

- Decision of 29 May 1968 (resolution 253 (1968)), para. 18.
2. From members of specialized agencies.
- Situation in Southern Rhodesia:
- Decision of 16 December 1966 (resolution 232 (1966)), para. 8.
- Decision of 29 May 1968 (resolution 253 (1968)), para. 18.
3. From the Secretary-General.
- (i) The Palestine question:
- Decision of 25 November 1966 (resolution 228 (1966)), para. 4.
- (ii) Situation in Southern Rhodesia:
- Decision of 16 December 1966 (resolution 232 (1966)), para. 9.
- Decision of 29 May 1968 (resolution 253 (1968)), para. 19.
- (iii) Situation in the Middle East (I):
- Decision of 6 June 1967 (resolution 233 (1967)), para. 2.
- Decision of 7 June 1967 (resolution 234 (1967)), para. 2.
- Decision of 9 June 1967 (resolution 235 (1967)), para. 3 (second part).
- Decision of 14 June 1967 (resolution 237 (1967)), para. 3.
- Situation in the Middle East (II):
- Decision of 22 November 1967 (resolution 242 (1967)), para. 4.
- Decision of 24 March 1968 (resolution 248 (1968)), para. 5.
- Decision of 27 April 1968 (resolution 250 (1968)), para. 2.
- Decision of 21 May 1968 (resolution 252 (1968)), para. 4.
- Decision of 27 September 1968 (resolution 259 (1968)), para. 1 (second part).
- (iv) The question of South West Africa:
- Decision of 25 January 1968 (resolution 245 (1968)), para. 4.
- Decision of 14 March 1968 (resolution 246 (1968)), para. 6.
- Decision of 15 November 1967 (resolution 241 (1967)), para. 6 (first part).
- (iii) Complaint by the Government of Cyprus:
- Decision of 22 December 1967 (resolution 244 (1967)), para. 6.
- (iv) The question of South West Africa:
- Decision of 25 January 1968 (resolution 245 (1968)), para. 5.
- Decision of 14 March 1968 (resolution 246 (1968)), para. 7.
- C. Statement by the President that the Council would remain seized of the question.
- (i) Situation in the Middle East (II):
- Decision: President's statement of 4 April 1968, (second part).
- (ii) Situation in Czechoslovakia:
- Decision: President's statement of 24 August 1968.
- D. Adjournment of meeting for consultation among members.
- (i) Situation in Viet-Nam:
- Decision of 2 February 1966.
- (ii) Complaint by the United States (The Pueblo incident):
- Decision of 27 January 1968.
- (iii) Complaint by Haiti:
- Decision of 27 May 1968.
- (iv) Situation in Czechoslovakia:
- Decision of 24 August 1968.
- IX. Measures to safeguard against aggression**
- A. Recognition of responsibility of Security Council and its nuclear-weapon-State permanent members in case of nuclear aggression or threat of such aggression against a non-nuclear-weapon State.
- Question of safeguards to non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.
- Decision of 19 June 1968 (resolution 255 (1968)), para. 1.
- B. Expression of support for intention to provide assistance to victims of nuclear aggression or objects of threat of such aggression.
- Question of safeguards to non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.
- Decision of 19 June 1968 (resolution 255 (1968)), pre-ambule and para. 2.
- C. Reaffirmation of the right of individual and collective self-defence recognized under Article 51 of the Charter.
- Question of safeguards to non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.
- Decision of 19 June 1968 (resolution 255 (1968)), para. 3.
- B. Provision by express decision to consider the matter further
- (i) Situation in Southern Rhodesia:
- Decision of 16 December 1966 (resolution 232 (1966)), para. 10.
- Decision of 29 May 1968 (resolution 253 (1968)), para. 23.
- (ii) Complaint by the Democratic Republic of the Congo:
- Decision of 10 July 1967 (resolution 239 (1967)), para. 4.

## Part II

### SITUATION IN VIET-NAM

#### INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter <sup>6</sup> dated 31 January 1966 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the United States requested that an urgent meeting of

the Security Council be called promptly to consider the situation in Viet-Nam. It was further stated in the letter that the United States Government had sought a peaceful settlement of this conflict on the basis of unconditional negotiations and the Geneva Agreements of 1954 but had no affirmative response from the Government of North Viet-Nam which set forth a number of preconditions unacceptable to the United States. It, therefore, concluded that it should now bring this problem with

<sup>6</sup> S/7105, O.R., 21st yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March., 1966, pp. 105-107.

all its implications for peace formally before the Security Council. Moreover, the United States Government was firmly convinced that in the light of the Council's obligations under the Charter to maintain international peace and security and the failure so far of all efforts outside the United Nations to restore peace, the Council should address itself urgently to the situation and exert its endeavours to finding a prompt solution.

On the same date, a draft resolution<sup>7</sup> was submitted by the representative of the United States according to which the Security Council would: (1) call for immediate discussions without preconditions among the appropriate interested Governments to arrange a conference looking towards the application of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in South-East Asia; (2) recommended that the first order of business of such a conference be arrangements for a cessation of hostilities under effective supervision; (3) offer to assist in achieving the purposes of this resolution by all appropriate means, including the provision of arbitrators or mediators; (4) call upon all concerned to co-operate fully in the implementation of this resolution; (5) request the Secretary-General to assist as appropriate in the implementation of this resolution.

At the 1273rd meeting, the Security Council decided by 9 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions, to include the question in its agenda.<sup>8</sup>

**Decision of 2 February 1966 (1273rd meeting):**

#### *Adjournment*

After adoption of the agenda at the 1273rd meeting on 2 February 1966, the President (Japan) said that before proceeding to the consideration of the question included in the agenda, he would like to suggest to the Council that members hold informal and private consultations with a view to determining the most effective and appropriate way of conducting the debate in the future and that, for this purpose, the meeting should be adjourned until the exact date and time could be arranged for the next meeting.<sup>9</sup> There being no objections, it was so decided.

The question remained on the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized.<sup>10</sup>

#### **COMPLAINT BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CYPRUS**

**Decision of 16 March 1966 (1275th meeting):**

- (i) *Reaffirming its previous resolutions, as well as the consensus of 11 August 1964;*
- (ii) *Urging the parties concerned to act with the utmost restraint and to make determined efforts with a view to achieving the objectives of the Security Council;*

(iii) *Extending once more the stationing of the United Nations Force in Cyprus established under the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964 for a period of three months ending 26 June 1966*

On 10 March 1966, the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council his report<sup>11</sup> on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, covering developments from 9 December 1965 to 10 March 1966. The Secretary-General recommended to the Council that despite the reservations which he had to make as a result of the financial situation of UNFICYP, the Force in Cyprus should be extended for a period of six months after 26 March 1966. He informed the Council that his efforts, subsequent to the resignation of Mr. Galo Plaza from the position of United Nations Mediator in Cyprus, towards achieving a resumption of the mediation function had, thus far, been unavailing due primarily to the widely differing and firmly held views in the matter of the three Governments most directly concerned. In this connexion, he referred to his note of 4 March 1967<sup>12</sup> by which he had informed the Council that he had broadened the scope of activity of this Special Representative in Cyprus, without prejudice to the mediation function as envisaged in resolution 186 (1964), authorizing him to employ his good offices and make such approaches to the parties in or outside Cyprus as might seem to be productive, in the sense of achieving, in the first instance, discussions at any level of problems and issues of either a purely local or broader nature.

At the 1274th meeting on 15 March 1966, the Security Council adopted,<sup>13</sup> without objection, the provisional agenda and invited the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey to participate in the discussion.<sup>14</sup> The Council considered the question at the 1274th and 1275th meetings held on 15 March and 16 March 1966.

At the 1274th meeting, a joint draft resolution was submitted by the representatives of Argentina, Japan, Mali, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Uganda and Uruguay.<sup>15</sup>

At the 1275th meeting on 16 March 1966, the representative of the USSR said that his Government had no objection to the stationing of the United Nations Force in Cyprus on condition that its extension was made in accordance with the provisions of the Security Council resolution 186 (1964), namely, that UNFICYP would retain its present functions and would continue to be financed on a voluntary basis.<sup>16</sup>

At the same meeting, the joint draft resolution was unanimously adopted.<sup>17</sup> It read as follows:<sup>18</sup>

*"The Security Council,*

*"Noting from the report of the Secretary-General of 10 March 1966 that in the present circumstances the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus is still needed if peace is to be maintained in the island,*

<sup>7</sup> S/7106, *OR*, 21st yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March, 1966*, p. 107.

<sup>8</sup> 1273rd meeting, para. 27.

<sup>9</sup> 1273rd meeting, para. 28.

<sup>10</sup> For retention of the item, see the Secretary-General's summary statement on matters of which the Security Council is seized chapter II, p. 51, No. 141. Subsequently, by letter dated 26 February 1966 (S/7168), the President (Japan) transmitted to the Secretary-General the text of a letter of the same date addressed by him to the members of the Security Council, in which he reported on the informal and private consultations with a number of members of the Council.

<sup>11</sup> S/7191, *OR*, 21st yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1966*, pp. 204-233.

<sup>12</sup> S/7180, *OR*, 21st yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1966*, p. 191.

<sup>13</sup> 1274th meeting, preceding para. 28.

<sup>14</sup> 1274th meeting, para. 29.

<sup>15</sup> S/7205, the same text as resolution 220 (1966); 1274th meeting, para. 30.

<sup>16</sup> 1275th meeting, para. 36.

<sup>17</sup> 1275th meeting, para. 37.

<sup>18</sup> Resolution 220 (1966).