

The Council considered this complaint at the 697th and 698th meetings on 6 and 19 April 1955, respectively.

At the 697th meeting on 6 April 1955, the Council, upon the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom, decided to postpone further discussion of the matter pending the receipt of a report from the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization.<sup>109</sup>

At the conclusion of the 698th meeting on 19 April 1955, the President (USSR) stated<sup>110</sup> the consensus of opinion of the Council to be that there was no need for any new action by the Council on the question under discussion, inasmuch as the facts brought to the Council's notice and the possible measures to avert frontier incidents along the demarcation line between Egypt and Israel were fully covered in the resolutions of 29 and 30 March 1955. He appealed to the parties to co-operate sincerely to give full effect to those resolutions.<sup>111</sup>

*Decision of 8 September 1955 (700th meeting): Calling upon the parties to take all steps necessary to bring about order and tranquillity in the area of the Egypt-Israel demarcation line*

By letter dated 7 September 1955,<sup>112</sup> the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States requested that the Security Council consider the following item:

"The Palestine question: Cessation of hostilities and measures to prevent further incidents in the Gaza area."

The three representatives explained that the discontinuance of the talks initiated by the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization in accordance with the resolution of 30 March 1955, and the recent outbreak of violence in the Gaza area made it imperative that an unconditional cease-fire be maintained in full force and that concrete measures be taken urgently by Egypt and Israel to prevent further incidents and to bring about order and tranquillity in the area.

A joint draft resolution to this effect accompanied the letter.

The Council, which considered this item at its 700th meeting on 8 September 1955, also had before it a letter dated 6 September<sup>113</sup> from the representative of Egypt concerning the observance by Egypt of the cease-fire proposed by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, and an Israeli armed attack at Khan Yunis in the Gaza area. It also had before it a letter dated 6 September 1955<sup>114</sup> from

<sup>109</sup> 697th meeting: paras. 81, 83. For the report of the Chief of Staff, see S/3390, O.R., 10th year, Suppl. for April-June 1955, p. 6.

<sup>110</sup> 698th meeting: paras. 149-150.

<sup>111</sup> A further appeal to the parties to co-operate fully in the prompt implementation of the Council's resolution of 30 March 1955 was contained in a letter (S/3406) dated 7 June 1955, which the President (United States) addressed to the members of the Council. Copies of the letter were sent to the representatives of Egypt and Israel and the Secretary-General. S/3406, O.R., 10th year, Suppl. for April-June 1955, p. 27.

<sup>112</sup> S/3432.

<sup>113</sup> S/3431.

<sup>114</sup> S/3433.

the representative of Israel containing the reply of his Government to the proposed cease-fire.

At the same meeting, the joint draft resolution was adopted unanimously.<sup>115</sup> It read as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Recalling its resolution of 30 March 1955 (S/3379),

"Having received the report of the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization (S/3430),

"Noting with grave concern the discontinuance of the talks initiated by the Chief of Staff in accordance with the above-mentioned resolution,

"Deploring the recent outbreak of violence in the area along the Armistice Demarcation Line established between Egypt and Israel on 24 February 1949,

"1. Notes with approval the acceptance by both parties of the appeal of the Chief of Staff for an unconditional cease-fire;

"2. Calls upon both parties forthwith to take all steps necessary to bring about order and tranquillity in the area, and in particular to desist from further acts of violence and to continue the cease-fire in full force and effect;

"3. Endorses the view of the Chief of Staff that the armed forces of both parties should be clearly and effectively separated by measures such as those which he has proposed;

"4. Declares that freedom of movement must be afforded to United Nations Observers in the area to enable them to fulfill their functions;

"5. Calls upon both parties to appoint representatives to meet with the Chief of Staff and to co-operate fully with him to these ends; and

"6. Requests the Chief of Staff to report to the Security Council on the action taken to carry out this resolution."

## THE THAILAND QUESTION

### INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter dated 29 May 1954,<sup>116</sup> addressed to the President of the Security Council, the acting permanent representative of Thailand brought to the attention of the Council, in conformity with Articles 34 and 35 (1) of the Charter, a situation which, in the view of his Government, represented a threat to the security of Thailand, the continuance of which was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. Large-scale fighting had repeatedly taken place in the immediate vicinity of Thai territory and there was a possibility of direct incursions of foreign troops. He brought the situation to the attention of the Security Council to the end that the Council might provide for observation under the Peace Observation Commission.

At the 672nd meeting on 3 June 1954, the Security Council included the question in the agenda.<sup>117</sup>

The Council considered the question at its 672nd, 673rd and 674th meetings between 3 and 18 June 1954.

<sup>115</sup> 700th meeting: para. 133.

<sup>116</sup> S/3220, O.R., 9th year, Suppl. for April-June 1954, p. 10.

<sup>117</sup> 672nd meeting: para. 17. On the inclusion of the question in the agenda, see chapter II, Case 9.

*Decision of 18 June 1954 (674th meeting): Rejection of the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Thailand*

At the 673rd meeting on 16 June 1954, the representative of Thailand\*, who was invited by the President (United States) to the Council table, submitted a draft resolution<sup>118</sup> to request the Peace Observation Commission to establish a sub-commission of from three to five members, with authority: (1) to dispatch observers to Thailand; (2) to visit Thailand if necessary; (3) to make such reports and recommendations as it deemed necessary to the Peace Observation Commission and to the Security Council; and (4) if the Sub-Commission were of the opinion that it could not adequately accomplish its mission without observation or visit to States contiguous to Thailand, to report to the Commission or to the Council for the necessary instructions.

At the same meeting, the President, speaking as the representative of the United States, requested under rule 38 of the provisional rules of procedure, that the draft resolution be put to the vote at the appropriate time.<sup>119</sup>

At the 674th meeting on 18 June 1954, the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Thailand was not adopted. There were 9 votes in favour and 1 against (the negative vote being that of a permanent member) with 1 abstention.<sup>120</sup>

The question remained on the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized.

## THE GUATEMALAN QUESTION

### INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By cablegram dated 19 June 1954,<sup>121</sup> the Minister for External Relations of Guatemala requested the President of the Security Council urgently to convene a meeting in order that the Council, in accordance with Articles 34, 35 and 39 of the Charter, might take the measures necessary to prevent the disruption of peace and international security in that part of Central America and also to put a stop to the aggression in progress against Guatemala. It was stated in the cablegram that Guatemala had made representations to the Government of Honduras, requesting it to restrain and control expeditionary forces which had been preparing to invade Guatemalan territory from Honduras. Notwithstanding those requests, the expeditionary forces had captured various Guatemalan posts on 17 June and had advanced about fifteen kilometres inside Guatemalan territory. On 19 June, aircraft coming from the direction of Honduras and Nicaragua had dropped bombs on fuel stocks in the port of San José, and attacked Guatemala City and other towns, machine-gunning Government and private buildings and bombing military bases. The cablegram also referred to "aggressor Governments and international provocateurs" respon-

sible for such outrages and acts of aggression and to "the policy of encircling and boycotting" Guatemala, which had been pursued "by United States leaders". It was further stated that the facts cited in the Guatemalan appeal "clearly prove that open aggression has been perpetrated by the Governments of Honduras and Nicaragua at the instigation of certain foreign monopolies whose interests have been affected by the progressive policy" of the Government of Guatemala.

The cablegram was placed on the provisional agenda of the 675th meeting on 20 June 1954. The agenda was adopted.<sup>122</sup>

After the adoption of the agenda, the President invited the representatives of Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua to participate in the discussion.<sup>123</sup>

The representative of Guatemala\* stated that Guatemala had been invaded by expeditionary forces forming part of an "unlawful international aggression" which was the outcome of a vast international conspiracy against his country. The matter had been brought to the Security Council so that the latter might carry out its task of preventing a war which might spread and of preserving world peace and security. On behalf of his Government, the representative of Guatemala made two requests: First, that "an observation commission should be sent to Guatemala to ask questions, to investigate, and to listen to the diplomatic corps". It was the desire of the Guatemalan Government that the Security Council should in the first place send a warning to the Governments of Honduras and Nicaragua, calling upon them to apprehend the exiles and mercenaries who were invading Guatemala from bases of operations in their territories. Secondly, the Guatemalan Government requested that an observation commission of the Security Council should be constituted in Guatemala, and in other countries if necessary, to verify through an examination of the documentary evidence, the fact that the countries accused by Guatemala had connived at the invasion.<sup>124</sup>

The representative of Guatemala stated that the Peace Committee of the Organization of the American States had met the previous day, but the Guatemalan Government, in exercise of its option as a member of that Organization, had officially declined to allow the Organization of American States and the Peace Committee to concern themselves with the situation.<sup>125</sup>

The representatives of Honduras\* and Nicaragua\* both stated that the matter should be dealt with by the Organization of American States.<sup>126</sup>

The representative of Brazil, drawing attention<sup>127</sup> to Chapter VIII of the Charter, and particularly to Article 52 (3), introduced a joint draft resolution<sup>128</sup> sponsored by Brazil and Colombia, to refer the complaint of the Government of Guatemala to the Organiza-

<sup>122</sup> 675th meeting: p. 1.

<sup>123</sup> 675th meeting: para. 2. See chapter III, Case 6.

<sup>124</sup> 675th meeting: paras. 6, 10, 43-46.

<sup>125</sup> 675th meeting: para. 60.

<sup>126</sup> 675th meeting: paras. 63, 65.

<sup>127</sup> 675th meeting: para. 67.

<sup>128</sup> S/3236, 675th meeting: para. 69. For constitutional considerations advanced in connexion with this resolution, see chapter X, Cases 4, 6, 7, and chapter XII, Case 4.

<sup>118</sup> S/3229, 673rd meeting: para. 10. With regard to participation, see chapter III, Case 5. For relations of the Council with the Peace Observation Commission, see chapter VI, Case 6. For discussion relevant to Article 34, see chapter X, Case 5.

<sup>119</sup> 673rd meeting: para. 57.

<sup>120</sup> 674th meeting: para. 71.

<sup>121</sup> S/3232, *O.R.*, 9th year, *Suppl. for April-June 1954*, pp. 11-13.