

cluding an embargo on oil and petroleum products;

"9. *Calls upon* the Government of the United Kingdom to enforce urgently and with vigour all the measures it has announced, as well as those mentioned in paragraph 8 above;

"10. *Calls upon* the Organization of African Unity to do all in its power to assist in the implementation of the present resolution, in conformity with Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations;

"11. *Decides* to keep the question under review in order to examine what other measures it may deem it necessary to take."

In view of the adoption of the draft resolution of Bolivia and Uruguay, the representatives of the Ivory Coast⁴⁴⁵ and the United Kingdom⁴⁴⁶ stated that they would not press for a vote on the draft resolutions which they had respectively introduced.

SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter⁴⁴⁷ dated 1 May 1965, the permanent representative of the USSR requested the President of the Security Council to convene an urgent meeting in order "to consider the question of the armed interference by the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic."

At the 1196th meeting on 3 May 1965, the Council decided⁴⁴⁸ to include the question in the agenda. The representative of Cuba was invited to participate in the discussion.⁴⁴⁹

The Council considered the question at its 1196th, 1198th, 1200th, 1202nd to 1204th, 1207th to 1209th, 1212th to 1223rd, 1225th to 1233rd meetings held between 3 May and 26 July 1965.

Decision of 14 May 1965 (1208th meeting):

- (i) *Calling for a strict cease-fire;*
- (ii) *Inviting the Secretary-General to send, as an urgent measure, a representative to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of reporting to the Council on the situation;*
- (iii) *Calling upon all concerned in the Dominican Republic to co-operate with the representative of the Secretary-General in the carrying out of that task.*

At the 1196th meeting on 3 May 1965, the representative of the USSR stated that the Council had been convened to deal with an armed intervention of the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic. Under the "false pretext of protecting American lives" fourteen thousand United States troops had already been landed on the territory of the Dominican Republic, and the city of Santo Domingo had actually been taken over by the United States forces. On 28 April, over 405 United States marines landed on Dominican territory and even if the United States version of its actions was to be accepted those troops would have been more than sufficient to evacuate United States citizens whereupon they would have been removed from that country. But even after the

question of convening the Security Council to consider the matter had been raised, 1700 more marines and 2,500 paratroopers were sent to the Dominican Republic. Moreover heavy armaments and even tanks had been utilized by the United States units in engagements with "patriotic" Dominican forces. It was thus clear that what was intended to be saved was a "reactionary dictatorship of the militarists" against which the Dominican people had taken up arms. Besides, no longer was a secret being made of plans to keep United States troops in the Dominican Republic even after order had been re-established in that country.

Furthermore, the representative of the USSR maintained that in sending troops to the Dominican Republic, the United States had not ascertained beforehand the view of the members of the Organization of American States (OAS), but had put before it a *fait accompli* as it had only been convened after their landing in Santo Domingo. Under those circumstances the concern and apprehension with which the other countries of the Americas viewed the interference by the United States troops was understandable.

The "aggression" committed by the United States against the Dominican Republic was fraught with the most serious consequences for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Security Council should therefore condemn the armed intervention of the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic as a violation of international peace and as an action incompatible with the obligations assumed by the United States under the United Nations Charter. The Council should further call upon the Government of the United States immediately to withdraw its troops from the territory of the Dominican Republic.⁴⁵⁰

At the same meeting the representative of the United States explained that despite the efforts of his Government and the Organization of American States to build a stable and free society capable of economic, social and political development, the people of the Dominican Republic had suffered from constant turmoil and political conflict since the overthrow of the Trujillo dictatorship. During the previous week that instability "erupted" and officials who had governed that country for a year and a half were violently forced out. As rival groups strove to capture power fighting broke out between and among them and the Dominican Republic was left without effective government for some days. As the situation deteriorated certain of the contending forces indiscriminately distributed weapons to civilians and as armed bands began to roam the streets of Santo Domingo, looting, burning and sniping, law and order completely broke down, and several foreign embassies were violated.

In the face of uncontrollable violence, the Government which had replaced the Reid Cabral Government also quickly crumbled in a few days. In the absence of any governmental authority, Dominican law enforcement and military officials informed the United States Embassy that the situation was completely "out of control", that the police and other authorities could no longer give any guarantee concerning the safety of citizens of the United States or of some thirty other countries. Faced with that emergency, the United States on 28 April had dispatched the first of its security forces sent to Dominican territory. Since their arrival, nearly 3,000 foreign nationals from thirty

⁴⁴⁵ 1265th meeting, para. 38.

⁴⁴⁶ 1265th meeting, para. 63.

⁴⁴⁷ S/6316, O.R., 20th year, Suppl. for April-June 1965, p. 70.

⁴⁴⁸ 1196th meeting: preceding para. 1.

⁴⁴⁹ 1196th meeting: para. 1.

⁴⁵⁰ 1196th meeting, paras. 11-30, 44, 51, 52.

countries had been evacuated without loss, although a number of United States military personnel had been killed or wounded. The United States had made a full report on the subject to the Organization of American States. It had also supported the dispatch by the OAS of an Inter-American Peace Committee which was already in Santo Domingo, and a proposal had been submitted to the OAS for other American States to make military forces available to assist in carrying out the mission of the Committee and of the OAS. Such a proposal was currently under consideration by the OAS Council.

The United States Government had also notified⁴⁵¹ the President of the Security Council of the action it had taken to evacuate citizens of foreign nationality, and to set in motion the machinery of the OAS. The Council of the OAS had met on 29 April and, as a first step, had called for an immediate cease-fire on all sides. Other urgent actions had also been taken by the OAS, which in accordance with Article 54 of the Charter of the United Nations, had been duly communicated to the Security Council.

After giving an account of the attempts at arriving at a cease-fire by the OAS and the Papal Nuncio in Santo Domingo and the reasons why lawlessness and disorder continued to persist although a cease-fire had been agreed upon by the two contending forces, the representative of the United States welcomed the discussion of the Dominican situation in the Security Council, but pointed out at the same time that Article 33 of the Charter provided that efforts should be made to find solutions to disputes by peaceful means including "resort to regional agencies or arrangements". In the light of the actions already taken, it would thus be in keeping with the precedents established by the Security Council to permit the regional organization to continue to deal with that regional problem.⁴⁵²

At the same meeting the representative of the USSR disputed the argument that protection of the lives of United States citizens was the real motive for the United States intervention in the Dominican Republic, and observed that the United States had subsequently resorted to the argument that "the principal purpose for the intervention of the armed forces of the United States in the Dominican Republic was the fear of an emergence there of a second Cuba".

Recalling the record of United States intervention in Latin America he maintained that only the "excuse" had changed but the "essence" of United States interventionist policy remained the same.

In conclusion he maintained that the attempt to crush the struggle of that small country for freedom and independence could only be qualified as an act of direct aggression. Consequently, the Security Council was duty-bound to consider urgently, under Article 39 of the Charter, the question of the armed interference of the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic. Claims that the situation in the Dominican Republic was currently the subject of consideration by the OAS was simply a United States attempt to evade its responsibility and to divert the Council from carrying out its duty as called for by the United States aggression.⁴⁵³

At the 1198th meeting on 4 May 1965, the representative of the USSR introduced a draft resolution⁴⁵⁴ under which the Security Council would condemn the armed intervention of the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic as a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations, and demand the immediate withdrawal of the armed forces of the United States from the territory of the Dominican Republic.

At the same meeting, the representative of the United States disputed the contention of the USSR representative that the United States had violated Article 2 (7) since in his view that Article dealt only with limitations on the authority of the United Nations itself⁴⁵⁵ and was therefore in no way relevant to the situation before the Council. Neither had there been any violations by the United States of Article 2 (4), since it was not employing force against the territorial integrity or against the political independence of the Dominican Republic.⁴⁵⁶ Moreover, American security forces, he asserted, had been dispatched to that "troubled country", not against the will of the Dominican authorities, but only when law enforcement and military officials, in circumstances where there was no government authority, had informed the United States Government that the situation was completely out of control.⁴⁵⁷

At the 1202nd meeting on 6 May 1965, the representative of the United States read before the Council the text of a resolution adopted on that date by the Organization of American States, whereby the Tenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs resolved: (1) to request the Governments of Member States to make contingents of their armed forces available to the OAS to form an Inter-American Force due to operate under the authority of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation; and (2) that that force would have as its sole purpose, in a spirit of democratic impartiality, that of co-operating in the restoration of normal conditions in the Dominican Republic, in maintaining the security of its inhabitants and the inviolability of human rights, and in the establishment of an atmosphere of peace and conciliation that would permit the functioning of democratic institutions.

The representative of the United States further referred to a declaration of his Government according to which the United States forces would be withdrawn from the Dominican Republic when the Unified Command of the OAS determined that the Inter-American Force was adequate for the purpose contemplated by the resolution adopted by the OAS on 1 May, and that they would not be needed as part of the Inter-American Force.⁴⁵⁸

At the 1204th meeting on 11 May 1965, the representative of Uruguay introduced a draft resolution⁴⁵⁹ whereby the Security Council, after taking note of several communications from the OAS and having regard to certain provisions of the United Nations Charter and the Charter of the OAS, would: (1) express deep concern at recent developments in the Dominican Republic; (2) reaffirm the right of the people

⁴⁵¹ S/6310, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1965, p. 65.

⁴⁵² 1196th meeting: paras. 61-63, 66-88.

⁴⁵³ 1196th meeting: paras. 191-210. For discussion on the respective responsibilities of the Security Council and the OAS concerning this question, see chapter XII, Case 9.

⁴⁵⁴ S/6328, 1198th meeting: para. 3.

⁴⁵⁵ For discussion of this question, see chapter XII, Case 6.

⁴⁵⁶ For discussion relating to Article 2(4) see chapter XII, Case 4.

⁴⁵⁷ 1198th meeting: paras. 152-158.

⁴⁵⁸ 1202nd meeting: paras. 36-37; also see S/6333, 6 May 1965 for text of OAS resolution.

⁴⁵⁹ S/6346, 1204th meeting: paras. 3-4.

freely to exercise, without coercion of any kind, their sovereign right of self-determination; (3) urgently appeal to all contending factions in the Dominican Republic to cease hostilities and make every possible effort to achieve a peaceful and democratic settlement of their differences (4) invite the Secretary-General to follow events closely and take such measures as he might deem appropriate for the purpose of reporting to the Council on all aspects of the situation; (5) invite the Organization of American States (OAS) to keep the Council promptly and fully informed of its action with respect to the situation; and (6) invite the OAS to co-operate with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in the implementation of the resolution. In support of his draft resolution, the representative of Uruguay stated that at that stage of the debate the only road open to the Council was to try to reach an agreement on a draft resolution which, without pronouncing itself on the substance of the question, would nevertheless allow the Council to exercise its competence and, at the same time, unequivocally assert its authority. The draft resolution which had been submitted was, therefore, an attempt to obtain agreement on what might be an acceptable minimum.

On 13 May 1965, the representative of the USSR submitted amendments⁴⁶⁰ to the draft resolution of Uruguay, which provided *inter alia* for deletion of the reference to the OAS reports in the preamble; the addition in operative paragraph 1 of the words "and condemns the armed intervention of the United States of America in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic as a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations"; and the replacement of operative paragraph 5 by the provision "*Calls upon* the Government of the United States immediately to withdraw its armed forces from the territory of the Dominican Republic".

At the 1207th and 1209th meetings, held on 13 and 14 May 1965, after considering a procedural question⁴⁶¹ relating to participation in the discussion of the question before it, the Council decided⁴⁶² at the latter meeting to take note of the relevant Secretary-General's report⁴⁶³ and, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, to invite the representatives of both contending Dominican authorities mentioned in that report to address the Council at an appropriate time in order to supply it with whatever information they had.⁴⁶⁴

At the 1208th meeting on 14 May 1965, the representative of Jordan introduced a draft resolution⁴⁶⁵ jointly submitted by Ivory Coast, Jordan and Malaysia. He stated that it was intended as an urgent measure on the part of the Security Council with regard to the current developments in the Dominican Republic and to enable the Council to obtain a clear report from the appropriate organs of the United Nations on the situation in the Dominican Republic.

⁴⁶⁰ S/6352.

⁴⁶¹ For discussion on participation, see chapter III, Case 1.

⁴⁶² 1209th meeting: paras. 47, 51.

⁴⁶³ S/6353, O.R., 20th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1965*, pp. 118-122.

⁴⁶⁴ Pursuant to this decision, the Council invited Mr. Rubén Brache and Mr. Guaroa Velásquez to make statements before it at the 1212th meeting on 19 May 1965. After similar agreements of the Council, both representatives also made statements at the 1225th meeting on 16 June 1965, at the 1230th meeting on 20 July 1965, and at the 1232nd meeting on 26 July 1965. Mr. Brache also spoke before the Council at the 1231st meeting on 22 July 1965.

⁴⁶⁵ S/6355, 1208th meeting: para. 6.

At the same meeting, the joint draft resolution was unanimously adopted.⁴⁶⁶

The resolution⁴⁶⁷ read:

"*The Security Council,*

"*Deeply concerned at the grave events in the Dominican Republic,*

"1. *Calls for a strict cease-fire;*

"2. *Invites the Secretary-General to send, as an urgent measure, a representative to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of reporting to the Security Council on the present situation;*

"3. *Calls upon all concerned in the Dominican Republic to co-operate with the Representative of the Secretary-General in the carrying out of this task.*"

At the 1209th meeting, held on the same day, the Secretary-General reported⁴⁶⁸ that in implementation of the Council's resolution an advance party of Secretariat members led by his Military Adviser was leaving that night for the Dominican Republic, and on 15 May 1965, he reported⁴⁶⁹ the appointment of Mr. José Antonio Mayobre as his representative in the Dominican Republic. At the 1212th meeting on 19 May 1965, the Secretary-General further reported⁴⁷⁰ that his representative had arrived at Santo Domingo on 18 May.

Decision of 19 May 1965 (1212th meeting); *Statement by the President*

At the 1212th meeting on 19 May 1965, upon the suggestion of the representative of France, the President (Malaysia) made a statement expressing the unanimous desire of the members of the Council to request the Secretary-General to communicate to his representative in Santo Domingo its wish that his urgent efforts should be devoted to the immediate securing of a suspension of hostilities so that the humanitarian work of the Red Cross to search for the dead and wounded might be facilitated.⁴⁷¹

Decision of 21 May 1965 (1214th meeting): *Rejection of the USSR draft resolution*

At the 1214th meeting on 21 May 1965, the representative of the United States introduced a draft resolution⁴⁷² whereby the Security Council, after taking note of the OAS reports, and of the reports of the Secretary-General, would: (1) note with satisfaction the temporary suspension of hostilities agreed to for humanitarian purposes; (2) call for observance of a strict cessation of hostilities; (3) note that the Tenth Meeting of Consultation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States had appointed its Sec-

⁴⁶⁶ 1208th meeting: para. 8.

⁴⁶⁷ S/RES/203 (1965), O.R., 20th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1965*, p. 10.

⁴⁶⁸ 1209th meeting: paras. 56-57.

⁴⁶⁹ S/6358, O.R., 20th yr., *Suppl. for April-June, 1965*, p. 127.

⁴⁷⁰ 1212th meeting: para. 78. From 18 May to 19 June 1965, the Secretary-General submitted the following reports to the Security Council on the situation in the Dominican Republic: S/6365, 18 May 1965; S/6369, 19 May 1965; S/6371 and Add.1-2, 20 May 1965; S/6378, 23 May 1965; S/6380, 24 May 1965; S/6386, 27 May 1965; S/6408, 3 June 1965; S/6420, 7 June 1965; S/6447 and Add.1, 16 June 1965; and S/6459, 19 June 1965.

⁴⁷¹ 1212th meeting: paras. 127-128. In his report (S/6371/Add.1) of 21 May 1965, O.R., 20th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1965*, p. 171, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the negotiations for a temporary suspension of hostilities in the Dominican Republic had been successfully concluded on 20 May 1965.

⁴⁷² S/6373, 1214th meeting: paras. 21-25.

retary-General to represent it in the Dominican Republic and had entrusted him with carrying out the objectives established by the OAS; (4) urge the OAS to intensify its efforts to establish the basis for the functioning of democratic institutions in the Dominican Republic and in particular to assure observance of the cease-fire agreed upon in the Act of Santo Domingo; (5) request the representative appointed by the Secretary-General, in carrying out the responsibilities assigned to him by the Security Council, to co-ordinate with the Secretary General of the OAS in the light of the OAS resolution of 20 May 1965.

At the same meeting, the representative of Uruguay introduced a revised text⁴⁷³ of his draft resolution submitted on 11 May 1965.

At the same meeting, the draft resolution submitted by the USSR on 4 May 1965, was voted upon and not adopted.⁴⁷⁴

Decision of 22 May 1965 (1217th meeting): *Requesting that the truce at Santo Domingo be transformed into a permanent cease-fire*

At the 1216th meeting on 22 May 1965, the representative of the USSR submitted a revised text⁴⁷⁵ of the amendments to the revised draft resolution submitted by Uruguay. The six USSR revised amendments were rejected⁴⁷⁶ in separate votes. The revised draft resolution of Uruguay was voted upon as a whole, and was not adopted,⁴⁷⁷ having obtained 5 votes in favour, 1 against, and 5 abstentions.

At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom introduced a draft resolution⁴⁷⁸ whereby the Council would call for a continued and complete cessation of hostilities, and would call on all concerned to intensify their efforts to that end and to do nothing to prejudice the achievement of that immediate and urgent aim.

Also at the same meeting, the representative of France submitted a draft resolution⁴⁷⁹ to request that the suspension of hostilities in Santo Domingo be transformed into a permanent cease-fire.

At the 1217th meeting on 22 May 1965, after the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States had indicated⁴⁸⁰ that they would not object to precedence being given to the French draft resolution over their own, the French draft resolution was adopted⁴⁸¹ by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The resolution⁴⁸² read:

"The Security Council,

"Deeply concerned at the situation in the Dominican Republic,

"Recalling its resolution of 14 May 1965,

"1. Requests that the suspension of hostilities in Santo Domingo be transformed into a permanent cease-fire;

"2. Invites the Secretary-General to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution."

⁴⁷³ S/6346/Rev.1, 1214th meeting: paras. 50-60.

⁴⁷⁴ S/6328, 1214th meeting: paras. 123-125.

⁴⁷⁵ S/6352/Rev.2, 1216th meeting: para. 40.

⁴⁷⁶ 1216th meeting: paras. 44-49.

⁴⁷⁷ 1216th meeting: para. 69.

⁴⁷⁸ S/6375, 1216th meeting: para. 107.

⁴⁷⁹ S/6375, 1216th meeting: para. 123.

⁴⁸⁰ 1217th meeting: paras. 22, 33-35.

⁴⁸¹ 1217th meeting: para. 46.

⁴⁸² SEC/RES/205 (1965), O.R., 20th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1965, pp. 10-11.

At the 1218th meeting on 24 May 1965, the representative of the United States, after reporting to the Council that the Act establishing the Inter-American Force had been signed on 23 May, and that all United States forces in the Dominican Republic were consequently assigned to that Force, together with contingents from Brazil, Costa Rica, Honduras and Nicaragua, stated that in the light of actions taken by the Security Council and by the OAS, he withdrew⁴⁸³ his draft resolution from the Council's further consideration.

Decision of 25 May 1965 (1219th meeting): *Adjournment*

At the 1219th meeting on 25 May 1965, the President (Malaysia) made a statement noting that a *de facto* cessation of hostilities had continued to prevail in Santo Domingo, that the Secretary-General had informed him that there had been no new developments concerning its observance since his last report, and that he would promptly make available to the members of the Council information sent to him by his representative as and when it was received. He therefore proposed that the Council should adjourn on the understanding that should any particular situation demand it, he might call it into immediate session. There being no objections to that statement, the President adjourned the meeting.⁴⁸⁴

Decision of 21 June 1965 (1228th meeting): *Adjournment*

At the 1228th meeting on 21 June 1965, the President (Netherlands) after recalling the informal consultations he had undertaken with members of the Council with the aim of finding a formula for a statement agreeable to all, stated that he would adjourn the Council meeting in order to continue the informal consultations in the hope of being able to present a generally agreed formula. There being no objections, the President adjourned the meeting.⁴⁸⁵

Decision of 26 July 1965 (1233rd meeting): *Statement by the President*

At the 1229th meeting on 20 July 1965, the Council had before it a report⁴⁸⁶ by the Secretary-General covering the period 19 June to 15 July 1965, and reports from the OAS and several other communications from the OAS and the "Constitutional Government" of the Dominican Republic.

At the 1233rd meeting on 26 July 1965, the President (USSR) stated⁴⁸⁷ that after consultations held among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to present the following summing up of the discussion held during the past few meetings of the Council on the Dominican situation:

"The information received and the reports of the Secretary-General, dated 16 July and 21 July 1965, on the situation in the Dominican Republic testify to the fact that in spite of the Security Council's resolutions of 14 May and 22 May 1965 violations of the Council's call for a strict cease-fire have taken place. There have been brought to the attention of the Council acts of repression against the civilian population and other violations of human rights, as

⁴⁸³ 1218th meeting: paras. 5-8, 21.

⁴⁸⁴ 1219th meeting: paras. 36, 37, 44.

⁴⁸⁵ 1228th meeting: paras. 6, 7.

⁴⁸⁶ S/6530, and Corr.1, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1965, pp. 86-95.

⁴⁸⁷ 1233rd meeting: para. 2.

well as data on the deterioration of the economic situation in the Dominican Republic.

"The interventions made by the members of the Council have condemned gross violations of human rights in the Dominican Republic, have expressed the desire that such violations should cease, and have indicated again the need for the strict observance of the cease-fire in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council.

"At the same time it has become apparent that the members of the Council consider it necessary that the Council continue to watch closely the situation in the Dominican Republic and that therefore the Secretary-General, in accordance with the previous decision of the Council, will continue to submit reports to the Council on the situation in the Dominican Republic."⁴⁸⁸

The President further stated⁴⁸⁹ that he would convene the Council should a request to that effect be made by a member of the Council or if the President deemed it necessary to do so.

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

COMPLAINT BY SENEGAL

Decision of 19 May 1965 (1212th meeting): *Deeply deploring any incursion by Portuguese military forces into Senegalese territory, reaffirming the Council resolution 178 (1963) on a previous complaint, and requesting once again the Government of Portugal to take all effective and necessary action to prevent any violation of Senegal's sovereignty and territorial integrity*

By letter⁴⁹⁰ dated 7 May 1965 to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Senegal requested that the Council be convened as soon as possible to consider "the repeated violations of Senegalese air space and territory by the Portuguese authorities". In the letter it was stated that despite the Council's resolution⁴⁹¹ of 24 April 1963, in which Portugal was requested to take whatever action was necessary to prevent any violation of Senegal's sovereignty and territorial integrity, violations of Senegal's air space and territorial integrity continued on a growing scale, and villages and crops were being set on fire. Since the adoption of the aforementioned Council resolution, the Government of Senegal had noted thirteen violations of its territory by Portugal, some of which⁴⁹² had already been brought to the attention of the Security Council. In view of the acts committed by the Portuguese authorities, the Government of Senegal considered that the Council should again request Por-

tugal to cease the violation of Senegalese territory. In any case, the letter added, "the Government of Senegal cannot for long remain inactive when its frontier villages are constantly being attacked and burned and its air space and national territory violated".

At the 1205th meeting on 12 May 1965, the Council included the item on its agenda.⁴⁹³ The question was considered by the Council at the 1205th, 1206th and 1210th to 1212th meetings between 12 and 19 May 1965. At the 1205th meeting on 12 May 1965, the representatives of Senegal and Portugal⁴⁹⁴ and at the 1210th meeting on 18 May 1965 the representative of Congo (Brazzaville)⁴⁹⁵ were invited to participate in the discussion.

At the 1205th meeting on 12 May 1965, the representative of Senegal* in his initial statement referred to the previous consideration by the Security Council of a violation of Senegalese air space at the village of Bouniak, and to the resolution then adopted by the Council in which Portugal was requested to take whatever action might be necessary to prevent any further violations of Senegalese territory. However, during the past two years since the adoption of that resolution, Portugal had committed sixteen new violations of Senegalese territory and air space. Senegal had not wished to draw the attention of the Council at the time of each of those violations, but during the past three months, in view of their increasing seriousness, it had been obliged to bring those incidents to the attention of the Council. In the course of the new violations, Portuguese troops had invaded the Senegalese villages of Thiamoulé (on 18 April 1964), Sara Coube (on 14 June 1964), Salikegne (on 6-8 January 1965), N'Gobry (on 15 February 1965), Bambatoding (on 11-12 April 1965), Sambalounda (on 14 April 1965) and Bambato (18-20 April 1965), opening fire on the villagers and causing considerable material damage. Portuguese soldiers had also crossed the frontier in the neighbourhood of the villages of Coumbacara (on 10 July 1963), Bambato (on 14 August 1964) and N'Gore (on 27 February 1965), and had also participated in incidents occurring in Senegalese territory on 29 September 1964 and on the night of 28 February-1 March 1965. There had been overflights by Portuguese planes at the villages of Tanaff (on 4 April 1964), Djidadji Balante (on 5 July 1964), Dofia (23 January 1965) and Saré Koubé (8 March 1965). Bullets, cartridge shells, tear-gas bombs and a hand-grenade had been found at the sites where the incidents had taken place. In addition to that evidence, two soldiers of the regular Portuguese Army and a Portuguese intelligence agent had been arrested by the Senegalese authorities. In answer to all the charges of Senegal, the only allegation made by Portugal was that each of its actions had been in the nature of a counter-attack, since they had been preceded by a Senegalese attack. However, Portugal could not submit any evidence in support of its allegation. As a precautionary measure, to avoid incidents, Senegal had no military force stationed along the frontier of more than 350 kilometres, but only a few guards patrolling it on bicycles. The representative of Senegal requested the Security Council to ask Portugal to take all measures to end incursions by its armed forces into Senegalese territory, and to abide by its decla-

⁴⁸⁸ The following were subsequent reports on the situation in the Dominican Republic submitted by the Secretary-General to the Security Council during the period covered by this Supplement: S/6542, 21 July 1965; S/6553, 22 July 1965; S/6615, 17 August 1965; S/6649 and Corr.1, 2 September 1965; S/6822, 23 October 1965 and Add.1-3, 26-30 October 1965; S/6975, 25 November 1965; S/6991 and Add.1, 3 December 1965; S/7025, 17 December 1965; S/7032, 20 December 1965 and Add.1-34, 22 December 1965 - 31 May 1966. For communications from the Secretary General of the OAS concerning the situation in the Dominican Republic see chapter XII, part V, pp. 209-213.

⁴⁸⁹ 1233rd meeting: para. 3.

⁴⁹⁰ S/6338, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for Apr.-June 1965, p. 105.

⁴⁹¹ S/RES/178 (1963), O.R., 18th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1963, pp. 1-2.

⁴⁹² S/6177 and S/6196 of 8 and 24 February 1965, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1965, pp. 47, 68.

⁴⁹³ 1205th meeting: para. 1.

⁴⁹⁴ 1205th meeting: para. 2.

⁴⁹⁵ 1210th meeting: paras. 2-4.