

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.