of military activities in the zone, and requesting the Chief of Staff to report to the Council on the implementation of the resolution*

By letter<sup>79</sup> dated 4 September 1957, the permanent representative of Jordan informed the President of the Security Council that on 21 July 1957 a number of Israel civilians, under the protection of Israel security forces, had begun certain activities in violation of the provisions of the Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement, in a sector of the no-man's-land to the south of Jerusalem constituted by the Agreement and placed under the supervision and control of the United Nations. In spite of a protest and formal complaint lodged with the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission and with the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization respectively, the Israel civilians had refused to cease their activities. Jordan requested that the Security Council be convened in urgent meeting to consider the serious situation resulting from these violations of the General Armistice Agreement.

By letter<sup>80</sup> dated 5 September 1957, the acting permanent representative of Israel requested the President of the Security Council to place on the agenda the following complaint of Israel against Jordan:

"Violations by Jordan of the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement, and in particular article VIII thereof."

He stated that article VIII of the General Armistice Agreement, under which a Special Committee composed of representatives of both parties was to meet for the purpose of formulating arrangements designed to enlarge the scope of the agreement, had not been implemented because of an obdurate refusal by Jordan to carry out this clear obligation. The only one of the specific requirements mentioned in paragraph 2 of such article VIII which had been put into effect had been the resumption of the operation of the railroad to Jerusalem. All the others had remained unimplemented due to the refusal on the part of Jordan to agree to the functioning of the Special Committee during the previous eight years. As a result, rights which Israel considered to be of cardinal religious, educational and practical importance had been gravely prejudiced. Jordan was also in standing violation of certain other provisions of the General Armistice Agreement. The Government of Israel could not agree to a selective interpretation and implementation of that agreement by Jordan, and accordingly turned to the Security Council for relief from the intolerable situation which had been created.

At the 787th meeting on 6 September 1957, the Council had before it a provisional agenda which, under the general heading of "The Palestine question", listed as sub-items 2 (a) and 2 (b) the complaints submitted by Jordan and Israel, respectively.

<sup>74</sup> 782nd meeting: paras. 199-201.

<sup>75</sup> 782nd meeting: paras. 202-213.

<sup>76</sup> 782nd meeting: paras. 214-215.

<sup>77</sup> 782nd meeting: para. 216.

<sup>78</sup> S/3844, O.R., 12th year, Suppl. for Apr.-June 1957, pp. 2-9.

<sup>79</sup> S/3878, O.R., 12th year, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1957, pp. 33-34.

<sup>80</sup> S/3883, O.R., 12th year, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1957, pp. 35-36.

Following adoption of the agenda,<sup>81</sup> the President invited the representatives of Jordan and Israel to the Security Council table.

Following discussion of the question whether the sub-items should be dealt with successively or concurrently, the Council decided by 9 votes in favour and 1 against, with 1 abstention, to hear the preliminary statements of the two interested parties first, and to postpone decision on the procedural question.<sup>82</sup>

At the 788th meeting on 6 September 1957, after statements had been made by the representatives of Jordan\* and Israel\*, the representative of the Philippines, supported by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States, proposed that the Council should request from the Acting Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine a report dealing with the complaint submitted by Jordan and a report on the complaint submitted by Israel. Pending receipt of these reports, both parties should refrain from taking any action between the armistice demarcation lines that would tend to increase tension. A suggestion made by the representative of Iraq that the activities of Israel in the area between the lines in the Jerusalem sector should be immediately stopped was not acted upon by the Council. After further suggestions made by the representatives of China and the United States, the President (Cuba) stated that the Council had decided, without objection, to request two reports from the Acting Chief of Staff in Palestine, one of which, dealing with the Jordan complaint, should be submitted within two weeks; and that copies of the record of the meetings should be transmitted to Israel and Jordan so that their respective Governments might fully understand the views expressed by the members of the Security Council.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>81</sup> 787th meeting: para. 27.

<sup>82</sup> 787th meeting: para. 39; for consideration of order of discussion of items on the agenda in relation to the scope of discussion, see chapter II, Case 15.

<sup>83</sup> 788th meeting: para. 132. For related discussion in connexion with rule 33 of the rules of procedure, see chapter I, Case 34.

In a report [S/3892, O.R., 12th year, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1957, pp. 38-43] dated 23 September 1957, the Acting Chief of Staff recommended to the Council that the parties should meet and discuss civilian activities in the zone through the Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission, and that the Government of Israel should suspend its afforestation project within the zone pending the outcome of such discussions, which should be completed within a period of two months. On 16 November 1957, the Acting Chief of Staff reported [S/3892/Add.2, O.R., 12th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1957, p. 2] that the United Nations military observers had not observed any such work proceeding in the area in question since 8 November 1957. By letters [S/3907 and S/3914, O.R., 12th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1957, pp. 6-8 and 17-18] dated 8 and 18 November 1957 to the Secretary-General, the representative of Jordan declared that further violations had been committed by Israel in the zone between the lines in Jerusalem. In a letter [S/3909, O.R., 12th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1957, pp. 8-11] dated 11 November 1957, the representative of Jordan transmitted to the Secretary-General certain comments on the report of the Acting Chief of Staff. By letter [S/3910, O.R., 12th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1957, pp. 10-11] dated 14 November 1957, the representative of Israel informed the Council that the Jordanian letter of 8 November contained serious misrepresentations designed to cast an unfavourable light on the legitimate activities of his Government.

At the 806th meeting on 22 November 1957, after the Council had adopted the agenda and the representatives of the parties concerned had been invited to the Council table, the President (Iraq) stated that discussion would proceed on sub-item 2 (a) of the agenda, dealing with the complaint submitted by Jordan. In response to a suggestion by the representative of Israel\* that in accordance with previous practice the Council should deal simultaneously with both sub-items on the agenda, the President ruled without objection that all speakers should address themselves to sub-item 2 (a) of the agenda.<sup>84</sup>

The Council continued consideration of the Jordanian complaint at the 809th and 810th meetings on 22 January 1958.

At the 809th meeting on 22 January 1958, the Council had before it a joint draft resolution<sup>85</sup> submitted by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States.

At the 10th meeting on 22 January 1958, after further statements by the parties concerned, including a statement by the representative of Israel\* that his Government, without prejudice to its legal rights and positions, had suspended since 8 November 1957 the activities which formed the substance of the Jordanian complaint,<sup>86</sup> the Council adopted the joint draft resolution unanimously.<sup>87</sup>

The resolution<sup>88</sup> read as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Recalling its consideration on 6 September 1957, of the complaint of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan concerning activities conducted by Israel in the zone between the armistice demarcation lines in the area of Government House at Jerusalem,*

*"Having considered the report relating to the zone dated 23 September 1957, submitted in response to the Council's request by the Acting Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization,*

*"Noting that the status of the zone is affected by the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement and that neither Israel nor Jordan enjoys sovereignty over any part of the zone (the zone being beyond the respective demarcation lines),*

<sup>84</sup> 806th meeting: paras. 5-6. For the discussion of this point, see chapter II, Case 15.

In compliance with the decision taken by the Council at its 788th meeting, the Acting Chief of Staff submitted a report [S/3913, O.R., 12th year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1957, pp. 12-16] dated 31 October 1957, relating to the Israel complaint against Jordan which specifically referred to the provisions of article VIII, articles I and II, and article XII of the General Armistice Agreement. The report dealt primarily with the more specific aspects of the complaint and made no attempt to evaluate the broader political issues between the two countries. The Council has not held any meetings to consider the subject of this report.

<sup>85</sup> S/3940, O.R., 13th year, Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1958, pp. 4-5.

<sup>86</sup> 810th meeting: para. 28.

<sup>87</sup> 810th meeting: para. 30.

<sup>88</sup> S/3942, O.R., 13th year, Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1958, pp. 4-5.

"Motivated by a desire to reduce tensions and avoid the creation of new incidents,

"1. *Directs* the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization to regulate activities within the zone subject to such arrangements as may be made pursuant to the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement and pursuant to paragraph 3 below, bearing in mind ownership of property there, it being understood that unless otherwise mutually agreed, Israelis should not be allowed to use Arab-owned properties and Arabs should not be allowed to use Israeli-owned properties;

"2. *Directs* the Chief of Staff to conduct a survey of property records with a view to determining property ownership in the zone;

"3. *Endorses* the recommendations of the Acting Chief of Staff to the end that:

"(a) The parties should discuss through the Mixed Armistice Commission civilian activities in the zone;

"(b) In order to create an atmosphere which would be more conducive to fruitful discussion, activities in the zone, such as those initiated by Israelis on 21 July 1957, should be suspended until such time as the survey will have been completed and provisions made for the regulation of activities in the zone;

"(c) Such discussions should be completed within a period of two months;

"(d) The Security Council should be advised of the result of the discussions;

"4. *Calls upon* the parties to the Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement to co-operate with the Chief of Staff and in the Mixed Armistice Commission in carrying out these recommendations pursuant to this resolution;

"5. *Calls upon* the parties to the Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement to observe article 3 of the Agreement and prevent all forces referred to in article 3 of the Agreement from passing over the armistice demarcation lines and to remove or destroy all their respective military facilities and installations in the zone;

"6. *Calls upon* the parties to use the machinery provided for in the General Armistice Agreement for the implementation of the Provisions of that Agreement;

"7. *Requests* the Chief of Staff to report on the implementation of this resolution."

*Decision of 15 December 1958 (844th meeting): Statement of the President expressing the conviction that the parties would prevent recurrences of incidents*

By letter<sup>90</sup> dated 4 December 1958, the permanent representative of Israel requested the President of the Security Council to convene an urgent meeting of the

Council to consider "a grave act of aggression" committed on 3 December 1958 by the armed forces of the United Arab Republic against Israel territory in the Huleh area in north-east Galilee. At noon of that day the Syrian army post at Darbashiya had opened fire on five Israeli shepherds and had killed one of them. The fire had continued until 1600 hours when the Syrian (UAR) forces had opened a heavy artillery barrage on all Israeli villages in the border area from Shamir to Gadot over a distance of 15 km. Three persons had been injured and severe damage had been caused to property. A cease-fire arranged by the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization for 1700 hours had not been honoured by the Syrian forces and their fire had ceased only some time later. This act of aggression was but the most serious in a number of attacks recently perpetrated by the Syrian forces against Israel, which had developed a character threatening peace and security and constituted a serious breach of the Charter and of the Israel-Syrian General Armistice Agreement. The Government of Israel accordingly turned to the Security Council to bring an immediate end to these aggressions.

On 8 December 1958, the Secretary-General circulated for the information of the members of the Security Council a report<sup>90</sup> by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine concerning the incident of 3 November 1958.

At the 841st meeting on 8 December 1958, the Security Council included the letter from the permanent representative of Israel in the agenda,<sup>91</sup> and invited the representatives of Israel and the United Arab Republic to take part in the discussion. It continued consideration of the question at the 844th meeting on 15 December 1958.

At the 841st meeting, following an elaboration by the representative of Israel\* of the contents of his letter concerning the events and actions complained of, the representative of the United Arab Republic\* stated<sup>92</sup> that on 3 December at 1210 hours local time Israel shepherds had come up against the civilian Arab population and had exchanged shots with local police. After this an Israeli armed force had come to the rescue of the shepherds and had later withdrawn. The exchange of fire had ended at 1508 hours; 15 minutes later, the Israeli armed post had opened artillery fire on the Syrian villages of Ain-Maamoun and Darbashiya. In legitimate defence, and only after the Israeli artillery had opened fire, the Syrian artillery had replied. The representative of the United Arab Republic expressed surprise that the Security Council had been seized of this question before the Mixed Armistice Commission had had an opportunity to examine it.<sup>93</sup>

At the 844th meeting on 15 December 1958, the Secretary-General, after expressing deepest concern over the situation in the Huleh region, which was reflected

<sup>90</sup> S/4124. For consideration of the question of legitimate self-defence, see chapter XI, part IV, Case 3.

<sup>91</sup> 841st meeting (PV): p. 6.

<sup>92</sup> 841st meeting (PV): pp. 6-22.

<sup>93</sup> 841st meeting (PV): pp. 26-30.

in the question before the Council, drew the attention of the Council to his plan to visit the countries concerned. It was his intention to take up the situation for most serious consideration by the authorities of Israel and the United Arab Republic in the hope of soliciting their full support for the efforts to attack the underlying problems which were at the source of the tension. He further informed the Council of the request made by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine to Israel and Syria authorities on 11 December 1958 that arrangements be made for visits by United Nations Military Observers to the areas within the north-eastern region. Positive replies had been received and inspections had begun that very morning.<sup>94</sup>

Before the adjournment of the meeting, the President (Sweden) made the following statement:<sup>95</sup>

"I am certain the Council agrees that incidents of the nature we have been discussing are regrettable, but also that they can be effectively dealt with by the Chief of Staff and his organization.

"We fully recognize the gravity of the action about which Israel had complained. The Council will, I feel confident, agree that the authority of the United Nations should be respected and that the parties should continue their co-operation with the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in the spirit of the Armistice Agreement.

"We have listened to the statement by the Secretary-General and taken note of his intention to visit the countries concerned, and there to take up the present situation for most serious consideration by the authorities of Israel and the United Arab Republic, in the hope of breaking the present trend and soliciting their full support for our efforts to attack the underlying problems which are at the source of the tension.

"I venture to express the hope that the incidents of which we have now heard are of an isolated nature. I am convinced that the parties will do everything in their power to prevent recurrences, which would tend to create new tensions in the Middle East."

**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**

**INITIAL PROCEEDINGS**

By a joint letter<sup>96</sup> dated 23 September 1956, the representatives of France and the United Kingdom requested the President of the Security Council to call a meeting of the Council on 26 September 1956 in order to consider the following question:

<sup>94</sup> 844th meeting (PV): pp. 2-6.

<sup>95</sup> 844th meeting (PV): p. 67.

<sup>96</sup> S/3654, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1956, p. 47.

"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."

They stated that the general nature of this situation had been set out in their letter<sup>97</sup> of 12 September 1956 to the President of the Security Council.

By letter<sup>98</sup> dated 24 September 1956, the representative of Egypt, in view of further developments since his letter<sup>99</sup> dated 17 September 1956 to the President of the Security Council, requested that the Security Council be urgently convened to consider the following question:

"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."

The items submitted by France and the United Kingdom, and by Egypt appeared as items 2 and 3, respectively, of the provisional agenda of the 734th meeting on 26 September 1956. The representative of Egypt was invited to participate in the discussion. At the 742nd meeting on 13 October 1956, the representatives of Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Yemen were invited to submit written statements.<sup>100</sup>

<sup>97</sup> S/3645, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1956, pp. 28-29. In this letter, the representatives of France and the United Kingdom stated that the situation created by the action of the Government of Egypt in attempting unilaterally to bring to an end the system of international operation of the Suez Canal, confirmed and completed by the Suez Canal Convention, had created a situation which might endanger the free and open passage of shipping through the Canal. A Conference had therefore been called in London on 16 August 1956, which had been attended by twenty-two States. Eighteen of them, representing over 90 per cent of the users interested in the Canal, had put forward proposals to the Government of Egypt relating to the future operation of the Canal. The Government of Egypt had refused, however, to negotiate on the basis of these proposals, which in the opinion of the French and United Kingdom Governments, offered means for a just and equitable solution. The two Governments considered that this refusal was an aggravation of the situation, which if allowed to continue, would constitute a manifest danger to peace and security.

<sup>98</sup> S/3656, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1956, p. 48.

<sup>99</sup> S/3650, O.R., 11th year, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1956, pp. 38-41. In this letter, the representative of Egypt declared that the act of nationalization of the Suez Canal Company had been taken by Egypt in the full exercise of its sovereign rights and without challenge of infringement of the right of any nation. It had been met by declarations by France of mobilization and movement of armed forces, by hostile economic measures and by incitement to the employees and pilots working in the Canal to abandon their work in an attempt to sabotage the operation of the Canal. Several offers by the Government of Egypt to enter into negotiations at a conference for reviewing the Convention of 1888 had been made to no avail, and instead a "Users' Association", incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of Egypt, had been created by eighteen Governments. Being determined to spare no effort to reach a peaceful solution of the Suez Canal question on the basis of the recognition of the legitimate and sovereign rights of Egypt and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, Egypt considered it indispensable that an end be put to acts such as those complained of, which were a serious danger to the international peace and security and were violations of the Charter.

<sup>100</sup> See chapter III, Case 23.