

dom,<sup>362</sup> Morocco,<sup>363</sup> United States,<sup>364</sup> Bolivia,<sup>365</sup> and Brazil.<sup>366</sup>

The representative of Cyprus \* denied allegations by the representative of Turkey regarding conditions of hardship facing the Turkish Cypriots particularly in the Kokkina area where members of the Turkish community were reportedly starving. In that connexion he cited a report<sup>367</sup> from UNFICYP concerning the supply of food in the area and other information to the effect that not only were food supplies ample but very large.<sup>368</sup>

The President (USSR) noting that certain members of the Council had expressed the desire to consult among themselves, proposed that the meeting be suspended for five minutes.<sup>369</sup>

Upon resumption of the meeting, the representative of Turkey \* remarked that although reports received from the Secretary-General had indicated that certain shipments of food had reached the Kokkina area, the situation was only slightly improved. Moreover, there was no reason to believe that that would continue. In order to be certain, he suggested that a committee made up of either the Commander of the United Nations Forces in Cyprus or his representative and a Greek, Turkish and British representative should go into the area, ascertain the facts and the needs of the people for continuous food supply and report by 13 September to the Security Council. The representative then assured the Council that "there is no question of mass deportations" of Greek citizens from Turkey. However, after the expiration of the Convention on Establishment, Commerce and Navigation of 1930, the Greek citizens who lived in Istanbul would be subject to the same regulations that applied to all foreign residents.<sup>370</sup>

The representative of Greece \* stated that in connexion with the question of availability of food in the besieged areas of Cyprus, his Government was prepared to leave it to the Secretary-General and his representative to determine what were reasonable quantities and supplies for those areas.<sup>371</sup>

The meeting was adjourned after the President stated that he would consult with the members to determine the date and time for the next meeting.<sup>372</sup>

### THE PALESTINE QUESTION

**Decision** of 17 December 1964 (1179th meeting):  
*Rejection of the Moroccan draft resolution*

**Decision** of 21 December 1964 (1182nd meeting):  
*Rejection of the joint United Kingdom-United States draft resolution*

By letter<sup>373</sup> dated 14 November 1964, the permanent representative of the Syrian Arab Republic requested that an urgent meeting of the Security Council be convened "to consider the latest aggression committed by Israel against the Syrian Arab Republic".

<sup>362</sup> 1147th meeting: para. 43.

<sup>363</sup> 1147th meeting: paras. 44-47.

<sup>364</sup> 1147th meeting: paras. 55-61.

<sup>365</sup> 1147th meeting: paras. 64-66.

<sup>366</sup> 1147th meeting: paras. 67-68.

<sup>367</sup> S/5961, O.R., 19th yr. Suppl. for July-Sept. 1964, pp. 367-370.

<sup>368</sup> 1147th meeting: paras. 32-34.

<sup>369</sup> 1147th meeting: para. 72.

<sup>370</sup> 1147th meeting: paras. 86-90, 95.

<sup>371</sup> 1147th meeting: paras. 115-117.

<sup>372</sup> 1147th meeting: para. 134.

<sup>373</sup> S/6044, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1964, p. 55.

By letter<sup>374</sup> dated 14 November 1964, the permanent representative of Israel drew the attention of the Security Council to an incident which took place in the Dan sector of the Israel-Syrian border on 13 November 1964. The letter stated that the incident commenced when an Israel police patrol, while proceeding along the border track of Kibbutz Dan, within Israel territory, suddenly came under gun-fire from the nearby Syrian army position of Nukheila. Later two Syrian tanks joined in the attack and artillery started bombarding two nearby villages. Attempts by personnel of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine (UNTSO) to arrange a cease-fire were without avail. In the last resort, Israel planes had to be brought into play in order to silence the Syrian gun positions and halt the bombardment of the Israel villages. As a result, the Syrians promptly agreed to a cease-fire. The Israel casualties in that incident were 3 killed and 11 wounded, and considerable damage was sustained by the two Israel villages as a result of the bombardment. The letter further disputed the Syrian allegation that the Israel patrol vehicle had penetrated into Syrian territory before it came under fire. It was further held that as the incident was one of the gravest clashes on that border in recent years, it was deemed appropriate that the relevant facts be made available to the Council. In conclusion, it was stated that unless the Syrians stopped firing across the border, the Israel Government could not abrogate its duty to defend the lives and property of its citizens, and the integrity of its territory.

By a further letter<sup>375</sup> dated 15 November 1964, the permanent representative of Israel requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the "repeated acts of aggression committed by Syrian armed forces" and the "threats by official spokesmen of the Syrian Government against the territorial integrity and political independence of Israel".

At the 1162nd meeting on 16 November 1964, the Security Council had before it a provisional agenda which, under the general heading: "The Palestine Question", listed as subitems (a) and (b) the complaints submitted by Syria and Israel respectively.

The agenda was adopted<sup>376</sup> and the Security Council considered the question at its 1162nd, 1164th to 1169th, 1179th and 1182nd meetings held between 16 November and 21 December 1964. The representatives of Syria and Israel were invited<sup>377</sup> to take part in the discussion.

At the 1162nd meeting on 16 November 1964, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic \* stated that on that occasion Israel had committed one of "the most wanton aggressions" in the series of attacks against Syria, and that the latest aggression by the Israel Air Force had been carefully planned and premeditated. It was not only a flagrant violation of the Armistice Agreement, but also a clear breach of the Charter. He disputed the Israel assertion in its letter of 14 November that the incursion into Syrian territory was made by a small routine Israel police patrol. It had been made by an armoured unit. The Syrian forces had opened fire on the armoured force only as a defensive action. He asserted that Israel had deliberately provoked that incident in order to have a pre-

<sup>374</sup> S/6045, *ibid.*, pp. 55-59.

<sup>375</sup> S/6046, *ibid.*, p. 60.

<sup>376</sup> 1162nd meeting: para. 3. See also chapter II, Case 2.

<sup>377</sup> 1162nd meeting: para. 4.

text for its large-scale air attack on the Syrian positions several miles inside Syrian territory. From the beginning, Israel had violated Syrian territory and infringed the Armistice Agreement. It attempted to justify its violation of the integrity of Syrian territory by alleging that it was only defending "the lives and property of its citizens and the integrity of its territory". He wanted to emphasize once again that the demilitarized zone was not Israel territory. The Syrian Government could not allow any Israel military movements across the demilitarized zone, as had happened on 14 November, and certainly would reject with all its strength any Israel incursions on its territorial soil. He requested the Council to condemn Israel in the strongest terms leaving no doubt that the Council was determined to put an end to Israel's aggressive acts and policies.

At the same meeting the representative of Israel\* stated that the 13 November incident seemed to have gone through two distinct phases. The first phase was initiated by the sudden and unprovoked attack on the Israel patrol proceeding along the border road in a single vehicle and containing two men, one of them the driver. It was upon that patrol that Syrian positions opened fire. A little while after the incident had started the Syrians launched into a second and far graver phase of their attack. From a number of their artillery positions at different locations on the heights, a simultaneous and co-ordinated bombardment commenced on the Israel villages in the valley below. Israel planes went into action only as a last resort because no other effective means was available in the area by which the shelling could have been halted. The sole purpose of that air strike was to suppress gun positions which were operating at the time against Israel population and territory. In conclusion, he urged that the Council should insist that Syria refrain, first from all further attacks upon, or interference with Israel activities in the border zone, and in particular, all firing across the border; and secondly, refrain from all further threats against the political independence and territorial integrity of Israel.<sup>378</sup>

At the 1164th meeting on 27 November 1964, the Council also had before it a report from the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization relating to the incident of 13 November 1964.<sup>379</sup>

At the 1169th meeting on 8 December 1964, the representative of Morocco introduced a draft resolution<sup>380</sup> by which the Security Council would: (1) condemn the air action undertaken by the armed forces of Israel against the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic on 13 November 1964; (2) express the most severe condemnation with regard to that action; (3) call upon Israel to take effective measures to prevent the repetition of such actions; and (4) call upon the Governments of Syria and Israel strictly to apply the provisions of the Armistice Agreement concluded between the two parties, and fully to participate in the meetings of the Mixed Armistice Commission.

<sup>378</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1162nd meeting: Israel,\* paras. 51, 52, 55, 58, 59, 79; Syria,\* paras. 10, 13, 32, 33, 42. For discussion relating to Article 51, see chapter XI, Case 9.

<sup>379</sup> S/6061, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1964, pp. 70-185.

<sup>380</sup> S/6085/Rev.1, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1964, p. 209.

At the 1179th meeting on 17 December 1964, the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States submitted a joint draft resolution<sup>381</sup> whereby the Security Council would: (1) deplore the renewal of military action on the Israel-Syria Armistice Demarcation Line on 13 November 1964; (2) take special note in the report of the Secretary-General of the observations of the Chief of Staff in paragraphs 24 through 27, and in that connexion recommend specifically: (a) that Israel and Syria co-operate fully with the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission in his efforts to maintain peace in the area; (b) that the parties co-operate promptly in the continuation of the work begun in 1963 of survey and demarcation as suggested in paragraph 45 of document S/5401, commencing in the area of Tel-El-Qadi, and proceeding thereafter to completion, in fulfilment of the recommendations of the Chief of Staff's reports of 24 August 1963 and 24 November 1964; and (c) that the parties participate fully in the meetings of the Mixed Armistice Commission; and (3) request the Secretary-General to inform the Council, by 31 March 1965, of the progress that had been made toward implementing those suggestions.

At the same meeting the Moroccan draft resolution was voted upon and was not adopted. The vote was 3 votes in favour, none against, with 8 abstentions.<sup>382</sup>

Following the voting, the representative of Morocco introduced amendments<sup>383</sup> to the joint United States-United Kingdom draft resolution, providing for the following: (1) insertion in operative paragraph 1, between the words "Deplores" and "the renewal", of the phrase "the violation by an Israel military patrol of the Armistice Demarcation Line in the area of Tel-El-Qadi, which had not been surveyed, contrary to the instructions of the Chairman of the Israel-Syria Mixed Armistice Commission,"; (2) insertion in operative paragraph 1, between the words "13 November 1964" and "deeply regrets" of the phrase "and the subsequent unjustified resort by Israel to aerial action"; (3) deletion in operative paragraph 2 of the word "special" after the word "Takes" and of the word "specifically" after the word "recommends"; (4) deletion in subparagraph (b) of operative paragraph 2 of the words following "demarcation" and substitution by the following: "along the entire Armistice Demarcation Line, including the area of Tel-El-Qadi and the three sectors of the demilitarized zone, in fulfilment of the recommendations of the Chief of Staff's reports of 24 August 1963 and 24 November 1964;" and (5) replacement of subparagraph (c) of operative paragraph 2 by the following: "That Israel as well as Syria participate fully in the meetings of the Mixed Armistice Commission;".

At the 1182nd meeting on 21 December 1964, the Council proceeded to vote on the joint draft resolution, together with the amendments submitted by Morocco. The first, second and fourth Moroccan amendments were not adopted, while the third and fifth amendments were adopted. The joint draft resolution, as amended, received 8 votes in favour and 3 against, but failed of adoption owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.<sup>384</sup>

<sup>381</sup> S/6113, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1964, p. 318.

<sup>382</sup> 1179th meeting: para. 28.

<sup>383</sup> S/6116, 1179th meeting: para. 37.

<sup>384</sup> 1182nd meeting: paras. 21-41.