

At the same meeting, the President withdrew his statement in favour of the following text of a statement to be made by the President, prepared by the representatives of the USSR and the United States:<sup>20</sup>

"I feel we should take note of the declarations made before the Security Council by the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and Greece, and also the views expressed by the representatives of the following members of the Security Council: The United States of America, France, China, Australia, Poland, the Netherlands, Egypt and Brazil, in regard to the question of the presence of British troops in Greece, as recorded in the proceedings of the Council, and consider the matter as closed."

The President stated<sup>21</sup> that it was his understanding that it would be the wish of the Council to proceed to the next item on the agenda.<sup>22</sup>

### THE INDONESIAN QUESTION (I)

#### INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter dated 21 January 1946,<sup>23</sup> the Ukrainian SSR\*, in accordance with Article 35 (1), drew the attention of the Security Council to the situation which had arisen in Indonesia. Military operations had been directed against the local population—operations in which regular British troops as well as Japanese forces had been taking part. In the opinion of the Ukrainian Government, the situation constituted "a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security . . . covered by Article 34". The Ukrainian SSR asked the Council to carry out the necessary investigation and to take the measures provided for by the Charter in order to put an end to the situation which had arisen.

At its 2nd meeting on 25 January 1946, the Council included the question in the agenda.

The question was considered by the Council at the 12th to 18th meetings held between 7 and 13 February 1946.<sup>24</sup>

*Decision of 13 February 1946 (18th meeting): Rejection of draft resolution submitted by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR*

At the 16th meeting on 11 February 1946, the representative of the Ukrainian SSR submitted a draft resolution<sup>25</sup> to set up a commission to carry out an inquiry on the spot.

At the 18th meeting on 13 February, the Ukrainian draft resolution was rejected, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of 7 members. There were 2 votes in favour.<sup>26</sup>

*Decision of 13 February 1946 (18th meeting): Rejection of draft resolution submitted by the representative of Egypt*

At the 17th meeting on 12 February 1946, the representative of Egypt submitted a draft resolution<sup>27</sup> to declare that it was clearly understood that British troops would not be used in any circumstances against the Indonesian national movement and that they would be withdrawn after the completion of their duties. The Council would also express its will to be informed in a short time of the results of the negotiations going on between the Netherlands and the Indonesian leaders and reserve to itself the right to take such further action as it thought proper.

At the 18th meeting on 13 February, the representative of the USSR submitted an amendment<sup>28</sup> to the Egyptian proposal to add a provision to set up a commission to clarify the Indonesian situation and hasten the re-establishment of normal conditions.

At the same meeting, the USSR amendment was rejected, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of 7 members. There were 3 votes in favour. The Egyptian draft resolution was rejected, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of 7 members. There were 2 votes in favour.<sup>29</sup>

The President (Australia) thereupon declared that the matter was closed.

### THE SYRIAN AND LEBANESE QUESTION

#### INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter dated 4 February 1946,<sup>30</sup> Syria and Lebanon brought to the attention of the Security Council, under Article 34, the presence of French and British troops in Syria and Lebanon which, they contended, constituted a grave infringement of the sovereignty of two States Members of the United Nations. The letter stated that the Governments of Syria and Lebanon had expected that these foreign troops would be withdrawn immediately upon the cessation of hostilities with Germany and Japan, but that the Franco-British Agreement of 13 December 1945 had made the withdrawal of troops subject to conditions which were inconsistent with the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter. In bringing the dispute to the attention of the Council, the Syrian and Lebanese delegations requested the Council to recommend the total and simultaneous evacuation of the foreign troops from the territories of Syria and Lebanon.

At its 19th meeting on 14 February 1946, the Council included the question in the agenda.<sup>31</sup>

The Council considered the Syrian and Lebanese question at the 19th to 23rd meetings between 14 and 16 February 1946.<sup>32</sup>

At the 20th and 21st meetings on 15 February 1946, the representatives of Syria and Lebanon declared that the presence of the foreign troops, without the consent of the two States concerned, had created a dispute threatening international peace and had become a source of possible intervention in the internal affairs of the two States Members of the United Nations. They maintained that the Agreement of 13 December 1945 was in

<sup>20</sup> 10th meeting: pp. 171-172.

<sup>21</sup> 10th meeting: p. 172.

<sup>22</sup> For consideration of the relation of the proceedings to chapter VI of the Charter, see chapter X, Case 21.

<sup>23</sup> O.R., 1st year, 1st series, Suppl. No. 1, p. 76.

<sup>24</sup> For the question of domestic jurisdiction in connexion with this case, see chapter XII, Case 1; for the applicability of Article 34, see chapter X, Case 7.

<sup>25</sup> 16th meeting: p. 223.

<sup>26</sup> 18th meeting: p. 258.

<sup>27</sup> 17th meeting: p. 251.

<sup>28</sup> 18th meeting: p. 260.

<sup>29</sup> 18th meeting: p. 263.

<sup>30</sup> S/5, O.R., 1st year, 1st series, Suppl. No. 1, pp. 82-83.

<sup>31</sup> 19th meeting: p. 271.

<sup>32</sup> For consideration of this question in relation to Article 33, see chapter X, Case 2.

violation of the principle of sovereign equality of the Members of the United Nations and contrary to the terms of Article 2 of the Charter. Their delegations were prepared to consider a solution which, based on the principles of the Charter, would provide for the simultaneous and unconditional withdrawal of the troops, subject to the time required for making the necessary technical and material arrangements, and would recognize that the question should be settled under the auspices of the Council until the withdrawal had been fully carried out.<sup>33</sup>

In the opinion of the representative of France, the fact that the Syrian and Lebanese Governments had invoked Article 34, without having stated precisely who were the parties to the possible dispute, and had not referred to Articles 35 and 33, indicated that there was no dispute, and that the existing situation in Syria and Lebanon could not in good faith be considered as likely to endanger international peace and security.<sup>34</sup> He further stated:

"The Agreement of 13 December is not interpreted by the signatories as implying any intention to maintain troops in the Levant indefinitely in the absence of a decision on the part of the Security Council. My Government is prepared to examine the question with the Syrian and Lebanese Governments with a view to settling with them the details of this solution."

The representative of the United Kingdom associated himself with the interpretation given by the representative of France to the Agreement of 13 December 1945.<sup>35</sup>

*Decisions of 16 February 1946 (23rd meeting): Rejection of draft resolutions submitted by the representatives of Mexico, Egypt and the United States*

During the consideration of the question, four draft resolutions were submitted to the Council:

(i) A Netherlands draft resolution, submitted at the 21st meeting on 15 February, to express confidence that, as a result of negotiations or otherwise, the foreign troops in Syria and Lebanon would be withdrawn at no distant date, and to request the parties to inform the Council when that had been done;<sup>36</sup>

(ii) A Mexican draft resolution, submitted at the 22nd meeting on 16 February, to recommend that the date of the simultaneous evacuation of British and French troops should be fixed by the parties through negotiations concerned with the necessary military-technical arrangements, and to request the parties to inform the Council when that was done;<sup>37</sup>

(iii) An Egyptian draft resolution, submitted at the same meeting, to recommend the parties to enter into negotiations as soon as possible with a view to establishing the technical details of the simultaneous withdrawal of French and United Kingdom troops, including the fixing of the date of its completion, and to request them to keep the Council informed of the result of those negotiations;<sup>38</sup>

(iv) A United States draft resolution, submitted at the same meeting, to express confidence that foreign troops in Syria and Lebanon would be withdrawn as soon as practicable and that negotiations to that end

would be undertaken by the parties without delay, and to request the parties to inform the Council of the results of the negotiations.<sup>39</sup>

At the 23rd meeting on 16 February, the Netherlands draft resolution was withdrawn.<sup>40</sup> The Mexican and Egyptian draft resolutions were rejected, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of 7 members. There were 4 votes in favour of each draft resolution.<sup>41</sup>

The United States draft resolution was not adopted. There were 7 votes in favour, 1 against (the vote against being that of a permanent member) and 3 abstentions.<sup>42</sup>

The representatives of France and the United Kingdom stated that they would, however, give effect to the United States draft resolution.<sup>43</sup>

By letters dated 30 April and 1 May 1946, the representatives of France and the United Kingdom respectively informed the Council of arrangements made for the withdrawal of forces in fulfilment of the undertaking regarding the United States proposal.<sup>44</sup>

## THE IRANIAN QUESTION (II)

### INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter dated 18 March 1946,<sup>45</sup> the representative of Iran informed the Security Council, under Article 35 (1), that a new dispute had arisen between Iran and the USSR as a result of the maintenance of Soviet troops in Iranian territory after 2 March 1946, contrary to the provisions of the Tripartite Treaty of Alliance of 29 January 1942, and the continued interference of the USSR in the internal affairs of Iran. By letter dated 20 March 1946,<sup>46</sup> he added that negotiations conducted pursuant to the resolution of 30 January had failed.

At the 26th meeting on 26 March 1946, the Council included the question in the agenda.<sup>47</sup>

The Security Council considered the question at its 26th through 30th meetings between 26 March and 4 April, 32nd and 33rd meetings on 15 and 16 April, 36th meeting on 23 April, 40th meeting on 8 May and 43rd meeting on 22 May 1946.

At the 26th and 27th meetings on 26 and 27 March, the Council had under consideration the USSR proposal to postpone consideration of the Iranian communication until 10 April.<sup>48</sup>

On the rejection of this proposal at the 27th meeting on 27 March,<sup>49</sup> the representative of the USSR, having stated that he was not in a position to take part in a discussion of the Iranian question after the rejection of his proposal, left the Council chamber.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>33</sup> 22nd meeting: pp. 332-333.

<sup>34</sup> 23rd meeting: p. 354.

<sup>35</sup> 23rd meeting: p. 364.

<sup>36</sup> 23rd meeting: pp. 367-368.

<sup>37</sup> 23rd meeting: p. 368.

<sup>38</sup> S/52, Security Council Journal No. 33, p. 639; S/51, Security Council Journal No. 33, p. 641. For communications by Syria and Lebanon, see S/64, Security Council Journal No. 36, p. 712; S/90, Security Council Journal No. 41, p. 815.

<sup>39</sup> S/15, O.R., 1st year, 1st series, Suppl. No. 2, pp. 43-44.

<sup>40</sup> S/18, O.R., 1st year, 1st series, Suppl. No. 2, p. 45.

<sup>41</sup> 26th meeting: p. 27. For consideration of the inclusion of the question in the agenda, see chapter II, Case 16.

<sup>42</sup> 26th meeting: p. 30.

<sup>43</sup> 27th meeting: p. 56.

<sup>44</sup> 27th meeting: p. 58.

<sup>38</sup> 20th meeting: pp. 284-289; 21st meeting: p. 300.

<sup>34</sup> 20th meeting: pp. 292-293.

<sup>35</sup> 20th meeting: p. 295.

<sup>36</sup> 21st meeting: p. 317.

<sup>37</sup> 22nd meeting: p. 319.

<sup>38</sup> 22nd meeting: pp. 323-324.