

By letter dated 26 January 1946,³ Iran replied that the conditions envisaged by Article 25 (sic) were present.

At its 2nd meeting on 25 January 1946, the Council included the question in the agenda.⁴

The Council considered the question at its 3rd and 5th meetings on 28 and 30 January 1946.

At the 3rd meeting on 28 January, the representative of Iran urged the Council to recommend in accordance with Article 2 (4) that, pending the completion of the withdrawal of the Soviet forces, Soviet authorities should cease to interfere in the internal affairs of Iran and should not prevent Iranian forces and officials from proceeding freely in and through territory in which Soviet forces were stationed or from the full exercise of their duties.⁵

At the same meeting, the representative of the USSR declared that negotiations had taken place between the Iranian and USSR Governments in November 1945 and had produced satisfactory results.⁶ He stated that there were no grounds for considering the substance of the Iranian statement, and suggested that the USSR and Iran should be given the opportunity to settle the matter.⁷

Decision of 30 January 1946 (5th meeting): Request to the USSR and Iran to inform the Council of the results of negotiations between them

At the 5th meeting on 30 January 1946, the representative of the United Kingdom submitted a draft resolution, the last paragraph of which read:⁸

"Requests the parties to inform the Council of any result achieved, and the Council in the meanwhile retains the right at any time to request information as to the progress of the negotiations. In the meantime the matter remains on the agenda."

After withdrawal by the representative of the United Kingdom of the provision to retain the matter on the agenda, the draft resolution was adopted unanimously.⁹ The resolution as adopted read:¹⁰

"The Council,

"Having heard the statements by the representatives of the Soviet Union and Iran in the course of its meetings of 28 and 30 January, and

"Having taken cognizance of the documents presented by the Soviet and Iranian delegations and those referred to in the course of the oral debates;

"Considering that both parties have affirmed their readiness to seek a solution of the matter at issue by negotiation; and that such negotiations will be resumed in the near future,

"Requests the parties to inform the Council of any results achieved in such negotiations. The Council in the meanwhile retains the right at any time to request information on the progress of the negotiations."

³ S/1, O.R., 1st year, 1st series, Suppl. No. 1, pp. 19-24.

⁴ 2nd meeting: p. 16. On the inclusion of the question in the agenda, see chapter II, Case 27.

⁵ 3rd meeting: p. 38.

⁶ 3rd meeting: pp. 39-41.

⁷ 5th meeting: pp. 42-43. Concerning the continuance of negotiations in relation to the competence of the Council, see chapter X, Case 1.

⁸ 5th meeting: p. 64.

⁹ 5th meeting: p. 71.

¹⁰ 5th meeting: pp. 70, 71. Regarding retention on the agenda in relation to the resumption of negotiations, see chapter X, Case 20.

THE GREEK QUESTION: USSR COMMUNICATION DATED 21 JANUARY 1946

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter dated 21 January 1946,¹¹ the USSR, under Article 35 of the Charter, brought the situation in Greece to the attention of the Security Council. It charged that the presence of United Kingdom troops in Greece and ensuing interference in the internal affairs of that State was causing "extreme tension fraught with the possibility of serious consequences both for the Greek people and for the maintenance of peace and security". The USSR requested the Council to discuss the question and "take the measures provided for by the Charter to put an end to the situation".

At the 3rd meeting on 28 January 1946, the Council included the communication from the USSR Government in the agenda.

The Council considered the question at its 6th to 8th and 10th meetings, between 1 and 6 February 1946.

Decision of 4 February 1946 (7th meeting): Rejection of proposal submitted by the representative of Poland

Following statements by representatives of the USSR, the United Kingdom and Greece, the representative of the United States suggested at the 7th meeting on 4 February that no formal action be taken in this case and that the three Governments be thanked for the statements that had been made in explanation of the position.¹²

At the same meeting, the President (Australia) suggested that, since no motion was before the Council, it was the sense of the Council that there was nothing inherent in the Greek situation at that time likely to lead to international friction or to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security and that the matter was therefore closed.¹³

The representatives of Poland,¹⁴ Egypt¹⁵ and the USSR¹⁶ then made proposals as to a statement to be made by the President expressing the sense of the Council. The representative of the USSR later withdrew his proposal¹⁷ in favour of the Polish proposal according to which the Council would take

"... note of the statements setting out the declarations of the Soviet Union, Great Britain and Greece, and of the assurance given by the representative of the United Kingdom that British troops in Greece will be withdrawn as soon as possible, and considers the question as closed."

At the 7th meeting on 4 February, the proposal submitted by the representative of Poland was rejected, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of 7 members. There were 2 votes in favour.¹⁸

Decision of 6 February 1946 (10th meeting): Taking note of declarations made and views expressed

At the 10th meeting on 6 February 1946, the President (Australia) read a statement¹⁹ which, in his view, might be accepted as a statement of the Council.

¹¹ O.R., 1st year, 1st series, Suppl. No. 1, pp. 73-74.

¹² 7th meeting: p. 112.

¹³ 7th meeting: p. 122.

¹⁴ 7th meeting: p. 122.

¹⁵ 7th meeting: pp. 122-123.

¹⁶ 7th meeting: p. 123.

¹⁷ 7th meeting: p. 124.

¹⁸ 7th meeting: pp. 125-126.

¹⁹ 10th meeting: p. 165.

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:²⁰

"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 stated²¹ that it was his understanding that it would be the wish of the Council to proceed to the next item on the agenda.²²

THE INDONESIAN QUESTION (I)

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter dated 21 January 1946,²³ 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 1946.²⁴

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 resolution²⁵ 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.²⁶

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 resolution²⁷ 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 amendment²⁸ 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.²⁹

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

THE SYRIAN AND LEBANESE QUESTION

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter dated 4 February 1946,³⁰ 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.³¹

The Council considered the Syrian and Lebanese question at the 19th to 23rd meetings between 14 and 16 February 1946.³²

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

²⁰ 10th meeting: pp. 171-172.

²¹ 10th meeting: p. 172.

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

²³ O.R., 1st year, 1st series, Suppl. No. 1, p. 76.

²⁴ 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.

²⁵ 16th meeting: p. 223.

²⁶ 18th meeting: p. 258.

²⁷ 17th meeting: p. 251.

²⁸ 18th meeting: p. 260.

²⁹ 18th meeting: p. 263.

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

³¹ 19th meeting: p. 271.

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