

Chapter X

CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER VI OF THE CHARTER

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTORY NOTE	201
PART I. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 33 OF THE CHARTER	
Note	202
PART II. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 34 OF THE CHARTER	
Note	207
PART III. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 35 OF THE CHARTER	
Note	209
Tabulation of questions submitted to the Security Council (1972-1974)	211
PART IV. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLES 36-38 AND OF CHAPTER VI IN GENERAL	
Note	216

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

As in the previous volumes of the *Repertoire*, the criterion for inclusion of material in the present chapter is the occurrence of discussion in the Council regarding Articles 33-38 of Chapter VI of the Charter. Thus, chapter X does not cover all the activities of the Council in the pacific settlement of disputes, for the debates preceding the major decisions of the Council in this field have dealt almost exclusively with the actual issues before the Council and the relative merits of measures proposed without discussion of their relation to the provisions of the Charter. For the decisions of the Council in the pacific settlement of disputes, the reader should turn to the appropriate sub-headings of the Analytical Table of Measures adopted by the Security Council.¹

The material in this chapter constitutes only part of the relevant material, since the procedures of the Council reviewed in chapters I-VI, in so far as they relate to the consideration of disputes and situations, are also integral to the application by the Council of Chapter VI of the Charter. Chapter X only presents the instances of deliberate consideration by the Council of the relation of its proceedings or of measures proposed to the text of Chapter VI.

The case histories on each question must be examined in the context of the respective proceedings presented in chapter VIII.

CHAPTER VI OF THE CHARTER: PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Article 33

1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

¹ Chapter VIII, part I.

Article 34

The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 35

1. Any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly.

2. A state which is not a Member of the United Nations may bring to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly any dispute to which it is a party if it accepts in advance, for the purposes of the dispute, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the present Charter.

3. The proceedings of the General Assembly in respect of matters brought to its attention under this Article will be subject to the provisions of Articles 11 and 12.

Article 36

1. The Security Council may, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 or of a situation of like nature, recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

2. The Security Council should take into consideration any procedures for the settlement of the dispute which have already been adopted by the parties.

3. In making recommendations under this Article the Security Council should also take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Court.

Article 37

1. Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that Article, they shall refer it to the Security Council.

2. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under Article 36 or to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

Article 38

Without prejudice to the provisions of Articles 33 to 37, the Security Council may, if all the parties to any dispute so request, make recommendations to the parties with a view to a pacific settlement of the dispute.

Part I

CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 33 OF THE CHARTER

NOTE

During the period under review, none of the communications submitting disputes or situations to the Security Council contained references to prior effort at pacific settlement. However, opening statements during the initial stage of the debates in connexion with the situation in Cyprus and the complaint by Iraq contained such references.²

The significance of Article 33 in the pacific settlement of disputes and situations rests not only on the discharge by the parties of their obligation under that Article but also on the possibility of recourse to the Article by the Council itself.³

The four case histories entered in this part of chapter X cover proceedings in the Council that have some bearing on the exercise by the Council of its responsibility to bring about pacific settlement of a dispute or situation.

Resolutions and decisions adopted by the Security Council during the period under review contained no explicit reference to Article 33. But some of them contained provisions calling on the parties concerned to enter into direct negotiations in order to settle their differences by peaceful means (Cases 1, 2 and 4). In another instance, the Council requested the Secretary-General to appoint a special representative to conduct an investigation of the events that had given rise to the complaint, and subsequently took note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General which informed the Council about the enquiry by the Special Representative acting in the exercise of the Secretary-General's good offices (Case 3). In all these cases, the Council issued also general calls for a negotiated settlement of the questions contested by the parties.

A number of draft resolutions which were either not adopted or not voted upon by the Council might also be considered as an implicit application of Article 33. During the meetings in Addis Ababa the representatives of Guinea, Somalia and Sudan submitted a draft resolution⁴ in connexion with the situation in territories under Portuguese administration; its operative paragraph 4 would reaffirm the urgent demand of the Council for: (d) "Negotiations, on

² In connexion with the situation in Cyprus: 1646th meeting: Secretary-General, paras. 6-19; Cyprus, paras. 27-39; 1683rd meeting: Cyprus, paras. 7-12; 1727th meeting: Cyprus, paras. 8-13; 1759th meeting: Cyprus, first intervention; 1771st meeting: Cyprus; 1779th meeting: Cyprus, first intervention. In connexion with the complaint by Iraq; 1762nd meeting: Iraq, first intervention; Iran, first intervention.

³ In this connexion confer also the various decisions of the Council entered under "Measures for settlement" and "Provisions bearing on specific issues relating to the settlement" in the Analytical Table of Measures of chapter VIII of this *Supplement*.

⁴ S/10607, *OR*, 27th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1972*, pp. 83-84. The text was introduced by the representative of Guinea at the 1637th meeting, paras. 10-24. At an earlier meeting (1635th meeting, paras. 62-66) the representative of the United States expressed hope that the parties involved in Portugal's African Territories would explore new avenues of settlement, such as bilateral or third-party commissions.

the basis of the right to self-determination and independence, with the genuine representatives of the people of the Territories with a view to the transfer of power to political institutions freely elected and representative of the peoples, in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV); ...", This provision was deleted from the revised draft subsequently adopted by the Council.⁵

During the meetings of the Council in Panama City the representatives of Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan and Yugoslavia submitted a draft resolution regarding the questions of the Panama Canal.⁶ Under the draft resolution the Council would have recalled that it is a purpose of the United Nations to bring about adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace, and (1) would have taken note that the Governments of the Republic of Panama and the United States of America agreed to reach a just and fair agreement with a view to the prompt elimination of the causes of conflict between them, (2) would have taken note also of the willingness shown by the Governments of the United States of America and the Republic of Panama to establish in a formal instrument agreements on the abrogation of the 1903 convention on the Isthmian Canal and its amendments and to conclude a new, just and fair treaty concerning the present Panama Canal which would fulfil Panama's legitimate aspirations and guarantee full respect for Panama's effective sovereignty over all of its territory; and (3) would have urged the Governments of the United States of America and the Republic of Panama to continue negotiations in a high spirit of friendship, mutual respect and co-operation and to conclude without delay a new treaty aimed at the prompt elimination of the causes of conflict between them.

In the course of the discussion focusing on the issue of the Panama Canal a large number of representatives stated their Governments' support for the pacific settlement of the issue, called upon the two parties to strive for a speedy conclusion of a new treaty and endorsed an urgent appeal by the Council, as proposed in the draft resolution, to the parties regarding the continuation and objectives of the negotiations between the United States and Panama.⁷ Other representatives also expressed support for a negotiated settlement, held, however, that it was up to the two parties to decide how to proceed in their talks, and cautioned the Council not to intervene unduly in this

⁵ 1639th paras. 130-135. S/10607/Rev.1 adopted as resolution 312 (1972).

⁶ S/10931/Rev.1, *OR*, 28th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1973*, pp. 57-58. It was submitted at the 1702nd meeting, paras. 28-29. For the original draft S/10931 submitted by Panama and Peru see 1698th meeting, para. 112.

⁷ For texts of relevant statements see 1697th meeting: Argentina, paras. 63-67; 1698th meeting: Venezuela, para. 42; Costa Rica, para. 57; Panama, paras. 114-118; 1699th meeting: Trinidad and Tobago, paras. 15-17; Indonesia, paras. 72-73; Yugoslavia, para. 84; 1700th meeting: Kenya, paras. 25-28; Austria, para. 47; Guinea, para. 65; 1701st meeting, India, paras. 55-58.

bilateral matter.⁸ The representative of the United States, invoking Article 33, stated: "While the Charter of the United Nations confers this responsibility on the Security Council, it also provides—indeed, in Article 33, it specifically enumerates—many ways to resolve international issues before such matters are brought directly before the Council,"⁹ and added that the Panama Canal question could best be resolved by direct negotiations between the parties rather than through involvement of the Security Council.¹⁰

The draft resolution received 13 votes in favour, 1 against with 1 abstention and failed of adoption owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.¹¹

During the examination of the situation in the Middle East held by the Council at 1717th to 1726th and 1733rd to 1735th meetings,¹² a draft resolution was submitted by the delegations of Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan and Yugoslavia;¹³ under this draft the Council would *inter alia* take note of the report of the Secretary-General which included an account of the objective and determined efforts of his Special Representative since 1967, (1) deeply regret that the Secretary-General was unable to report significant progress by him or by his Special Representative in carrying out the terms of resolution 242 (1967), (3) express serious concern at Israel's lack of co-operation with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, (7) request the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to resume and pursue their efforts to promote a just and peaceful solution of the Middle East problem, (8) decide to afford the Secretary-General and his Special Representative all support and assistance for the discharge of their responsibilities and (9) call upon all parties concerned to extend full co-operation to the Secretary-General and his Special Representative.

While expressing general support for the exercise of good offices through the Special Representative, those representatives who made what might be considered implicit references to Article 33, addressed themselves to the issue of negotiations, direct or indirect, with or without prior conditions, between Israel and the Arab States involved: several spokesmen stressed the need for negotiations to arrive at a peace settlement,¹⁴ others rejected this proposal and advocated the involvement of the Security Council in the search for further steps toward peace in the Middle East.¹⁵

The draft resolution received 13 votes in favour, 1 against—one member did not participate in the vote—and failed of adoption owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.¹⁶

Except for one explicit reference to Article 33,¹⁷ there have been only what might be considered implicit references to this Article in the debates in the Council.¹⁸ In connexion with the situation in Namibia, several representatives mentioned the various means for the peaceful settlement of disputes and situations under the Charter; one of them supported the ongoing negotiations between the Government of South Africa and the Secretary-General as a major instrument provided for in the Charter, while two African spokesmen warned that all the provisions for peaceful settlement under the Charter had been used to no avail because of South African defiance and that these instruments should only be employed if they were likely to succeed.¹⁹ In connexion with his Government's complaint the representative of Senegal urged the Council to order the Government of Portugal to start at once on the negotiations regarding the Senegalese peace plan.²⁰ During the Council meetings in Panama City one representative declared that the use of peaceful means was customary in settling disputes among the American States; others addressed themselves to the unresolved questions of the Malvinas and of Belize and urged that these issues be settled peacefully by negotiation and compromise.²¹

Case 1. Situation in territories under Portuguese administration: In connexion with draft resolutions submitted jointly by Guinea, Somalia and Sudan (S/10834), withdrawn, S/10838, replaced by S/10838/Rev.1, voted upon and adopted on 22 November 1972 as resolution 322 (1972).

Numerous speakers urged that the Portuguese Government should accept the call of the liberation movements in the territories under its administration for negotiations toward a peaceful settlement as a result of which these territories would gain their independence. These negotiations should be initiated in accordance with the provisions for peaceful settlement under the Charter. Besides general calls for negotiations several representatives offered more specific proposals: some of these envisaged to restrict the subject of the negotiations to the mode of transferring governmental authority to the independence movements in the territories; others emphasized the need for unconditional open talks. Most of the speakers in the debate suggested a strong involvement of the United Nations in

⁸ For relevant statements see 1699th meeting: Australia, para. 112; 1700th meeting: Canada, para. 173; 1701st meeting: France, para. 15; United Kingdom, para. 106.

⁹ 1701st meeting, para. 117.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, para. 121. See also 1702nd meeting, para. 38, and 1704th meeting, paras. 73-75.

¹¹ 1704th meeting, para. 66.

¹² For the procedural history of these meetings see chapter VIII, part II: "The situation in the Middle East," pp. 124-131.

¹³ S/10974, *OR*, 28th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1973*, pp. 20-21.

¹⁴ See 1717th meeting: Israel, paras. 109-112; 1735th meeting: Australia.

¹⁵ See 1717th meeting: Jordan, para. 135; 1720th meeting: Kuwait, para. 37; 1734th meeting: Tunisia.

¹⁶ 1735th meeting, following the intervention by Panama.

¹⁷ See above, foot-note 9.

¹⁸ Implicit references to Article 33 which occurred during the proceedings involving the cases 1 through 4 below, are not included in this paragraph.

¹⁹ For relevant statements in connexion with the situation in Namibia see 1657th meeting: Italy, para. 105; 1678th meeting: Ethiopia; 1757th meeting: Niger.

²⁰ In connexion with the complaint by Senegal see 1667th meeting: Senegal, paras. 42-43.

²¹ For relevant statements see 1696th meeting: Colombia, para. 123; 1697th meeting: Argentina, para. 90; 1698th meeting: Guatemala, paras. 108-109; 1700th meeting: Guinea, para. 60; 1701st meeting: United Kingdom, para. 107.

getting the negotiations started and even in mediating between the parties during the actual negotiating process.²²

The draft resolutions submitted by Guinea, Somalia and Sudan contained paragraphs calling upon the Government of Portugal to enter into negotiations with the other parties involved. Thus, draft resolution S/10834, which was subsequently withdrawn, would have provided under paragraph 6 as follows:

Calls upon the Government of Portugal, in conformity with the recommendations contained in General Assembly resolution 2918 (XXVII), and in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), to enter into negotiations with the national liberation movements of Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, and Mozambique recognized by the Organization of African Unity with a view to arriving at a solution to the armed conflict that prevails in those Territories and permitting them to accede to independence; ...²³

It was replaced by a new text which underwent a few further changes (S/10838/Rev.1) and was subsequently adopted by the Council as resolution 322 (1972).²⁴ It read in its paragraph 3 as follows:

Calls upon the Government of Portugal, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), to enter into negotiations with the parties concerned, with a view to achieving a solution to the armed confrontation that exists in the Territories of Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, and Mozambique and permitting the peoples of those Territories to exercise their right to self-determination and independence; ...

Case 2. *Situation in the Middle East:* In connexion with a draft resolution submitted jointly by the USSR and the United States (S/11036), voted upon and adopted on 21 October 1973 as resolution 338 (1973); another draft resolution jointly submitted by the ten non-permanent members of the Council (S/11156), voted upon and adopted on 15 December 1973 as resolution 344 (1973), and a third draft resolution submitted jointly by Austria, Indonesia, Kenya, Mauritania, Peru, and the United Republic of Cameroon (S/11565), voted upon and adopted on 29 November 1974 as resolution 363 (1974).

Following the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East in October 1973, the Council issued several calls for the immediate start of negotiations between the parties, the first of these being resolution 338 (1973). The two sponsors of draft resolution S/11036, the USSR and the United States, affirmed resolution 242 (1967) as the main instrument for the settlement of the conflict in the Middle East and urged the parties and the members of the Council to initiate the search for a peaceful settlement through negotiations in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and under appropriate auspices. Spokesmen for the parties involved differed as to the goals and the procedures of the suggested negotiations, one side advocating direct talks, the other side rejecting direct negotiations at that

time and favouring principal involvement of the United Nations.²⁵

Under the draft resolution which was adopted as resolution 338 (1973), the Security Council *inter alia*

2. *Calls upon* the parties concerned to start immediately after the cease-fire the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in all of its parts;

3. *Decides* that, immediately and concurrently with the cease-fire, negotiations shall start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East.²⁶

In accordance with resolution 338 (1973) steps were taken to start negotiations between the parties. The Council convened to discuss the arrangements for the proposed Peace Conference on the Middle East and adopted the draft resolution S/11156, which had been submitted by the ten non-permanent members of the Council, as resolution 344 (1973) which read *inter alia* as follows:

The Security Council,

Considering that it has decided by its resolution 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973 that talks among the parties to the Middle East conflict for the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 should be held under "appropriate auspices",

Noting that a peace conference on the Middle East situation is to begin shortly at Geneva under the auspices of the United Nations,

1. *Expresses the hope* that the Peace Conference will make speedy progress towards the establishment of a just and durable peace in the Middle East;

2. *Expresses its confidence* that the Secretary-General will play a full and effective role at the Conference in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and that he will preside over its proceedings, if the parties so desire;

3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Council suitably informed of the developments in negotiations at the Conference, in order to enable it to review the problems on a continuing basis; ...

During the debate several speakers stated that the phrase "under appropriate auspices" in resolution 338 (1973) referred to those of the United Nations, that the arrangements for the Peace Conference on the Middle East were not sufficient to implement the phrase in resolution 338 and that the new resolution constituted an attempt to involve the United Nations and in particular the Council in this upcoming conference directly related to the responsibility of the Council for the maintenance of peace and security. One of these speakers went further by stating that his Government could not accept the abdication of this responsibility by the Council; in his opinion the Council would have to give its approval to the final peace settlement by accompanying it with suitable guarantees, but resolution 344 (1973) failed to spell out the link between the negotiations and the Council or to establish the conditions under which the Secretary-General would be invited to the Conference and under which he would keep the Council informed. Others abstained in the vote because they held that the adopted text could not be supported at that moment since negotiations regarding invitations to the conference were still proceeding and since previous resol-

²² For relevant statements see 1672nd meeting: Sierra Leone, Ethiopia, 1673rd meeting: Tanzania, Mr. Dos Santos, Somalia. 1674th meeting: Belgium; 1676th meeting: Yugoslavia, Italy, Somalia; 1677th meeting: Panama; India; Japan; Somalia; France; United Kingdom; United States.

²³ S/10834, *OR*, 27th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1972*, pp. 47-48.

²⁴ For the detailed procedural history of this case see chapter VIII, part II, under the same title.

²⁵ For relevant statements see 1743rd meeting: United States, Egypt; Israel; 1747th meeting: United States; USSR.

²⁶ For the detailed procedural history of this case see chapter VIII, part II, under the same title.

utions contained the whole framework for the conference and the peace negotiations.²⁷

In connexion with the renewal of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General²⁸ in the agenda. The Secretary-General, in orally introducing the report in the Council, emphasized the urgency of a negotiated settlement between the two parties involved. Several representatives expressed hope that the peace negotiations would be renewed again and called urgently for a resumption of the Peace Conference in Geneva as the most suitable forum for the conduct of the peace talks under resolution 338 (1973). The President speaking as his Government's representative stated that his Government shared the sense of urgency and would make every effort to advance step by step towards peace in the area.²⁹

The draft resolution S/11565 was jointly submitted by Austria, Indonesia, Kenya, Mauritania, Peru and the United Republic of Cameroon and was adopted as resolution 363 (1974).³⁰ It provided *inter alia*:

The Security Council

...

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,

...

Decides:

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

Case 3. *Complaint by Iraq*: In connexion with a statement of 28 February 1974 by the President, representing the consensus of the members of the Council (S/11229) and a draft resolution emerging from consultations among members of the Council (S/11299), voted upon and adopted as resolution 348 (1974).

During the debate concerning frontier incidents involving Iran and Iraq all speakers urged the use of peaceful means in settling these incidents and called for bilateral negotiations between the parties involved. While one party insisted on strictly bilateral exchanges through normal diplomatic channels, the other sought to employ also judicial settlement and third party involvement in the search for a solution. Following the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the report of the Secretary-General thereon,³¹ the Council resumed the discussion. Most representatives explicitly acknowledged

the important third party role played by the United Nations and emphasized the use of the good offices of the Secretary-General through his Special Representative in bringing about the agreement among the parties regarding the next stages of the process of resolving the issue of the frontier incidents. Two members of the Council pointed out that the Secretary-General should seek the agreement of the Council regarding the nature and extent of his assistance to the parties in the exercise of his good offices.³²

At the 1764th meeting on 28 February 1974, the President read a statement³³ representing the consensus of the members of the Council, which provided *inter alia*:

2. ... The Council reaffirms the fundamental principles set out in the Charter regarding respect for the territorial sovereignty of States and the pacific settlement of disputes...

3. From the information available to the Council, it appears that the cause of the events lies, *inter alia*, in the fact that the legal basis for the delimitation of the boundary between the parties is contested.

4. The Council has noted the recent exchange of ambassadors between the two States and hopes that this could constitute a channel through which problems affecting relations between the parties might be resolved.

5. As additional information is required, the Security Council requests the Secretary-General:

– to appoint as soon as possible a special representative ...; and

– to report within three months. ...

On 20 May 1974, the Secretary-General submitted his report³⁴ in accordance with the consensus of the Council, in which he communicated to the Council the points of agreement between the parties arrived at through his Special Representative, acting in exercise of the good offices of the Secretary-General.

At its 1770th meeting on 28 May 1974, the Council considered this report and adopted a draft resolution which had emerged as a result of prior consultations,³⁵ as resolution 348 (1974). It read as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling its consensus adopted on 28 February 1974 (S/11229),

1. *Takes note with appreciation* of the Secretary-General's report, which was circulated to the Security Council on 20 May 1974 (S/11291);

2. *Welcomes* the reported determination on the part of Iran and Iraq to de-escalate the prevailing situation and to improve their relations and, in particular, the fact that both countries have agreed through the Secretary-General's Special Representative, acting in the exercise of the Secretary-General's good offices, to the following points:

(a) A strict observance of the 7 March 1974 ceasefire agreement;

²⁷ For relevant statements see 1760th meeting: Guinea; France; United Kingdom; United States; China. For the detailed procedural history of this case see chapter VIII, part II, under the same title.

²⁸ S/11563, dated 27 November 1974, *OR, 29th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1974*, pp. 43-47.

²⁹ For relevant statements see 1809th meeting: Secretary-General; Peru; USSR; Cameroon; France; Byelorussian SSR; President (United States).

³⁰ For the detailed procedural history of this case see chapter VIII, part II, under the same title.

³¹ S/11291, *OR, 29th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1974*, pp. 125-129. For the consideration of this matter as an instance of the Council's investigative function under the Charter see part II, case 7.

³² For relevant statements see 1762nd meeting: Iraq; Iran; 1763rd meeting: United Arab Emirates; Iran; 1764th meeting: President; China; 1770th meeting: USSR; China; United Kingdom; United States; Byelorussian SSR; President (Kenya); Iran; Iraq.

³³ S/11229, *OR, 29th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1974*, pp. 108-109.

³⁴ S/11291, *OR, 29th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1974*, pp. 125-129.

³⁵ S/11299, adopted without change. For the detailed procedural history of this case see chapter VIII, part II, under the same title.

(b) Prompt and simultaneous withdrawal of concentrations of armed forces along the entire border, in accordance with an arrangement to be agreed upon between the appropriate authorities of the two countries;

(c) The creation of a favourable atmosphere conducive to achieving the purpose stated in the following subparagraph, by refraining totally from any hostile actions against each other;

(d) An early resumption, without any preconditions, at the appropriate level and place, of conversations with a view to a comprehensive settlement of all bilateral issues;

3. *Expresses the hope* that the parties will take as soon as possible the necessary steps to implement the agreement reached;

4. *Invites the Secretary-General* to lend whatever assistance may be requested by both countries in connexion with the said agreement.

Case 4. *Situation in Cyprus*: In connexion with a draft resolution emerging from consultations among members of the Council (S/11350), voted upon and adopted as resolution 353 (1974), a draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom, (S/11446), revised through consultations among members of the Council (S/11446/Rev.1), voted upon and adopted as resolution 357 (1974), a draft resolution submitted by France (S/11450), twice revised (S/11450/Rev.2), voted upon and adopted as resolution 360 (1974), a draft resolution submitted by Austria, France and the United Kingdom (S/11479), voted upon and adopted as resolution 361 (1974), and a draft resolution emerging from consultations among members of the Council (S/11573), voted upon and adopted as resolution 364 (1974).

Prior to the crisis of July 1974, the Council had, on occasion adopted resolutions which might be considered as an indirect application of Article 33: in extending the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force for further periods, the Council also continued to urge the parties to maintain determined co-operative efforts to achieve the objectives of the Security Council by availing themselves in a constructive manner of the current auspicious climate and opportunities.³⁶

During the debates in the Council concerning the crisis of summer 1974, numerous speakers called for negotiations between the parties directly involved and among the guarantor States to seek a just and lasting peaceful settlement of the intercommunal issues dividing the island republic and the surrounding neighbouring States. Most of these invoked the principles of the Charter of the United Nations for the pacific settlement of disputes and indicated that the continued involvement of the United Nations, in particular in the person of the Secretary-General and his Representative, was highly desirable and useful. One representative called for negotiations under the chairmanship of the Secretary-General and proposed the principal participation of the Security Council in the search for a solution. The representative of Cyprus raised the question whether

negotiations could be fair and open while the invader was occupying large parts of the territory.³⁷

At the 1781st meeting on 20 July 1974, the President proposed to put to the vote a draft resolution which had emerged as a result of consultations among members of the Council.³⁸ The draft resolution was adopted as resolution 353 (1974); it provided in paragraph 5:

(The Security Council, ...)

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; ...

At the 1792nd meeting on 14 August 1974, the Council voted upon a draft resolution, originally submitted by the United Kingdom³⁹ and revised during consultations among members of the Council,⁴⁰ and adopted it as resolution 357 (1974), paragraph 3 of which read as follows:

(The Security Council, ...)

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); ...*

At the 1794th meeting on 16 August 1974, the President noted that a draft resolution submitted by France⁴¹ had been twice revised.⁴² The Council voted upon and adopted the revised draft resolution as resolution 360 (1974). It provided under paragraph 3:

(The Security Council, ...)

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; ...*

At the 1795th meeting on 30 August 1974, a draft resolution sponsored by Austria, France and the United Kingdom⁴³ was voted upon and adopted as resolution 361 (1974); it provided *inter alia*:

(The Security Council, ...)

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; ...*

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; ...*

In connexion with the extension of the mandate of UNFICYP at the 1810th meeting on 13 December 1974, the Council in voting for the draft resolution which had

³⁷ For relevant statements see 1779th meeting: Cyprus; 1780th meeting: United States; 1781st meeting: United Kingdom; United States; Austria; 1782nd meeting: United States; 1792nd meeting: United States; 1794th meeting: President (USSR); 1810th meeting: Cyprus; United States.

³⁸ S/11350, adopted without change.

³⁹ S/11446, *OR*, 29th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1974*, p. 104.

⁴⁰ S/11446/Rev.1, adopted without change.

⁴¹ S/11450, *ibid.*, pp. 105-106.

⁴² S/11450/Rev.2, adopted without further change.

⁴³ S/11479, adopted as orally revised.

³⁶ Resolutions 315 (1972) of 15 June 1972; 324 (1972) of 12 December 1972; 334 (1973) of 15 June 1973; 343 (1973) of 14 December 1973; 349 (1974) of 29 May 1974; especially para. 2. In these resolutions the Council reaffirmed earlier resolutions whereby it had *inter alia* recommended certain measures of pacific settlement, in particular resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, para. 7, and resolution 244 (1967) of 22 December 1967, paras. 3 and 5.

emerged from consultations among members of the Council,⁴⁴ provided *inter alia* the following:

(The Security Council, ...)

⁴⁴ S/11573, adopted without change. For the detailed procedural history of this case see chapter VIII, part II, p. 144, under the same title.

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, ...

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; ...

Part II

CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 34 OF THE CHARTER

NOTE

During the period under review, there has been no instance of an explicit reference to Article 34 in the resolutions or decisions of the Security Council. But there has been some constitutional discussion regarding the interpretation and application of this Article in connexion with an informal proposal under consideration.⁴⁵

The four case histories entered in this part relate in varying degrees to the functions of investigation by the Security Council as envisaged in Article 34, but in only one of these instances the stated purpose of the proposed investigation was to determine whether the continuance of the particular dispute or situation was in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.⁴⁶ In another instance, the Council requested the Secretary-General to appoint a special representative to conduct an investigation of the events in a situation which could endanger peace and stability in the region.⁴⁷ In a third instance involving the situation created by the aggressive acts of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia against the security and economy of Zambia, the Council decided to dispatch a special Security Council mission, assisted by a team of six United Nations experts, to assess the situation in the area and the needs of Zambia in maintaining alternative systems of communications for the normal flow of traffic.⁴⁸ In the fourth instance, the Council considered a draft resolution which proposed the dispatch of a special mission of the Council for the purpose of assessing the development of events in Cyprus, creating a serious threat to international peace and security, and of verifying on the spot the implementation of resolution 353 (1974).⁴⁹

On a number of occasions, suggestions have been made that the Council consider the dispatch of fact-finding and information-gathering missions to assist in the struggle for self-determination and independence,⁵⁰ to form investigating committees and missions for the purpose of exam-

ining the progress in major issues affecting the future of Africa,⁵¹ for the control of the arms flow into the territories under Portuguese administration⁵² and for the involvement of the Council in ending border incidents in Africa.⁵³

In discussing such a suggestion, one spokesman pointed to the great value of investigations conducted by the United Nations in the past and quoted their success as proof "that there exists no substitute for first-hand information on the political, economic and social situation in the Territories and on the views, wishes and aspirations of the people,....".⁵⁴

During the Council debates, Article 34 was invoked several times. In connexion with the complaint by Cuba, the Article was referred to, together with Articles 35 and 39, in support of or in opposition to, the charges brought by the Government of Cuba.⁵⁵ The Article was also invoked during the consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America by a representative who then added: "The perception that Article 34 of the Charter provides a rich source of constitutional authority has already done much to strengthen the Council's effectiveness and to develop the Organization's peace-keeping role. It is unquestionably the case that acts of aggression have been discouraged through United Nations presences appointed to observe, to report and to publicize activities in troubled areas of the world. ... But preventive diplomacy, like preventive medicine, should not await the manifestation of ill health. The investigative jurisdiction conferred by Article 34 is not restricted to specific disputes brought to the Council on the basis of adversary proceedings. It can and should be invoked by the Council itself responsive to its

⁵¹ In connexion with the same question: 1630th meeting: Yugoslavia.

⁵² In connexion with the situation in Territories under Portuguese administration: 1672nd meeting: Liberia; 1676th meeting: Somalia; 1677th meeting: India, and in opposition to such an investigating committee: Panama.

⁵³ In connexion with the complaint by Senegal: 1669th meeting: United States.

⁵⁴ In connexion with the consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America: 1699th meeting: Chairman, Special Committee of Twenty-Four.

⁵⁵ In connexion with the complaint by Cuba: 1741st meeting: Chile; 1742nd meeting: President (Yugoslavia); See also case 6 below for further details.

⁴⁵ Case 6 below, in connexion with the complaint by Cuba.

⁴⁶ Case 6.

⁴⁷ Case 7 below, in connexion with the complaint by Iraq.

⁴⁸ Case 5 below, in connexion with the complaint by Zambia.

⁴⁹ Case 8 below, in connexion with the situation in Cyprus.

⁵⁰ In connexion with the consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America: 1699th meeting: Chairman, Special Committee of Twenty-Four, in connexion with the consideration of questions relating to Africa ...: 1636th meeting: Burundi.

obligations for maintaining peace and security in all regions of the world.⁵⁶

Case 5. *Complaint by Zambia*: In connexion with draft resolutions submitted jointly by Guinea, Kenya, Sudan and Yugoslavia (S/10875 and S/10876), revised, voted upon and adopted on 2 February 1973 as resolutions 326 and 327 (1973).

During the discussions prior to and following the adoption of the two resolutions by the Council, the majority of its members favoured the dispatch of a Council mission and of a team of United Nations experts to examine the situation in Zambia and to assess its needs for the maintenance of its economy and of alternative systems of communications, as long as the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia continued to exist and to threaten or to attack the security and the economy of Zambia. Others expressed grave doubts about the utility of a political mission and proposed to restrict the investigating team to technical experts drawn from the locally and otherwise easily available United Nations staff, so that the investigation could be conducted free from the political and time pressure of a high-level Council mission and could if necessary be extended or intensified in order to gauge the effectiveness of the Council measures in Zambia.⁵⁷

The two draft resolutions⁵⁸ jointly submitted by the initial sponsors Guinea, Kenya, Sudan and Yugoslavia, were slightly revised in the course of the proceedings and subsequently adopted as resolutions 326 and 327 (1973).⁵⁹

Resolution 326, paragraph 9 read as follows:

(The Security Council, ...)

9. *Decides* to dispatch immediately a special mission, consisting of four members of the Security Council, to be appointed by the President of the Security Council after consultations with the members, to assess the situation in the area, and requests the mission so constituted to report to the Council not later than 1 March 1973; ...

Resolution 327, paragraph 3 provided the following:

(The Security Council, ...)

"3. *Decides* to entrust the Special Mission, consisting of four members of the Security Council, referred to in paragraph 9 of resolution 326 (1973), assisted by a team of six United Nations experts, to assess the needs of Zambia, in maintaining alternative systems of road, rail, air and sea communications for the normal flow of traffic; ..."

The report of the Security Council Mission established under resolution 326 (1973)⁶⁰ was submitted to the Council on 6 March 1973 and considered during the 1692nd through 1694th meetings.⁶¹

⁵⁶ 1696th meeting: Guyana.

⁵⁷ For relevant statements see 1687th meeting: Zambia; 1688th meeting: Kenya; 1689th meeting: France; United States; 1690th meeting: Sudan; 1691st meeting: United States; France; President; 1692nd meeting: Indonesia.

⁵⁸ S/10875 and S/10876; they were replaced by S/10875/Rev.1 and S/10876/Rev.1 cosponsored also by India and Indonesia.

⁵⁹ For the vote see chapter VIII, part II, under the same title.

⁶⁰ S/10896/Rev.1, *OR*, 28th yr., *Special Supplement No. 2*.

⁶¹ For the detailed procedural history of this case see chapter VIII, part II, under the same title.

Case 6. *Complaint by Cuba*: In connexion with two letters (S/10993 and S/10995) from the representative of Cuba calling for a meeting of the Security Council, invoking Articles 34, 35 and 39 of the Charter and asking for the intervention of the Council.

The Council debate about the Cuban charges against Chile engendered some relevant constitutional discussion regarding the interpretation of Article 34 and the definition of the alleged acts as a threat to international peace and security. Several speakers supporting the Cuban viewpoint invoked Article 34 alone or together with Articles 35 and 39 and described the Chilean acts of violence as constituting a serious threat to international peace and security. On the basis of this interpretation the representative of Cuba formally asked for an investigation of his Government's charges by the Council. Those opposing the Cuban allegations did not see the events as fulfilling the criteria of Article 34 and related provisions of the Charter and rejected therefore the call for a Council investigation. Quoting the text of Article 34, the representative of Chile stated: "... Therefore two conditions have to be fulfilled at the same time for the Security Council to be allowed to carry out an investigation. The controversy or dispute complained about must first of all be present and, secondly, it must threaten or endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. In the incident that occurred around the Cuban Embassy in Santiago neither of those two conditions is fulfilled."⁶²

Although the representative of Cuba formally asked for an investigation by the Council, no draft resolution to that effect was submitted, and the President adjourned the meeting without setting a new date for another meeting on the issue.⁶³

Case 7. *Complaint by Iraq*: In connexion with the President's statement representing the consensus of the members of the Council (S/11229).

During the consideration by the Council of the complaint by Iraq concerning incidents on its frontier with Iran, the representative of Iraq expressed his Government's willingness to accept a special mission of the Secretary-General to investigate the situation along the eastern borders. Following the successful outcome of the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, several spokesmen praised the investigation by the Special Representative as an example of the quiet resolution of political conflict and as successful fact-finding which would allow the resumption of negotiations toward a bilateral agreement between the two parties.⁶⁴

At a result of consultations among the members the President was able to make a statement representing the consensus of the members of the Council.⁶⁵ It provided in paragraph 5 as follows:

⁶² For relevant statements see 1741st meeting: Cuba; Chile; 1742nd meeting: United States; President (Yugoslavia); Cuba; Chile.

⁶³ For the detailed procedural history of this case see chapter VIII, part II, pp. 187-189, under the same title.

⁶⁴ For relevant statements see 1762nd meeting: Iraq; 1764th meeting: President; 1770th meeting: United States; Iran.

⁶⁵ S/11229, *OR*, 29th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1974*, pp. 1-2.

5. As additional information is required, the Security Council requests the Secretary-General:

... to appoint as soon as possible a special representative to conduct an investigation of the events that have given rise to the complaint by Iraq; and

... to report within three months.

On 20 May 1974, the Secretary-General submitted a report to the Council on the implementation of its consensus, and the Council considered the report at its 1770th meeting.⁶⁶

Case 8. *Situation in Cyprus*: In connexion with a draft resolution submitted by the USSR (S/11391), considered but not voted upon.

In the course of the Council debates concerning the crisis of summer 1974, the representative of the USSR repeatedly called for the immediate dispatch of a Special Mission of the Council to Cyprus for the purpose of verifying on the spot the implementation of resolution 353

⁶⁶ S/11291, with an annex containing the report of the Special Representative, *OR, 29th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1974*, pp. 125-129. For the detailed procedural history of this case see chapter VIII, part II, p. 189 under the same title.

(1974) and of reporting to the Council. This proposal was also part of a draft resolution sponsored by the USSR.⁶⁷ The representative underlined the urgency of his Government's proposal by pointing to the deteriorating situation on the island and to the lack of up-to-date information for the Council whose active engagement would intensify the investigation of the current development and function as a moderating pacifying force on the troubled island. A number of representatives supported the USSR proposal, while others criticized it as a superfluous manoeuvre merely designed to disturb the efforts by the interested parties and by the Secretary-General to arrive at a peaceful solution. The draft resolution (S/11391) was considered by the Council which, however, did not vote upon the measure.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ S/11391, *OR, 29th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1974*, p. 70.

⁶⁸ For relevant statements see 1786th meeting: United Kingdom; 1787th meeting: USSR; 1792nd meeting: President (USSR); Cyprus; 1793rd meeting: President (USSR); 1794th meeting: President (USSR); 1795th meeting: President (USSR); United Kingdom; China; Byelorussian SSR; 1810th meeting: Byelorussian SSR; 1810th meeting: Byelorussian SSR. For the detailed procedural history of this case see chapter VIII, part II, p. 144 under the same title.

Part III

CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 35 OF THE CHARTER

NOTE

During the period under review, twelve questions involving the maintenance of international peace and security were brought to the attention of the Security Council, all by Members of the United Nations. The relevant date regarding the submission of these questions are summarized in the appended tabulation.

The Security Council has continued to consider, at the request of the parties or other Members of the United Nations, questions that had previously been included in the agenda: the situation in Southern Rhodesia; the situation in the Middle East; complaint by Senegal; the situation in Territories under Portuguese administration; complaint by Zambia; the situation in Namibia; and complaint by the Government of Cyprus.⁶⁹

SUBMISSION BY MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Members of the United Nations have generally submitted questions to the Security Council by means of a communi-

⁶⁹ No new complaints were submitted under this agenda item; following the series of meetings since the 1779th meeting, on 16 July 1974, during which the Council discussed the new developments under the agenda item "The situation in Cyprus", the Council decided at its 1810th meeting, on 13 December 1974, to have the former item ("Letter dated 26 December 1963 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus...") deleted from the list of items of which the Security Council is seized. Accordingly, the old item is not included in this tabulation. For the consideration by the Council of the reports of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus see chapter VIII, part II under the title: The Situation in Cyprus.

cation addressed to the President of the Security Council, although Article 35 was cited only once⁷⁰ as the basis for submission.⁷¹

No question was submitted to the Council as a dispute. In twenty-one instances⁷² questions were explicitly described as situations; in eleven,⁷³ the letter of submission contained terms similar to those of Article 39. In one instance,⁷⁴ the Council was requested by a group of Members from the OAU to decide to convene meetings in an African capital to consider questions relating to Africa; a somewhat similar request was submitted by a Council member to hold meetings at Panama City to consider issues relating to Latin America.⁷⁵ In another case, Members requested meetings to resume consideration of a matter already on the agenda of the Council and to consider a special Committee report on the question.⁷⁶ Two Members requested separately that the Council consider the refusal

⁷⁰ Together with Articles 34 and 39. See tabulation section B, entry 8.

⁷¹ In two other instances, Charter articles were cited in the letter requesting a meeting of the Council: see tabulation section B, entry 3 (XII), where Article 24 was invoked, and entry 6, containing an explicit reference to Article 28 (3).

⁷² See tabulation, section B, entries 3 (i-iii, vi, ix, xii-xiv); 5; 7 (ii); 8; 9 (i); 11 (i-ix).

⁷³ See tabulation, section B, entries 3 (i, iii, ix-xi); 4; 7 (i); 8; 10; 11 (ii, vii).

⁷⁴ See tabulation, section B, entry 1.

⁷⁵ See tabulation, section B, entry 6.

⁷⁶ See tabulation, section B, 2 (i-iii).

by another Member to implement a Council resolution,⁷⁷ whereas the latter asked for a meeting a few days later to consider the mutual release of all prisoners of war involved in their conflict.⁷⁸ On two occasions, a Member, as Chairman of the African Group, referred to a General Assembly resolution adopted on the same day and asked for a meeting of the Council to consider the related question.⁷⁹

STATES NOT MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

During the period under review, there was no incidence of a question being submitted by a non-member of the United Nations.

⁷⁷ See tabulation, section B, entry 3 (v and vi)

⁷⁸ See tabulation, section B, entry 3 (vii)

⁷⁹ See tabulation, section B, entries 9 (ii) and 12

PROCEDURAL CONSEQUENCES OF SUBMISSION UNDER ARTICLE 35

Communications submitting questions for consideration by the Security Council have been dealt with in accordance with rules 6-9 of the provisional rules of procedure; material relating to the application of these rules is contained in chapter II, parts II and III, of this *Supplement*.

During the period under review, none of the letters of submission contained a draft resolution.

The Council has not considered whether or not to accept the designation of any of the new questions submitted for its consideration in the initial submission. Nor was any question raised as to the appropriate designation for a question included in the agenda at an earlier period.⁸⁰

⁸⁰ In one instance, in connexion with the situation in the Middle East, several Council members raised objections to the inclusion of a subitem in the provisional agenda. For the procedural history of this important case, including the vote and the resolution of the resulting procedural impasse see chapter II, part III, C. 1, Case.

Tabulation of questions submitted to the Security Council (1972-1974)

**SECTION A. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS AS DISPUTES
SECTION B. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS AS SITUATIONS

Question	Submitted by	Other parties	Articles invoked in letter	Request for action by Security Council	Reference
1. Consideration of questions relating to Africa (letter dated 29 December 1971)	Secretary-General ^a	OAU	None	transmitting to the President of the Council the text of General Assembly resolution 2863 (XXVI) regarding the OAU request for Council meetings in an African capital	S/10480, mimeographed
2. Situation in Southern Rhodesia (i) letter dated 15 February 1972)	Guinea, Somalia, Sudan		None	"request that the Council convene to resume consideration of this matter."	S/10540, OR, 27th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1972, p. 50.
(ii) letter dated 20 September 1972)	Guinea, Somalia, Sudan		None	"to convene a meeting ... to resume consideration of the problem of Southern Rhodesia"	S/10798, OR, 27th yr., Suppl. for July-Aug. 1972, p. 104.
(iii) letter dated 8 May 1973)	Guinea, Kenya		None	"to convene a meeting ... to consider the second special report of the ... Committee ... concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia"	S/10925, OR, 28th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1973, p. 36.
3. Situation in the Middle East (i) letter dated 25 February 1972 ^b)	Lebanon	Israel	None	"persistent acts of aggression by Israel against Lebanon, ... In view of extreme gravity of the situation endangering the peace and security of Lebanon, request to convene meeting"	S/10546, OR, 27th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1972, p. 53.
(ii) letter dated 25 February 1972)	Israel	Lebanon	None	"intolerable situation created by ... armed attacks against Israel from Lebanese territory. In view of the gravity of armed attacks, request to convene an urgent meeting"	S/10550, OR, 27th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1972, p. 57.
(iii) letter dated 23 June 1972 ^b)	Lebanon	Israel	None	"persistent acts of aggression by Israel against Lebanon. In view of the extreme gravity of the situation, request to convene an urgent meeting"	S/10715, OR, 27th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1972, p. 137.
(iv) letter dated 23 June 1972)	Israel	Lebanon	None	"request to convene meeting to consider the continuous armed attacks from Lebanese territory against Israel"	S/10716, OR, 27th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1972, p. 137.

^a Although the Secretary-General transmitted the General Assembly resolutions to the Council President, the request for a series of Council meetings was initially submitted by the Executive Secretary of OAU on behalf of the members to the Council President (S/10272 dated 13 July 1971).

^b The letter of submission employs terms similar to those of Article 39 of the Charter.

Tabulation of questions submitted to the Security Council (1972-1974) (continued)

**SECTION A. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS AS DISPUTES
SECTION B. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS AS SITUATIONS

Question	Submitted by	Other parties	Articles invoked in letter	Request for action by Security Council	Reference
((v) letter dated 5 July 1972)	Syrian Arab Rep.	Israel	None	"request a meeting of Council to deal with refusal by Israel to heed SC res. 316 (1972)" (release of Syrian and Lebanese military and security personnel abducted by Israel)	S/10730, OR, 27th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1972, p. 57.
((vi) letter dated 5 July 1972)	Lebanon	Israel	None	"in view of the gravity of the situation resulting from Israeli defiance of the SC resolution 316 (1972), request to convene a meeting"	S/10731, OR, 27th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1972, pp. 57 f.
((vii) letter dated 17 July 1972)	Israel		None	"request to convene a meeting to consider the mutual release of all prisoners of war"	S/10739, OR, 27th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1972, p. 72.
((viii) letter dated 9 September 1972)	Syrian Arab Rep.	Israel	None	"in view of continuing Israeli attacks on Syrian territories, request an urgent meeting"	S/10782, OR, 27th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1972, pp. 97 f.
((ix) letter dated 10 September 1972 ^b)	Lebanon	Israel	None	"premeditated and unprovoked aggression by Israel; in view of gravity of situation request an urgent meeting"	S/10783, OR, 27th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1972, p. 98.
((x) letter dated 12 April 1973 ^b)	Lebanon	Israel	None	"act of aggression by Israel; due to the gravity of that act and the threat it poses to peace and security in the Middle East, request to convene urgent meeting"	S/10913, OR, 27th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1973, pp. 22 f.
((xi) letter dated 11 August 1973 ^b)	Lebanon	Israel	None	"Israeli air force invaded the air space of Lebanon and forced a civilian plane to fly into Israel; request an urgent meeting to deal with this most serious act of Israeli aggression"	S/10983, OR, 28th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1973, p. 25.
((xii) letter dated 7 October 1973)	United States		24	"request a meeting to consider the situation in the Middle East"	S/11010, OR, 28th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1973, p. 70.
((xiii) letter dated 14 April 1974)	Lebanon	Israel	None	"Israeli armed forces launched an attack against six villages in southern Lebanon. Due to gravity of the situation, endangering peace and security of Lebanon, request an urgent meeting"	S/11264, OR, 29th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1974, pp. 107 f.

	((xiv) letter dated 30 May 1974)	United States		None	"request an urgent meeting to consider the situation in the Middle East, in particular the disengagement of Israeli and Syrian forces"	S/11304, <i>OR</i> , 29th yr., <i>Suppl. for April-June 1974</i> , p. 146.	
4.	Complaint by Senegal (letter dated 16 October 1972 ^b)	Senegal		Portugal	None	"this latest systematic act of aggression by Portugal against Senegal is most serious and significant, because a deliberate planned act of war is involved. ... Request a meeting as a matter of urgency"	S/10807, <i>OR</i> , 27th yr., <i>Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1972</i> , p. 17.
5.	Situation in Territories under Portuguese administration (letter dated 7 November 1972)	Thirty-seven States		Portugal	None	"request to convene a meeting to examine the present situation in the Territories under Portuguese domination. The Council should take the necessary measures to bring Portugal to recognize the right of self-determination and independence of the African peoples under its domination"	S/10828, <i>OR</i> , 27th yr., <i>Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1972</i> , p. 30.
6.	Consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America (letter dated 9 January 1973)	Panama			28 (3)	proposal that the Council meet at Panama City to consider measures for the strengthening of international peace and security	S/10858, <i>OR</i> , 28th yr., <i>Suppl. for Jan.-March 1973</i> , pp. 27 f.
7.	Complaint by Zambia (i) letter dated 24 January 1973 ^b	Zambia			None	"request urgently to convene a meeting for the purpose of considering serious acts of aggression against Zambia, committed by the white minority, illegal and racist régime in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia"	S/10865, <i>OR</i> , 28th yr., <i>Suppl. for Jan.-March 1973</i> , p. 31.
	(ii) letter dated 23 January 1973)	Guinea, Kenya, Sudan			None	"request urgent meeting to consider the explosive situation along the Zambian border which threatens the peace and security of the whole area"	S/10866, <i>OR</i> , 28th yr., <i>Suppl. for Jan.-March 1973</i> , p. 31.
8.	Complaint by Cuba (letter dated 13 September 1973 ^b)	Cuba		Chile	34, 35, 39	"Request to convene the Council as a matter of urgency with a view to considering the serious acts committed by the Armed Forces of Chile... The situation constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security within the meaning of Articles 34, 35 and 39 of the Charter"	S/10995, <i>OR</i> , 28th yr., <i>Suppl. for July-Sept. 1973</i> , p. 31.

Tabulation of questions submitted to the Security Council (1972-1974) (concluded)

**SECTION A. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS AS DISPUTES
SECTION B. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS AS SITUATIONS

Question	Submitted by	Other parties	Articles invoked in letter	Request for action by Security Council	Reference
9. Situation in Namibia (i) letter dated 4 December 1973)	Guinea, Kenya, Sudan		None	"request an urgent meeting for the consideration of the serious situation in Namibia"	S/11145, OR, 28th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1973, p. 257.
(ii) letter dated 13 December 1974)	Upper Volta		None	"As Chairman of the African Group, refer to General Assembly res. 3295 (XXIX) of 13 December 1974, and request a meeting of the Council at the earliest possible date to consider the question of Namibia"	S/11575, OR, 29th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1974, p. 67.
10. Complaint by Iraq (letter dated 12 February 1974b)	Iraq	Iran	None	"Request an urgent meeting to consider the continuing acts of aggression launched by Iranian armed forces against the territorial integrity of Iraq"	S/11216, OR, 29th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Feb. 1974, p. 96.
11. Situation in Cyprus (i) letter dated 16 July 1974)	Cyprus		None	"Request an urgent meeting on the critical situation in Cyprus that has been created today as a result of outside intervention with grave and threatening implications to the Republic of Cyprus and to international peace and security in the area, and for appropriate measures to be taken to protect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus"	S/11335, OR, 29th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1974, p. 22
(ii) letter dated 20 July 1974b)	Greece	Turkey, Cyprus	None	"Request an urgent meeting in order to take appropriate steps following the explosive situation for international peace and security that was created by the brutal aggression of Turkish armed forces against Cyprus now in progress"	S/11348, OR, 29th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1974, p. 30.
(iii) letter dated 21 July 1974)	Cyprus		None	"Request an emergency meeting because of the grave deterioration of the situation in Cyprus"	S/11358, OR, 29th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1974, p. 53.
(iv) letter dated 23 July 1974)	Greece	Turkey, Cyprus	None	"Request to convene immediately the Council in order to examine a most serious situation created by the continuous Turkish violations of the cease-fire decided by the Council"	S/11366, OR, 29th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1974, p. 57.

(v) letter dated 26 July 1974)	Cyprus	Turkey	None	"Request an emergency meeting to consider the grave deterioration of the situation in Cyprus, through the continued and flagrant violations of the cease-fire by Turkey"	S/11384, <i>OR</i> , 29th yr., <i>Suppl. for July-Sept. 1974</i> , p. 66.
((vi) letter dated 28 July 1974)	USSR	Cyprus	None	"Request an urgent meeting to consider the question of the implementation of resolution 353 (1974), adopted on 20 July 1974, concerning the situation in Cyprus. ... a tense situation threatening international peace and security continues to exist in Cyprus."	S/11389, <i>OR</i> , 29th yr., <i>Suppl. for July-Sept. 1974</i> , pp. 68 f.
((vii) letter dated 13 August 1974b)	Cyprus	Turkey	None	"Request an emergency meeting to be convened immediately to consider the dangerously grave situation that has arisen in Cyprus in consequence of renewed acts of naked aggression against Cyprus by Turkey"	S/11444, <i>OR</i> , 29th yr., <i>Suppl. for July-Sept. 1974</i> , p. 103.
((viii) letter dated 13 August 1974)	Greece	Turkey, Cyprus	None	"Request an urgent meeting in order to take appropriate steps following the explosive situation for international peace and security that was created after the interruption of the second phase of the Geneva talks as a result of the Turkish Foreign Minister's declaration that he considers the Conference terminated."	S/11445, <i>OR</i> , 29th yr., <i>Suppl. for July-Sept. 1974</i> , p. 104.
((ix) letter dated 27 August 1974)	Cyprus	Turkey	None	"Request a meeting to consider the grave situation in Cyprus including the refugee problem, and more particularly that arising from the expulsion by force and terror of the whole Greek Cypriot population from their homeland in the invaded territory"	S/11471, <i>OR</i> , 29th yr., <i>Suppl. for July-Sept. 1974</i> , p. 124.
12. Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa (letter dated 9 October 1974)	Tunisia		None	"As Chairman of the African Group, request the convening of a meeting to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa, in conformity with resolution 3207 (XXIX) adopted by the General Assembly on 30 September 1974"	S/11532, <i>OR</i> , 29th yr., <i>Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1974</i> , p. 25.

Part IV

CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLES 36-38 AND OF CHAPTER VI IN GENERAL

NOTE

Part IV deals with cases in which discussion has arisen regarding the responsibility of the Security Council for the settlement of the particular dispute or situation under consideration in the light of the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter.⁸¹

During the period under review, debates preceding decisions of the Council in this field have dealt almost exclusively with the actual issues before the Council and the relative merits of measures proposed without discussion regarding their relation to the provisions of the Charter. Evidence for the interpretation of the provisions of Articles 36-38 has continued to be scant. None of the Articles have been invoked in the text of decisions adopted by the Council, whereas Article 37 and Chapter VI as a whole have been explicitly, yet merely incidentally, referred to during the debates.⁸²

The material included in this part deals mainly with the issue whether the Council could or should be involved in the discussion of a particular question or situation. In one instance (Case 9) some representatives clearly expressed their opposition to an active role of the Council in ongoing bilateral negotiations, while on two other occasions Article 2 (7) of the Charter was cited as barring the Council from concerning itself with the respective issue.⁸³

For relevant decisions other than those reviewed in this part the appropriate headings in the Analytical Table of Measures of chapter VIII of this *Supplement* should be consulted, as well as the materials in the other parts of chapter X.⁸⁴

Case 9. *Consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security*: In connexion with a draft resolution submitted by Panama, Peru and Yugoslavia (S/10931), resubmitted in revised

⁸¹ For general criteria for entries in this part, see *Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council 1946-1951*, pp. 296 and 410.

⁸² Article 37: in connexion with the Consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America ..., 1698th meeting: President (Panama), Chapter VI: in connexion with the same agenda item, 1704th meeting: President (Panama); in connexion with the situation in the Middle East, 1720th meeting: Algeria; in connexion with the Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa, 1801st meeting: Madagascar.

⁸³ In connexion with the Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa, Article 2 (7) was invoked by South Africa, at the 1800th meeting. Chile (1741st meeting) invoked the same provision in connexion with the complaint by Cuba. Chile also introduced another reason against the Council's involvement: the alleged situation was no longer continuing, but had been terminated, and was therefore outside the provisions of Chapter VI.

⁸⁴ Special attention should be drawn to part I of this chapter, since the material covered in that part focuses primarily on the basic instruments of peaceful settlement and on the constitutional place occupied by the Council in this procedure.

form by Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan and Yugoslavia (S/10931/Rev.1), voted upon and not adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.

During the meetings in Panama City the question of the Panama Canal was of central concern. The sponsors of the original draft resolution (S/10931) and those co-sponsoring the revision (S/10931/Rev.1) held that the Council possessed the authority to settle the question of the Panama Canal Zone in accordance with the principles of international law and justice and with the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter. This view was opposed by other members of the Council including a permanent member party to the question, who took the position that the Council could not dictate to the parties the specific terms of a settlement which they were in the process of negotiating, but indicate merely the general principles on the basis of which such a settlement should be established.⁸⁵

Draft resolution S/10931⁸⁶ provided *inter alia* that the Council would (3) call upon the parties directly concerned to execute promptly a new treaty including the agreements mentioned above for the purpose of eliminating the causes of conflict between the two countries, and (5) declare that the effective neutralization of the Panama Canal would foster international peace and security and the maintenance of the peaceful use of the Canal by the international community.

The revised draft resolution S/10931/Rev.1⁸⁷ which was sponsored by eight non-permanent members, would *inter alia* have recalled peaceful settlement of disputes as a principal purpose of the United Nations and under paragraph 3 would have urged the Government of the United States of America and the Republic of Panama to continue negotiations in a high spirit of friendship, mutual respect and co-operation and to conclude without delay a new treaty aimed at the prompt elimination of the causes of conflict between them.

At the 1704th meeting the revised draft resolution received 13 votes in favour, 1 against with 1 abstention and failed of adoption owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ For relevant statements see 1698th meeting: President (Panama), 1701st meeting: France; 1704th meeting: President (Panama); United States, United Kingdom, France. The representative of the United States added that his delegation considered the revised draft resolution as unbalanced and imprecise and voted against it also for that reason. The representative of the United Kingdom explained that his delegation abstained in the vote because the text was not acceptable to one of the parties.

⁸⁶ For the text see 1698th meeting.

⁸⁷ S/10931/Rev.1, *OR*, 28th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1973*, pp. 57-58.

⁸⁸ For the detailed procedural history of this case see chapter VIII, part II, under the same title.