

- Decision of 9 August 1964 (S/RES/193 (1964)), preamble.
- Decision of 25 September 1964 (S/RES/194 (1964)), para. 4.
- (ii) The question of race conflict in South Africa:
Decision of 9 June 1964 (S/RES/190 (1964)), para. 3.
- (iii) Situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo:
Decision of 30 December 1964 (S/RES/199 (1964)), para. 7.
- (iv) Complaint by Senegal:
Decision of 19 May 1965 (S/RES/204 (1965)), para. 4.
- (v) Situation in the Dominican Republic:
Decision of 22 May 1965 (S/RES/205 (1965)), para. 2.
- (vi) The India-Pakistan question:
Decision of 4 September 1965 (S/RES/209 (1965)), para. 4.
Decision of 6 September 1965 (S/RES/210 (1965)), para. 2 (third part).
Decision of 20 September 1965 (S/RES/211 (1965)), para. 5.
Decision of 5 November 1965 (S/RES/215 (1965)), paras. 3 and 4.
- (vii) Situation in Territories in Africa under Portuguese administration:
Decision of 22 November 1965 (S/RES/218 (1965)), para. 8 (second part).
3. From regional agencies or arrangements.
Situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo:
Decision of 30 December 1964 (S/RES/199 (1964)), para. 6.
- B. Provision by express decision to consider the matter further.
- (i) Situation in Southern Rhodesia:
Decision of 6 May 1965 (S/RES/202 (1965)), para. 7.
Decision of 20 November 1965 (S/RES/217 (1965)), para. 11.
- (ii) The India-Pakistan question:
Decision of 6 September 1965 (S/RES/210 (1965)), para. 3.
- C. Statement by the President that the Council would remain seized of the question.
- (i) Complaint by Panama:
Decision: President's statement of 10 January 1964.
- (ii) Situation in the Dominican Republic:
Decision: President's statement of 26 July 1965.

Part II

COMPLAINT BY PANAMA

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter¹⁰ dated 10 January 1964, the permanent representative of Panama requested the President of the Security Council, in accordance with Articles 34 and 35, paragraph 1 of the Charter of the United Nations, to convene an early meeting of the Council to consider "urgent matters connected with the grave situation that exists between Panama and the United States of America because of the Canal enclave in our territory". The situation with which Panama was confronted had been brought about by the "repeated threats and acts of aggression committed by the Government of the United States" in Panama, which infringed its territorial sovereignty, violated its territorial integrity and constituted in practice "a serious danger to international peace and security". In addition to other "serious acts" committed as a result of the intolerance of United States troops stationed in the Canal Zone on 3 November 1959, and which had resulted in a total of eighty wounded, Panama had been the victim of aggression since 9 January 1964, with a total of twenty dead and over 300 wounded persons. Should the situation continue to deteriorate, the state of alarm fraught with insecurity and violence was bound to persist. Panama accordingly requested that the United Nations should intervene, so that "these acts of aggression may be considered by the Security Council".

At the 1086th meeting on 10 January 1964, the Council included the item in its agenda¹¹ and considered it at that meeting. The representative of Panama was invited to take part in the discussion.¹²

Decisions of 10 January 1964 (1086th meeting):
Statement by the President expressing the consensus of the Council to the effect (1) that its President would address an appeal to the parties for an immediate end to the exchange of fire and bloodshed and (2) that the matter remained on the Council's agenda

At the 1086th meeting on 10 January 1964, the representative of Panama* stated that Panama was the victim of an unprovoked armed attack against its territory and its civilian population, committed by the armed forces of the United States garrisoned in the Panama Canal Zone, "while neither its Government, its population nor its citizens have committed any hostile act of any kind". After describing certain "provocations" which had been committed by United States citizens and students he recalled an agreement between Panama and the United States, under which the flags of both countries were to fly together at certain places in the Canal Zone. However, the "Zonians" as United States citizens living in the Zone were called, had done all they could to prevent the agreement from being implemented, and in an arbitrary gesture, the United States Governor in the Canal Zone decided that in some places in the Canal Zone neither the Panamanian nor the United States flag should be hoisted. Despite that ban, United States students attending schools in the Canal Zone decided on their own initiative to hoist only the United States flag at those schools. Such an act of disrespect for an international agreement and challenge to the Panamanian nation caused considerable annoyance to the community of Panama. Consequently on the previous day, 9 January 1964, a number of Panamanian citizens and students decided to hoist their flag at those places where it legally should be hoisted. The police of the Canal Zone and the military forces garrisoned there then opened fire with machine-guns on the peaceful demonstrators, taking a high toll in lives and injuring people. After

¹⁰ S/5509, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964, pp. 18-19.

¹¹ 1086th meeting: para. 19.

¹² 1086th meeting: para. 20.

giving a detailed account of the legal situation and of the claims of Panama concerning the Canal Zone, he stated that the Zone should "not continue under its present status, which is and will remain a cause of permanent discord". In his view, it was imperative that the status of the Panama Canal be changed, either by nationalization or by internationalization. The Panamanian representative was requesting the intervention of the Security Council in the hope that peace and tranquillity would be restored in the Canal Zone, and that lasting solutions would be sought for Panama.

The representative of the United States stated that the riots and violence in Panama were of special regret to the United States Government and people since they blotted the record of the long and friendly and improving relationship between both countries. The United States Government was doing everything humanly possible to restore the situation. The United States President had telephoned the President of Panama to discuss the situation, and the two Presidents had agreed that violence in the Canal Zone had to be stopped. The United States President had also given instructions to United States authorities to do everything within their power to restore and maintain peace and order in the Canal Zone. It was to be hoped that the Panamanian authorities were being equally vigorous in their efforts to restrain lawlessness and to maintain order and prevent further incidents of violence and bloodshed.

The representative of the United States further denied the Panamanian representative's allegations of aggression and stated that when the Canal Zone police appeared unable to restore order, United States Army forces had been requested to assume responsibility for the protection of the Zone. They had acted with the greatest restraint. There was no evidence that either the police of the Zone or the United States Army ever went outside the Zone. Their only use of firearms had been within the Zone, to protect United States citizens residing there against an onrushing crowd of several thousand and against snipers. That act of self-defence within the Canal Zone boundaries he asserted, could not be called an act of aggression.

Furthermore, the Organization of American States had moved into action with great rapidity. The Inter-American Peace Commission had met at the request of Panama and the United States to consider the situation, and had agreed to go to Panama immediately to ascertain the facts. He suggested that the Council, bearing in mind the fact that the Inter-American Peace Commission was about to leave for Panama, should agree that "the problem should continue to be pursued in the regional forum which was established precisely to deal with situations arising among States in the Western Hemisphere". The United Nations Charter, both in Articles 33 and 52, provided for pacific settlement of local disputes through regional agencies. In accordance with the provisions of those articles, and without derogating from the responsibilities of the Security Council, he believed that such local disputes could most effectively be dealt with through regional procedures.

The representative of Brazil suggested that the President of the Council be authorized to address an appeal to both parties to bring to an immediate end the exchange of fire, and to request them to impose restraint over the military forces under their command and the civilian population under their control.

The Brazilian representative's initiative was supported by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Morocco, Ivory Coast, the United States and China. The representative of Panama also stated that his reaction to the suggestion was favourable.

At the end of the discussion the President (Bolivia) noted that many of the members of the Council had supported the proposal of the representative of Brazil to the effect that the President of the Council would be authorized to address an appeal¹³ to the Governments of the United States and of Panama so that they should immediately take the most appropriate measures to bring to an end the exchange of fire and the bloodshed. There being no objection he declared the proposal as adopted. The President also stated that the question would remain on the agenda of the Council.¹⁴

THE INDIA-PAKISTAN QUESTION

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT (1117TH MEETING)

By letter¹⁵ dated 16 January 1964, the representative of Pakistan requested the President of the Council to convene an immediate meeting of the Council to consider "the grave situation that has arisen in the State of Jammu and Kashmir" which, he contended, was "the direct consequence of the unlawful steps that the Government of India is continuing to take in order to destroy the special status of the State" in disregard of the resolutions of the Security Council and of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP). References were made to two earlier letters from the President of Pakistan to the President of the Council, dated 9 October 1963¹⁶ and 3 January 1964¹⁷ drawing the attention of the Council to the measures contemplated by the Government of India "to consolidate India's hold over the bulk of Jammu and Kashmir, to demoralize its people and to interpose further obstacles in the establishment of conditions for the exercise of their free choice in regard to their future". It was further stated in the letter that as a result of those acts and the occurrence of sacrilegious acts disrespectful to the Muslim population as well as communal strife in Calcutta and other districts of West Bengal, "an extremely tense and explosive situation in *Azad* Kashmir and throughout Pakistan" had been created as a consequence of which "Indian-Pakistan relations had been dangerously strained".

By letter¹⁸ dated 24 January 1964, the representative of India denied the allegations of the representative of Pakistan concerning "the existence of a tense situation and an atmosphere of crisis". He asserted that the Pakistani request was "a propaganda move" intended to exploit certain recent incidents and to divert attention from the disturbances in East Pakistan affecting the minority community there. The attacks on the Hindu minorities in that area continued and, in

¹³ The appeal addressed on 11 January 1964 was circulated as S/5519, and the replies appeared in S/5519, and S/5519/Add.1, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964*, pp. 35-36.

¹⁴ 1086th meeting: para. 108. For texts of relevant statements, see: 1086th meeting: President (Bolivia), paras. 104-105; Brazil, paras. 58-59; China para. 197; Ivory Coast, para. 91; Morocco, para. 84; Panama,* paras. 21-36; United Kingdom, para. 78; United States, paras. 37-53.

¹⁵ S/5517, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964*, pp. 26-34.

¹⁶ S/5437, *O.R.*, 18th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1963*, pp. 5-7.

¹⁷ S/5504, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964*, pp. 12-15.

¹⁸ S/5522, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964*, pp. 38-47.