



THE HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL OF 1967

MEMBERS OF THE HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL OF 1967

ARGENTINA

BRAZIL

BULGARIA

CANADA

CHINA

DENMARK

ETHIOPIA

FRANCE

INDIA

JAPAN

MALI

NIGERIA

USSR

UNITED KINGDOM

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL OF 1967

Key international security concerns at the beginning of 1967 revolve around the situations in Africa, including Southern Rhodesia, the Congo and South Africa. Peacekeeping questions are a major concern; the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) operation between Egypt and Israel and the Soviet Union's unwillingness to pay for certain peacekeeping operations, have both been subjects of Council discussion. The war in Viet-Nam is also a significant underlying factor in world politics, although it has received limited formal attention in the Security Council. Continued disputes over recognition issues between the two Chinas is also an issue. Additionally, the Cold War struggles between the United States and the Soviet Union are a constant undercurrent in the world of international politics, with many developing States stressing their non-aligned status and forming a power bloc within the United Nations to combat the increasingly polarized world around them.

For each topic area, Representatives should consider the following questions. These questions are designed to assist in developing a deeper understanding of the issues at hand, particularly from your State's perspective:

- Should the United Nations be involved in the situation? If yes, what role can the United Nations play in the situation?
- How can regional organizations be brought into the discussion and aid in solutions to the problems?
- Does your government feel that this situation is a threat to international peace and security?
- What are your government's interests in the region?

THE SITUATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA

On 11 November 1965, the territorial government of Southern Rhodesia, led by Ian Smith, unilaterally declared independence from the United Kingdom, sparking intense political conflict. The declaration directly violated the 1961 decolonization agreement signed by the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia, which required that the territory achieve majority rule prior to independence. Southern Rhodesia had been a self-governing territory of the United Kingdom for over 40 years, but the government was dominated by European elites who would have had to relinquish power under a legally independent Rhodesia. On 12 November 1965, the Security Council passed Resolution 216, condemning Southern Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence, calling on all Member States to refrain from recognizing the regime in Southern Rhodesia and from providing it with any assistance.

On 20 November 1965, the Council requested that Member States make a voluntary break in diplomatic and economic relations with the newly-independent Rhodesia. One month later, in Resolution 232, the Council imposed mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia. In April of 1966, following months of failed diplomatic efforts, the United Kingdom requested a Council meeting to approve their blockade of the *Joanna V*, a Portuguese oil tanker attempting to make a delivery to the Rhodesian government via the port of Beira in Mozambique. In response, the Council passed Resolution 221 on 9 April, allowing the United Kingdom to use force if necessary to prevent the delivery of the oil. The resolution also granted the United Kingdom the right to detain the *Joanna V*, should delivery succeed. Prior to the oil tanker incident, the United Kingdom had been given broad latitude by its Council allies to attempt a diplomatic solution to the problems caused by its former colony; bringing this issue before the Council marked a new escalation in the conflict.

Several African governments requested that the Council take much stronger steps to remove the Smith government from power, up to and including the authorization of the use of force under the terms of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Extending the use of force for more than just embargo enforcement was not supported by the United States, France or the United Kingdom, which instead stood behind the continued use of sanctions, political pressure and negotiations. On 10 May 1966, 32 African States requested a Council meeting to renew discussion on Rhodesia, noting that Council actions had been ineffective in removing the minority government and again asking that the Council consider authorizing a use of force intervention. The request stated that economic sanctions were clearly failing; not all States were enforcing the sanctions, and some States were still investing in Rhodesia. In discussions on the issue, the Soviet Union specifically accused the United Kingdom of trying to reach an agreement with the Smith regime at the expense of the Zimbabwean people. A resolution, sponsored by the African bloc and reflecting its concerns, failed by a vote of six in favor, one opposed and eight abstentions. Similar discussions continued throughout the year on these issues, leading up to an eventual request by the United Kingdom for another Council meeting in December. The United Kingdom was prepared to call for additional measures against Southern Rhodesia, including stronger economic sanctions.

During the debate, other States criticized the United Kingdom's enforcement efforts. Further, a number of speakers criticized the United Kingdom's refusal to use force, as it had been partially authorized to do at its own request. Significantly, the Western powers were also beginning to realize that the situation was becoming more intractable as time went on. The African States on the Council sponsored an amendment to the



draft resolution being debated at the Council's December session which noted that the situation constituted a threat to international peace and security. This direct Chapter VII of the UN Charter language was included in the text of the final resolution. Referencing Chapter VII had been staunchly opposed by the United Kingdom and its allies in past discussions but gained more traction here, with those formerly opposed agreeing to abstain. On 16 December 1966 the Council passed Resolution 232 which increased sanctions on the Smith Government. Although language was included in Resolution 232 defining the situation as a threat to international peace and security, no official authorization of force has been granted, leaving the situation in an uneasy status-quo.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Minter, William and Elizabeth Schmidt (1988). When Sanctions Worked: The Case of Rhodesia Reexamined. African Affairs, Vol 87, Issue 347 (April) pp. 207-238.

UN DOCUMENTS

United Nations, Security Council. (1966). Southern Rhodesia. 16 December. S/RES/232.
 United Nations, Security Council. (1966). Southern Rhodesia. 9 April. S/RES/221.
 United Nations, Security Council. (1965). Southern Rhodesia. 20 November. S/RES/217.
 United Nations, Security Council. (1965). Southern Rhodesia. 12 November. S/RES/216.

THE QUESTION OF PALESTINE

Throughout 1966, the Security Council discussed actions taken by Israel, Syria and Jordan since the 1949 General Armistice Agreements. Repeated border incursions and military incidents led to heightened tensions in the region throughout the year. Syria and Jordan frequently accused Israel of violating the Armistice Agreements by attacking their respective territories. Israel accused Syria of continued attacks from the Golan Heights, and both Syria and Jordan of military activities across various border regions. Israel also accused both countries of harboring and supporting pro-Palestinian terrorists, who frequently conducted terrorist activities across the borders into Israel.

On 25 February 1966, a military coup in Syria returned Nureddin al-Atassi to power. From February to October, Israel alleged that Syria had attacked Israeli settlements from fortified positions in the Golan Heights. In response, Israel conducted military reprisals, while Syria argued that the original attacks were fabrications and that subsequent Israeli attacks were clear violations of the 1949 Armistice Agreements.

On the Israeli-Jordanian border, a number of smaller border incursions culminated in a 13 November invasion of southern Hebron by Israeli forces. Israeli forces attacked a number of villages in this region in what Israeli officials called reprisals for Jordanian cross-border interventions and sponsorship of pro-Palestinian Fatah forces, and what Jordan called an unprovoked attack. Resolution 228, passed on 28 November, criticized the large scale and carefully planned military action into Jordanian territory by Israeli armed forces and censured Israel for its actions. It was the only formal Council action on the region during 1966, though

the Council called Israel, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Egypt and Saudi Arabia to speak several times as hostilities occurred throughout 1966.

Several other issues contributed to the heightening of tensions surrounding the Palestine issue. On 19 May, a sale of military jet fighters and bombers by the United States to Israel was, for the first time ever, publicly disclosed. Additionally, on 4 November, Syria and Egypt concluded a mutual defense treaty, which also provided for joint control of armed forces in case of war or aggression against either party. Furthermore, the Soviet Union, aligned with Syria since the 1956 Suez Crisis, had maintained an active political presence in the region. Most of their political pressure has been focused on aligning the other Arab states to act against Israel, including Jordan, since they have a significant Palestinian-Arab population. However, Arab unity was shaken by a 7 December call by Syria—to Jordanians and Palestinian Arabs within Jordan—for the ouster of King Hussein of Jordan. This call was accompanied by an offer to provide arms to any parties involved in the uprising.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Congressional Quarterly (1991). The Middle East. 7th Edition.
 Fine, Leonard (1967). Politics in Israel.
 Hadawi, Sami (1991). Bitter Harvest, A Modern History of Palestine.
 Laqueur, Walter (1969). The Israeli-Arab Reader: A Documentary History of the Middle East Conflict.
 Laqueur, Walter (1969). The Struggle for the Middle East: The Soviet Union and the Middle East, 1958-1968.
 Oren, Michael (2002). Six Days of War: June 1967 and the Making of the Modern Middle East.
 Shlaim, Avi (2001). The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World.

UN DOCUMENTS

United Nations, General Assembly. (1967). Report of the Security Council: 16 July 1965 – 15 July 1966. A/6302.
 United Nations, Security Council. (1966). The Palestine Question. 25 November. S/RES/228.
 United Nations, Security Council. (1966). Report by the Secretary-General on the Present Status of the Demilitarized Zone Set Up by this General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria. 2 November. S/7573.
 United Nations, Security Council. (1966). Report by the Secretary-General on the Present Inability of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission to Function and the Attitudes of the Parties Thereto. 1 November. S/7572.
 United Nations, Security Council. (1966). Report by the Secretary-General on the Inspections of the Demilitarized Zone and Defensive Areas on 19 October 1966. 23 October. S/7561/Rev.1.
 United Nations, Security Council. (1966). Letter Dated 6 October 1966 From the Permanent Representative of Turkey Addressed to the Secretary-General. 7 October. S/7533.
 United Nations, Security Council. (1966). Report by the Secretary-General, As Requested by the Security Council, with Regard to Item (b) of the Agenda Adopted by the Council On 25 July 1966. 27 July. S/7433.
 United Nations, Security Council. (1966). Report by the Secretary-General, As Requested by the Security Council, with Regard to



Item (a) of the Agenda Adopted by the Council on 25 July 1966. 26 July. S/7432.

THE SITUATION IN VIET-NAM

THE SITUATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

Following its independence from Belgium in 1960, the Republic of the Congo (renamed the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 1965) went through four years of civil war with significant United Nations and international intervention. The United Nations Operation in the Congo (ONUC) peacekeeping effort concluded in June of 1964. In the fall of 1965, the Security Council's attention turned back to simmering tensions between the Congo and the bordering Portuguese colony of Angola.

On 21 September 1966, the Congolese government accused Portugal of supporting former (now exiled) Congolese Prime Minister Tshombe and allowing the use of Angola and Cabinda as a base for insurgent activities into the Congo. The Portuguese embassy in Kinshasa was attacked by locals on 24 September, with Congolese radio broadcasts allegedly responsible for inciting much of the violence.

At Congo's request, the Security Council discussed the issue in September and October. Congo argued that Portugal was supporting these rebels because the Congolese government had granted *de jure* recognition to the Angolan government in exile. Portugal denied any support for the Congolese insurgents. On 14 October 1966, the Council passed Resolution 226, urging Portugal to deny foreign mercenaries the use of Angola as a base of operations for incursions into neighboring countries. This eased political tensions in the region.

The November 1966 military coup that abolished all competing political parties and firmly placed Joseph Mobutu in control of the country created new political complications and threats to peace in the country, though its long-term effects on peace and political reality remain unclear.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Library of Congress Country Studies (1993). Zaire: The Party-State as a System of Rule.
 United Nations (2001). Republic of the Congo-ONUC Background.
 United Nations (1996). The Blue Helmets: A Review of United Nations Peace-Keeping.

UN DOCUMENTS

- United Nations, Security Council. (1966). Question Concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo. 14 October. S/RES/226.
 United Nations, Security Council. (1966). Letter Dated 3 October 1966 From the Charge D'Affaires a.i. of the Democratic Republic of the Congo Addressed to the President of the Security Council. 3 October. S/7524.
 United Nations, Security Council. (1966). Letter Dated 24 September 1966 From the Charge D'Affaires a.i. of Portugal Addressed to the President of the Security Council. 26 September. S/7506.
 United Nations, Security Council. (1966). Letter Dated 21 September 1966 From the Acting Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Addressed to the President of the Security Council. 22 September. S/7503.

The 1960s brought a renewed focus on the political makeup of the Viet-Name peninsula. The 1954 Geneva Accords, which sought to end tensions between Western powers and communists forces, was never fully accepted. As the 1960s progressed, forces of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam (North Viet-Nam), backed by both the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, sought to expand their influence by increasing their push into the Republic of Viet-Nam (South Viet-Nam) and entering into the war in neighboring Laos. In 1965, the United States, which had been providing military advisors and support to the Republic of Viet-Nam for the last decade, began amassing significant ground combat troops in the Republic of Viet-Nam to directly combat the threat of communist insurgents. This increased presence of Western-backed troops drew renewed focus from the Soviet Union which led to significantly increased tensions in the region.

In January 1966, the United States reported taking new steps toward achieving peace in Viet-Nam. While the United States continued to stress the importance of South Viet-Name self-determination, they also suggested that it would be ideal for all parties to agree on and to implement the 1954 and 1962 Geneva Accords. The situation in Viet-Nam had never previously been discussed by the Security Council but, in an effort to bring the international political arena to bear in this direction, the United States called for a meeting of the Council on 31 January. At this meeting, the United States argued that a new dimension of peace was possible and suggested that the Council assist in brokering an attempt to arrange a new conference to implement the Geneva Accords in Viet-Nam.

The United States' attempt to work through the Council was opposed on many sides. Secretary-General U Thant specifically opposed open debate of the issue before the Council, noting the problematic nature of the United States' influence in Council involvement. Thant suggested that, since the original Geneva Accords were negotiated outside of a United Nations context, any new negotiations based on these Accords were not properly within the purview of the United Nations. The Soviet Union also opposed open discussion in the Council, accusing the United States of trying to use the Council for its own purposes in the war effort. Additionally, France (which was involved in Viet-Nam before the United States presence there) also opposed these discussions, citing concern with the United States being the only party to the conflict that was a United Nations Member, and the fact that this would deny a voice to the two parts of Viet-Nam and to mainland China.

Following a contentious vote on 2 February, with nine in favor, two opposed, and four abstentions, the topic of Viet-Nam was added to the Council's agenda. Despite being added to the agenda, actual discussions proved less than meaningful. A letter from the Council President explaining the discussions noted that the failure of all parties to the dispute to meet with the Council was likely the key factor in the inability to reach any formal decision. In general, the President noted that the Members expressed a general concern over continued hostilities in the region. This minimal statement was criticized by several Council members who argued that the discussions had been strictly procedural and that the President should not have drawn any conclusions from the statements made. While a number of reports were made by the Secretary-General and various Members on the situation in Viet-Nam, after February 1967 it has not yet been considered in formal discussions.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Herring, George (2001) America's Longest War: The United States in Vietnam, 1950-1975. 4th ed.
- Summers, Harry G. (2009) Vietnam War Almanac.
- Turley, William S. (1986) The Second Indochina War: A Short Political and Military History.

UN DOCUMENTS

- United Nations, General Assembly. (1967). Report of the Security Council: 16 July 1965 - 15 July 1966. A/6302.
- United Nations, General Assembly. (1966). Introduction to the Annual Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization. A/6301/Add.1.
- United Nations, Security Council. (1966). Letter Dated 26 February 1966 From the President of the Security Council to the Secretary-General. 26 February. S/7168.

THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS

The United Nations Security Council first became involved in Cyprus in 1964 with the establishment of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) on 4 March. The United Nations sent Peacekeeping troops to Cyprus in response to the escalating violence between the Greek and Turkish factions beginning on 21 December 1963. These factions have been fighting over Cyprus since it gained independence from the British in 1959. Compromises in the development of the constitution angered both Greek Cypriots, who were in favor of reuniting with Greece, and Turkish Cypriots, who were in favor of dividing the island between the two groups. In addition to establishing UNFICYP peacekeeping efforts, Security Council Resolution 186 recommended that the Secretary-General appoint a mediator to aid and oversee formal peacekeeping efforts; however, the chaotic situation in Cyprus has prevented any substantive talks from happening between the factions. In December of 1966, the Security Council passed Resolution 231 extending the UN peacekeeping force until June of 1967.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ehrlich, Thomas (1974). Cyprus: 1958-1967.
- Nicolet, Claude (2001). United States Policy Towards Cyprus, 1954-1974: Removing the Greek-Turkish Bone of Contention.
- Richmond, Oliver, and James Ker-Lindsay (2001). The Work of the UN in Cyprus: Promoting Peace and Development.
- Solsten, Eric (1993). Cyprus: A Country Study.

UN DOCUMENTS

- United Nations, Security Council (1966). The Cyprus Question. 15 December. S/RES/231.
- United Nations, Security Council (1965). Report of the United Nations Mediator on Cyprus to the Secretary General. 26 March. S/6253
- United Nations, Security Council (1964). The Cyprus Question. 4 March. S/RES/186.

OTHER ISSUES: PEACEKEEPING ISSUES

United Nations peacekeeping operations continue to face challenges as a result of the continuing refusal of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), among others, to pay for costs incurred for the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) and the United Nations Operation in the Congo (ONUC). The USSR has said that it considers these operations to be politically motivated and refuses to make payments. Under Article 19 of the United Nations Charter, "a Member State in arrears in the payment of its dues in an amount that equals or exceeds the contributions due for two preceding years can lose its vote in the General Assembly."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- United Nations (1996). The Blue Helmets: A Review of United Nations Peace-Keeping. 3rd Edition.

OTHER ISSUES: THE QUESTION OF THE REPRESENTATION OF CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

The representation of China continues to affect many issues before the United Nations. Since the Chinese Revolution in 1949, the Republic of China, currently based on Formosa/Taiwan, has held the official Chinese seat, including in the Security Council; however, the prominence of the People's Republic of China on the mainland has raised questions about the legitimacy of this arrangement. Discussions about this issue occurred between August and November of 1966, mainly in the General Assembly. These discussions revolved around questions such as the war in Viet-Nam, in which the People's Republic of China's involvement and lack of United Nations membership is becoming an increasingly important issue. There are also various other political and trade issues to consider when dealing with the increasingly powerful mainland government. A key question raised by allies of the Formosa government is: What would happen to Taiwan if the seat were to be awarded to the mainland government, both in terms of United Nations representation and its future relations with other States?

UN DOCUMENTS

- United Nations, General Assembly (1961). Representation of China in the United Nations. 15 December. A/RES/1668.