

SECURITY
COUNCILCONSEIL
DE SECURITESUMMARY STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF MATTERS OF
WHICH THE SECURITY COUNCIL IS SEIZED AND OF THE
STAGE REACHED IN THEIR CONSIDERATION

Pursuant to rule 11 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the Secretary-General submits the following summary statement of matters of which the Security Council is seized and of the stage reached in their consideration on 23 July 1949.

1. THE IRANIAN QUESTION

The Iranian application, dated 19 January 1946 (Security Council Journal No. 2, page 13) was considered at the 3rd and 5th meetings of the Council (London, 28 and 30 January 1946). A resolution was unanimously adopted requesting the parties to inform the Council of any results achieved in their negotiations.

The Iranian Ambassador made a second application by letter dated 18 March 1946 (S/15), which was considered at the 25th through 30th meetings (26 March to 4 April 1946). After various procedural decisions, the Council resolved by 9 votes (the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics being absent and the representative of Australia abstaining) to defer further proceedings until 6 May, on which date the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Iran were requested to report to the Council (Security Council Journal No. 241, pages 458-9).

By letter dated 6 April (S/30), the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics proposed the removal of the Iranian question from the Council agenda; by letter dated 9 April 1946 (S/33), the Iranian Ambassador opposed this proposal. The letters were discussed at the 32nd meeting (15 April).

By letter dated 15 April (S/37), the Iranian Ambassador transmitted a telegram from his Government stating that it withdrew its complaint from the Council.

At the 33rd meeting (16 April), the Secretary-General submitted a memorandum (S/39) concerning the legal effect of the above-mentioned letters from the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Iranian Ambassador. The Council referred this memorandum to the Committee

/of Experts

of Experts and considered its report (S/42) at the 36th meeting (23 April). A draft resolution submitted by the representative of France (Security Council Journal No. 27, page 522), providing that the Secretary-General collect information to complete the Security Council's report to the General Assembly, was rejected by a vote of 3 in favour (France, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and 8 against. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the decision to retain the Iranian question on the Council's agenda was contrary to the Charter, and that accordingly, his delegation did not consider it possible to participate further in the discussion of the Iranian question in the Council.

By letter dated 6 May 1946 (S/53), the Iranian Ambassador reported on the withdrawal of Soviet troops. At the 40th meeting (8 May) the Council resolved to defer further proceedings and requested the Iranian Ambassador to submit a complete report to the Security Council immediately upon the receipt of the information which would enable it to do so (Security Council Journal No. 33, page 635).

By letters dated 20 May and 21 May (S/66 and S/68), the Iranian Ambassador reported additional information concerning the matters brought to the Council's attention by his Government.

At the 43rd meeting (22 May), the Council resolved to adjourn the discussion of the Iranian question, the Council to be called together at the request of any of its members (Security Council Journal No. 26, page 711).

By letter dated 5 December 1946 (S/204), the Iranian Ambassador in Washington, D.C., forwarded a report concerning the Province of Azerbaijan.

2. SPECIAL AGREEMENTS UNDER ARTICLE 43 AND THE ORGANIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES MADE AVAILABLE TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL

At the 23rd meeting (16 February 1946), the Council directed the Military Staff Committee, as its first task, to examine from the military point of view the provisions of Article 43 of the Charter and submit the results of the study and any recommendations to the Council in due course.

At the 105th meeting (13 February 1947), the Council in its resolution (S/268/Rev.1/Corr.1), concerning the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 41 (I) and 42 (I), requested the Military Staff Committee to submit its recommendations in pursuance of Article 43 as soon as possible, and as a first step, to submit not later than 30 April 1947 its recommendations with regard to the basic principles which should govern the organization of armed forces to be made available to the Security Council.

By letter dated 30 April 1947 (S/336), the Military Staff Committee submitted its report on "General principles governing the organization of the armed forces made available to the Security Council by Member nations of the United Nations".

/General discussion

General discussion of the report took place at the 138th through 141st meetings (4 to 16 June 1947), with discussion of the separate articles following at the 142nd and 143rd meetings (18 and 20 June) and at the 145th, 146th, 149th and 157th meetings (24 June to 15 July 1947). The Council adopted various articles of the report, including several amendments submitted by the representatives of Australia and Belgium.

Replies to several questions raised during the discussion on the articles of the report were received from the Military Staff Committee (S/380, S/394 and S/395). At the 146th meeting, the Council requested the Committee to submit an estimate of the overall strength of the armed forces to be made available to the Security Council, indicating the strength and composition of the separate components and the proportions that should be provided by the five permanent members. At the 149th meeting, the Council considered the Committee's estimate (S/394) and also decided to request the Military Staff Committee's interpretation of the initial contribution of armed forces referred to in articles 10 and 11. The answer of the Military Staff Committee was circulated as document S/408.

At the 157th meeting (15 July 1947), the last held on this matter, the Council discussed article 11 of the report and proposals submitted by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Australia.

3. RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

By letter dated 5 September 1947 (S/540/Corr.1) the representative of the United Kingdom suggested several additional rules of procedure concerning Council meetings. This letter has not yet been considered by the Council.

The provisional rules of procedure adopted by the Council to date are contained in document S/96/Rev.3.

4. STATUTE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE

At the 23rd meeting (16 February 1946) the Council agreed to postpone consideration of the report of the Military Staff Committee concerning its statute and rules of procedure (S/10 as revised in S/115). The Committee of Experts was instructed to examine the report. It was agreed, pending approval of the report, to authorize the Military Staff Committee to carry out its business along the lines suggested in its report. At the 25th meeting (26 March 1946), consideration of the report was further postponed pending examination by the Committee of Experts.

On 17 July 1947, the report of the Committee of Experts was circulated as document S/421 but has not yet been placed on the Council's agenda.

5. THE GENERAL REGULATION AND REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS AND INFORMATION ON THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

By letter dated 27 December 1946 (S/229), the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted a proposal regarding the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41 (I). This proposal was placed on the agenda for the 88th meeting (31 December 1946), and at the 90th meeting (9 January 1947), the Council agreed to formally accept General Assembly resolution 41 (I) and proceed to the question of implementation.

Further discussion took place at the 92nd and 93rd meetings (15 January) and at the 95th meeting (20 January). Draft resolutions were submitted by the representatives of the United States of America (S/233), France (S/243), Australia (S/249) and Colombia (S/251).

At the 95th meeting (20 January), the Council adopted by 9 votes to 2, a resolution submitted by the representative of the United States to defer consideration of these items and of the first report of the Atomic Energy Commission until 4 February 1947.

Discussion was resumed at the 98th and 99th meetings (4 February 1947). A new draft resolution was submitted by the representative of the United States (S/264). The Council agreed that the authors of the various draft resolutions would meet unofficially with the President to try to work out a common text upon which unanimous agreement could be obtained. The draft resolution resulting from these consultations (S/268), was discussed at the 102nd through 105th meetings (11 - 13 February 1947). The Security Council resolved (S/268/Rev.1/Corr.1) inter alia, to set up a Commission for Conventional Armaments to be composed of representatives of the members of the Security Council and to submit to the Security Council, within the space of not more than three months, proposals (a) for the general regulation and reduction of armaments and armed forces; and (b) for practical and effective safeguards in connexion with the general regulation and reduction of armaments.

By letter dated 25 June 1947 (S/387), the Chairman of the Commission transmitted a report to the Council, attaching a plan of work and a proposal for the organization of the Commission's work. At the 152nd meeting (8 July 1947), the Council adopted, by 9 votes with 2 abstentions (Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the plan of work adopted by the Commission for Conventional Armaments (S/387, Annex A). The Council took note of the Commission's plan of organization of its future work (S/387, Annex B).

/By letter

By letter dated 14 January 1949 (S/1216), the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council General Assembly resolution 192 (III) concerning prohibition of the atomic weapon and reduction by one-third of the armaments and armed forces of the permanent members of the Security Council. This letter was considered at the 407th and 408th meetings (7 and 10 February 1949).

At the 407th meeting, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted a draft resolution (S/1246/Rev.1) dealing with this question.

At the 408th meeting, the representative of the United States submitted a draft resolution (S/1248) recommending that General Assembly resolution 192 (III) be transmitted to the Commission for Conventional Armaments for action according to its terms. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics also introduced a draft resolution proposing that his previous draft resolution (S/1246/Rev.1) be transmitted, together with General Assembly resolution 192 (III), to the Commission for Conventional Armaments and separately to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission.

The United States draft resolution (S/1248) was adopted by 9 votes, with 2 abstentions.

The first Union of Soviet Socialist Republics draft resolution (S/1246/Rev.1) was rejected by a vote of 2 in favour (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and 9 abstentions.

6. APPOINTMENT OF A GOVERNOR FOR THE FREE TERRITORY OF TRIESTE

By letter dated 13 June 1947, the representative of the United Kingdom requested that an early date be fixed for the discussion by the Council of the appointment of a Governor for the Free Territory of Trieste. The question was placed on the agenda at the 143rd meeting (20 June) and discussed in private at the 144th and 155th meetings (20 June and 10 July 1947). The Council set up a sub-committee composed of the representatives of Australia, Colombia and Poland to collect additional information about the candidates.

At the 203rd meeting, held in private on 24 September 1947, the Council examined the sub-committee's report and also a new candidate proposed by the representative of China. The Council decided to ask the permanent members to hold an informal consultation.

At the 223rd meeting, held in private on 18 December 1947, the Council decided, in pursuance of article 11 (paragraph 1) of the Permanent Statute for the Free Territory of Trieste, to request the Governments of Italy and Yugoslavia to consult with each other in an effort to reach agreement on
/a candidate

a candidate and to report on their progress to the Council not later than 5 January 1948.

The replies of the two Governments to this request were discussed at the 233rd meeting, held in private on 23 January 1948. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics suggested that Council members should express their opinions of the new candidates mentioned in the above replies, but some permanent members declared that they were not yet in a position to discuss these candidates. The Council decided to ask the permanent members to consider the matter further the following week, and also to have another Council meeting on the question as soon as possible.

At the 265th meeting, held in private on 9 March 1948, the Security Council agreed after some discussion to postpone further consideration of this question until such time as it was requested by any member of the Council.

By letter dated 8 February 1949 (S/1251), the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics requested that this item be included in the provisional agenda. At the 411th meeting (17 February) he introduced a draft resolution (S/1260) proposing that Colonel Herman Flukiger be appointed Governor of the Free Territory of Trieste.

Discussion was continued at the 422nd and 424th meetings (28 March and 10 May). At the 424th meeting, the Security Council voted on the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics draft resolution (S/1260) which was rejected by a vote of 2 in favour (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) with 9 abstentions.

7. THE EGYPTIAN QUESTION

By letter dated 8 July 1947 (S/410), the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt stated that British troops were maintained in Egyptian territory against the unanimous will of the people and contrary to the letter and spirit of the Charter and to General Assembly resolution 41 (I). He also complained of British policy in relation to the Sudan, stating that the facts set forth had given rise to a dispute between the Egyptian and the United Kingdom Governments, and the continuance of the dispute was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. He stated that negotiations had been attempted pursuant to Article 33 of the Charter, but had failed to achieve their end. Consequently, the Egyptian Government brought its dispute with the Government of the United Kingdom to the Security Council under Articles 35 and 37, requesting the Security Council to direct:

- (a) The total and immediate evacuation of British troops from Egypt, including the Sudan;
- (b) The termination of the present administrative regime in the Sudan.

The Security Council placed this question on the agenda at the 159th meeting (17 July 1947) and commenced discussion of the question at the 175th meeting (5 August 1947). Discussion continued at the 176th, 189th, 193rd, 196th, 198th, 199th and 200th meetings, (11 to 29 August). The Brazilian representative introduced a draft resolution (S/507) and accepted several amendments thereto, submitted by the representatives of China (S/507/Add.1), Belgium (S/507/Add.1) and Australia (S/516). The amended draft resolution was rejected by a vote of 6 in favour, 1 against (Poland) and three abstentions (Colombia, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). The United Kingdom representative did not participate, in accordance with Article 27 of the Charter. The representative of Colombia then submitted a new draft resolution (S/530), which was voted on in parts and rejected.

The Council further considered the question at the 201st meeting (10 September 1947). A draft resolution submitted by the representative of China (S/547) and amendments thereto submitted by the representative of Australia (S/549) were rejected, failing to obtain the required number of affirmative votes. The President then stated that the Egyptian question would remain on the agenda, and that the Council would continue its consideration at the request of any member of the Council or of either of the two parties concerned.

3. THE INDONESIAN QUESTION

By letter dated 30 July 1947 (S/447) the Government of India, under Article 35, paragraph 1 of the Charter, drew the attention of the Security Council to the situation in Indonesia and stated that in its opinion the situation endangered the maintenance of international peace and security. The Government of India requested the Council to take the necessary measures provided by the Charter to put an end to the situation.

By letter dated 30 July 1947 (S/449), the Australian Government also brought the hostilities in progress in Java and Sumatra to the Council's attention, stating that it considered these hostilities constituted a breach of peace under Article 39 and urging the Council to take immediate action to restore international peace and security.

The Council placed the Indonesian question on its agenda at the 171st meeting (31 July 1947) and invited the representatives of India and the Netherlands to participate in the discussion. After discussing the question at the 172nd and 173rd meetings (1 August 1947), the Council adopted a resolution (S/459) calling upon the parties to cease hostilities forthwith, to settle their disputes by arbitration or by other peaceful means, and to keep the Security Council informed about the progress of the settlement.

/By letters

By letters dated 3 and 4 August 1947 (S/466), the Netherlands representative informed the Council that orders had been issued to the Netherlands forces in the areas concerned to cease hostilities. By cablegram dated 5 August (S/469), the Vice-Premier of the Republic of Indonesia informed the Council that his Government had decided to order a cessation of hostilities. He requested that the Council appoint a committee to secure effective implementation of the cessation of hostilities.

Further discussion of the Indonesian question continued at the 173th, 181st, 184th, 185th, 187th and the 192nd through 195th meetings (7 to 26 August 1947).

By telegram dated 1 August 1947 (S/458), the permanent representative of the Philippines to the United Nations expressed the desire of his Government to participate in the discussion of the Indonesian question. This request, rejected at the 178th meeting, was reconsidered at the request of the representative of the Philippines (S/485), and an invitation approved at the 184th meeting. At the 181st meeting, it was decided to invite a representative of the Republic of Indonesia to participate in the discussion. At the 184th meeting, a Belgian proposal to invite the representatives of East Indonesia and Borneo to participate in the discussion was rejected and, at the 193rd meeting, a Belgian proposal to invite these representatives to participate on the same basis as the representatives of Indonesia was rejected.

At the 181st meeting, the representative of Australia introduced a draft resolution (S/488), to which amendments were submitted by the representatives of Poland (S/488/Add.1) and China (S/488/Add.2) at the 185th and 187th meetings. At the 192nd meeting, draft resolutions were introduced, jointly by the representatives of Australia and China (S/513), by the representative of Australia separately (S/512), and by the representative of the United States (S/514). At the 193rd meeting, the representative of Belgium introduced a draft resolution (S/517).

At the 194th and 195th meetings, the draft resolutions were put to a vote. The joint Australian-Chinese resolution, providing for a Consular Commission in Batavia to report on the situation in Indonesia, was adopted by 7 votes, with 4 abstentions (Colombia, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom).

The United States draft resolution in which the Council expressed its readiness, if the parties so requested, to assist in the settlement of the dispute through a committee of the Council consisting of three members of the Council, was adopted by 8 votes, with 3 abstentions (Poland, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

All other draft resolutions and amendments were defeated. A new draft resolution submitted by the representative of Poland (S/521) was then adopted by 10 votes, with 1 abstention (United Kingdom), calling on the parties to adhere strictly to the Council's resolution of 1 August 1947. The text of the resolutions adopted at the 194th and 195th meetings are given in document S/525.

By letters dated 4 and 18 September 1947 (S/545 and S/564), the representatives of the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia informed the Council that the Governments of Belgium and Australia had accepted their invitations to serve on the Council's Committee of Good Offices on the Indonesian Question, and by letter dated 18 September (S/558), the representatives of Australia and Belgium informed the Council that the Government of the United States of America had agreed to be the third member.

At the 207th meeting (3 October), the Council adopted a draft resolution (S/574) submitted by the representative of Australia requesting the Secretary-General to act as convener of the Committee of Good Offices and requesting the Committee to proceed to exercise its functions with the utmost dispatch.

The Security Council, at its 207th to 211th and 213th to 219th meetings (3 October to 1 March 1947) discussed the interim report (S/573) and the full report (S/586) of the Consular Commission at Batavia. Draft resolutions were submitted by the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (S/575), Australia (S/579/Rev.1), the United Kingdom, with amendments by the representative of Belgium accepted by the representative of the United Kingdom (S/578), the United States (S/585, subsequently revised in S/588) and Poland (S/589). The representatives of Belgium (S/592) and China (S/591) submitted amendments to the revised United States draft resolution. The representative of the United Kingdom later withdrew his resolution.

At the 217th meeting, the draft resolutions submitted by the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (S/575) and Australia (S/579/Rev.1) were put to the vote and rejected. The representative of Australia then submitted an amendment (S/593) to the United States revised draft resolution.

A sub-committee, consisting of the representatives of Australia, Belgium, China and the United States, was created to try to merge the revised United States draft resolution and the various amendments thereto into one text. The sub-committee met on 1 November 1947 and submitted a combined draft resolution (S/594) which was considered by the Security Council at the 218th and 219th meetings.

/The representative

The representative of the United States, supporting the draft resolution submitted by the sub-committee, withdrew his own revised draft resolution and stated that he was authorized by the representatives of Australia, Belgium and China to announce that they also withdrew their amendments to that draft. An amendment (S/595) introduced by the representative of Colombia to the draft resolution submitted by the sub-committee was rejected. The revised United States draft resolution as submitted by the sub-committee (S/594) was put to the vote and adopted. The Polish draft resolution (S/589) was rejected.

The revised resolution, as adopted on 1 November (S/597), provided among other things that the Committee of Good Offices assist the parties in reaching agreement on an arrangement which would ensure the observance of the cease-fire resolution.

At the 224th meeting (19 December), the Security Council agreed that the Committee of Good Offices should continue with the same membership after 31 December 1947 even though Australia retired from the Security Council as of that date.

At the 229th meeting (17 January 1948), the President read a cablegram (S/650) from the Chairman of the Committee of Good Offices stating that delegations of the Republic of Indonesia and the Netherlands would sign a truce agreement on 17 January 1948 on board the U.S.S. "Renville" and that immediately thereafter, both parties would sign an agreement on twelve political principles which were to form the agreed basis for discussions concerning the settlement of the dispute. On 19 January six additional political principles were accepted. These documents came to be known as the Renville Agreement.

The first interim report of the Security Council's Committee of Good Offices on the Indonesian Question (S/649 and S/649/Corr.1) was considered by the Security Council at the 247th to 249th, the 251st, 252nd, 256th and 259th meetings (17 to 28 February 1948) with representatives of Australia, India, the Netherlands, the Philippines, the Republic of Indonesia and the Committee of Good Offices participating without the right to vote. A draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Canada (S/678), and amendments thereto were submitted by the representatives of Australia (S/681) and Colombia (S/682). The Australian amendment was withdrawn and the Colombian amendment defeated. The Canadian draft resolution (S/678), noting the Committee's report with satisfaction and maintaining the Council's offer of good offices, was adopted by 7 votes, with 4 abstentions (Colombia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

/A resolution

A resolution introduced by the representative of China (S/689) was also adopted, requesting the Committee of Good Offices to pay particular attention to political developments in Western Java and Madura and to report thereon at frequent intervals.

On 1 May the Council received the Committee's report on political developments in West Java (S/729). On 26 May the Council received the Committee's second interim report (S/787) and its report on political developments in Madura (S/786). On 4 June the Committee forwarded a report on a conference of representatives of areas in Indonesia other than the Republic which had convened in Indonesia on 27 May 1948 (S/842). These various reports were discussed by the Council at the 316th, 322nd and 323rd meetings (10 and 17 June). At the 323rd meeting, the Council discussed press reports that negotiations in Indonesia had been suspended and agreed that the President should send a cablegram to the Chairman of the Committee requesting information on the reported suspension.

On 21 June the Council received by telegram the first chapter of the Committee's third interim report (S/848). On 22 and 23 June, the Committee submitted reports (S/850 and Add.1) on the circumstances of the temporary suspension and the resumption of discussions.

Discussion was continued at the 326th meeting (23 June) and it was agreed that the President should request the Committee to continue its efforts to attain a peaceful adjustment between the parties and to keep the Council informed of further developments.

On 29 June the Committee telegraphed a report (S/858) on the continuing difficulties in the negotiations. After further discussion at the 328th and 329th meetings (1 and 6 July), a proposal introduced by the representative of China, to authorize the President of the Security Council to request an early report from the Committee of Good Offices on the existing restrictions on Indonesia's domestic and international trade and on the reasons for the delay in the implementation of article 6 of the Truce Agreement, was adopted by 9 votes, with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

On 23 July the Committee telegraphed its report on trade restrictions (S/919) and also reported (S/918) that the political negotiations had been suspended. These reports were discussed at the 341st and 342nd meetings (29 July). The representative of China introduced a draft resolution (S/931) calling upon the Governments of the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia, with the assistance of the Committee of Good Offices, to maintain strict observance of both the military and economic articles of

the Renville Truce Agreement, and to implement early and fully the twelve Renville political principles and the six additional principles. The draft resolution was adopted (S/933) by 9 votes, with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

On 15 November 1948, the Committee of Good Offices submitted its fourth interim report (S/1085). On 12 and 18 December, the Committee submitted special reports concerning the collapse of direct talks between representatives of the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia (S/1117 and S/1129).

On 20 December, the Council convened in emergency session (387th meeting) in Paris at the request of the United States representative (S/1128) to consider further the Indonesian question in the light of a resumption of military operations in Indonesia which had begun on 19 December. The question was considered at the 387th to 393rd, the 395th and 396th meetings (20 to 29 December). During this period, the Committee of Good Offices submitted a number of reports (S/1129/Add.1, S/1138, S/1144, S/1146, S/1154, S/1156 and S/1166) concerning the outbreak of hostilities and later developments in Indonesia.

Initially draft resolutions were introduced jointly by the representatives of Colombia, Syria and the United States (S/1142), with an amendment proposed by the representative of Australia (S/1145), and by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (S/1148). The joint draft resolution as amended was adopted on 24 December (S/1150) by 7 votes with 4 abstentions (Belgium, France, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). It called upon the parties to cease hostilities forthwith, and immediately to release the President of the Indonesian Republic and other political prisoners arrested since 18 December, and instructed the Committee of Good Offices to report on events since 12 December and on the parties' compliance with the above directives.

The Council rejected the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics draft resolution (S/1148) and a Canadian draft resolution (S/1149) introduced after the adoption of the joint draft resolution, together with Australian and Syrian amendments to the latter. On 27 December, the Council rejected further draft resolutions (S/1158 and S/1159) submitted by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

At the 395th meeting (28 December), the Council adopted by 9 votes, with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), a Colombian draft resolution (S/1165) requesting the Consular representatives in Batavia referred to in the resolution of 25 August 1947 (S/513) to report fully on the situation in the Republic of Indonesia, covering observance of the cease-fire orders and conditions in areas under

military occupation or from which armed forces might be withdrawn. At the same meeting, the Council adopted a Chinese draft resolution (S/1164) by 8 votes, with 3 abstentions (Belgium, France, United Kingdom) which noted that the Netherlands Government had not released the prisoners as requested by the resolution of 24 December, and called upon the Netherlands Government to set them free forthwith and report to the Council within 24 hours.

After the 396th meeting (29 December), further discussion was deferred until the Council reconvened at Lake Success.

On 7 January 1949, the Committee of Good Offices submitted a further report (S/1189), concluding that the resolution of 24 December had not been implemented. The Council continued its discussion of the Indonesian question at the 397th, 398th and 400th to 406th meetings (7 to 28 January). It approved the request of Belgium (S/1192) and the Union of Burma (S/1200) to participate in the discussion without vote.

At the 402nd meeting (21 January), the representatives of China, Cuba, Norway and the United States introduced a draft resolution (S/1219) which, in summary, called upon the Government of the Netherlands to ensure the immediate discontinuance of all military operations, to release all political prisoners arrested in the Republic since 17 December 1948, to facilitate the immediate return of officials of the Republican Government to Jogjakarta, and to afford them facilities for their effective functioning in the Jogjakarta area; called upon the Government of the Republic simultaneously to order its armed adherents to cease guerrilla warfare; called upon both parties to co-operate in the restoration of peace and the maintenance of law and order; reconstituted the Committee of Good Offices as the United Nations Commission for Indonesia to assist the parties in the implementation of this resolution, assigning to the Commission a number of additional functions, including that of recommending to the parties the extent to which areas controlled by the Republic under the Renville Agreement should be progressively returned to its administration, of supervising such transfers, of recommending which if any Netherlands forces should be retained temporarily in any area in order to assist in the maintenance of law and order, and of observing elections; recommended the resumption of negotiations toward the establishment of a federal, independent and sovereign United States of Indonesia, authorized the Commission to invite representatives of areas in Indonesia other than the Republic to participate, established a time schedule for those negotiations, and asked the Commission to report to the Council, if the schedule were not met.

At the 403rd meeting, the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (S/1219) introduced several amendments (S/1230) to their text. At the 405th meeting, the Canadian delegation introduced a clarifying amendment (S/1232) which was accepted by the sponsors.

At the 406th meeting the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics introduced an amendment (S/1233) to the joint draft resolution calling for immediate withdrawal of the Netherlands troops to the positions provided for by the Renville Truce Agreement. The amendment was rejected by a vote of 4 in favour (Cuba, Egypt, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) with 7 abstentions. The joint draft resolution as amended (S/1234) was voted on paragraph by paragraph, and was adopted. The representative of France abstained on all paragraphs, the representatives of Argentina, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics abstained on some paragraphs and all other representatives voted in favour of all paragraphs.

At the 411th meeting (17 February 1949) the Council agreed, in accordance with a recommendation received from the United Nations Commission for Indonesia (S/1258) to postpone the reporting date of the Commission, as stipulated in the Security Council resolution of 28 January 1949, from 15 February to 1 March 1949. On the latter date, the Commission's report (S/1270 and Addenda 1 to 3) was received. It was discussed at the 416th through 421st meetings (10 to 23 March). At the 417th meeting (11 March) the Council approved a request from the representative of Pakistan (S/1283) to participate in the discussion without vote.

At the 421st meeting (23 March), the Council approved by 8 votes with 3 abstentions (France, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) the text of a directive to the United Nations Commission for Indonesia submitted by the Canadian representative which reads as follows:

"It is the sense of the Security Council that UNCI, in accordance with the Council's resolution of 28 January 1949, and without prejudicing the rights, claims and positions of the parties, should assist the parties in reaching agreement as to (a) the implementation of the Council's resolution of 28 January, and in particular paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part thereof, and (b) the time and conditions for holding the proposed conference at The Hague, to the end that the negotiations contemplated by the resolution of 28 January may be held as soon as possible. It is

further the sense of the Council that, if such an agreement is reached, the holding of such a conference and the participation of UNCI in accordance with its terms of reference would be consistent with the purposes and objectives of the Council's resolution of 28 January 1949.

On 9 May the Commission reported (S/1320) that, on 7 May at the fifth meeting of the discussions pursuant to the Council's directive of 23 March, the Chairmen of the delegations of both parties had submitted formal statements, to which they had agreed in consultation, and that discussions were continuing. The Republican Chairman had stated that he was authorized to give the personal assurances of the President and Vice-President of the Republic that they favoured and would urge the Republican Government to adopt as a policy, as soon as possible after its restoration to Jogjakarta, (1) the issuance of an order to Republican armed adherents to cease guerrilla warfare; (2) co-operation in the restoration of peace and the maintenance of law and order; and (3) participation in a round-table conference at The Hague with a view to accelerate unconditional transfer of real and complete sovereignty to the United States of Indonesia.

The Netherlands Chairman had stated, inter alia, that in view of the undertaking announced by the Republican delegation, the Netherlands Government agreed to the return of the Republican Government to Jogjakarta and to facilitate the exercise of its functions in the residency of Jogjakarta; the Netherlands Government reaffirmed its willingness to ensure immediate discontinuance of all military operations and to release all political prisoners arrested in the Republic since 17 December 1948.

9. VOTING PROCEDURE IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL

At the 197th meeting (27 August 1947), the Council discussed General Assembly resolution 40 (I) concerning voting procedure in the Security Council (S/237). The Council decided to refer the resolution to the Committee of Experts with instructions to consider the matter and to make recommendations as to action the Council might take to comply with the recommendations.

By letter dated 2 December 1947 (S/620), the Secretary-General drew the Council's attention to General Assembly resolution 117 (II), concerning the voting procedure in the Security Council, which was considered at the 224th meeting (19 December 1947).

By letter dated 25 April 1949 (S/1312), the Secretary-General drew the attention of the Council to General Assembly resolution 267 (III), adopted on 14 April 1949, concerning the problem of voting in the

10. PROCEDURE IN APPLICATION OF ARTICLES 87 AND 88 OF THE CHARTER WITH
REGARD TO THE PACIFIC ISLANDS UNDER STRATEGIC TRUSTEESHIP OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

By letter dated 2 December 1947 (S/613), the representative of the United States of America informed the Security Council that Eniwetok Atoll, part of the Pacific Islands under strategic trusteeship of the United States, had been closed for security reasons in order that the United States Government might conduct experiments relating to nuclear fission there.

11. APPLICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

By telegram dated 22 September 1948 (S/1012), the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria renewed the Bulgarian Government's request for admission to membership and requested reconsideration of its application. This telegram was placed on the provisional agenda of the 360th meeting (28 September), but consideration was postponed for a few days at the request of the Bulgarian Government.

By letter dated 27 September (S/1017), the Hungarian Minister, on instructions from his Government, requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Assembly of the United Nations, with his support, the Hungarian Government's formal application for admission to the United Nations.

By telegrams dated 13 and 12 October 1948 respectively (S/1033 and S/1035), the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Albania and of the Mongolian People's Republic renewed the applications of their Governments for admission to the United Nations.

By telegram dated 12 October (S/1051), from the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Government of the People's Republic of Roumania renewed its application for membership.

At the 423rd meeting (8 April 1949), the Council considered the application of the Government of Nepal (S/1266 and Add.1), for membership in the United Nations and referred the matter, in accordance with rule 59 of the provisional rules of procedure, to the Committee on the Admission of New Members.

At the 427th to 430th meetings (16 June to 11 July 1949), the Security Council considered General Assembly resolution (197, III, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H) requesting the reconsideration by the Council of the applications of Portugal, Jordan, Italy, Finland, Ireland and Austria, and also the renewed applications of Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Mongolia and Roumania. At the 427th meeting, the representative of Argentina submitted draft resolutions (S/1331 to S/1337) recommending that Portugal, Jordan, Italy, Finland, Ireland, Austria and Ceylon be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

At the 428th meeting, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted a draft resolution recommending that Albania, the Mongolian People's Republic, Bulgaria, Roumania, Hungary, Finland, Italy, Portugal, Ireland, Jordan, Austria and Ceylon be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

Discussion continued at the 429th to 431st meetings (24 June to 20 July 1949). At the 431st meeting, voting did not take place on the draft resolutions submitted by Argentina and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (S/1331 to S/1337, and S/1340).

12. THE PALESTINE QUESTION

By letter dated 2 December 1947 (S/614), the Secretary-General requested that the President of the Security Council draw the Council's attention to General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, concerning the future government of Palestine, and particularly to paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of the operative part of that resolution.

At the 222nd meeting (9 December), the President stated that the Security Council had received the above-mentioned letter of the Secretary-General (S/614). It was decided to postpone discussion of the matter.

At the 243rd meeting (10 February 1948), the Security Council considered the first monthly progress report (S/633) of the United Nations Palestine Commission. The Council agreed that it should take note of that document and postpone further discussion until it had received the special report which was due shortly.

The Security Council at the 253rd to 255th and 258th meetings (24 to 27 February 1949) considered the first monthly progress report (S/663) of the United Nations Palestine Commission to the Security Council and the Commission's first special report (S/676) to the Council covering the problem of Security in Palestine. The representatives of Egypt and Lebanon, following their requests dated 7 December 1947 (S/617, S/618) were, in accordance with a previous decision of the Council, invited to participate in the discussion without vote. The Jewish Agency for Palestine, was, at its request, invited to the Council table for the purpose of supplying such information and rendering such assistance as the Council might require. At the suggestion of the President, the Council agreed to grant the same privilege to the Arab Higher Committee if it so requested.

Draft resolutions were introduced by the representatives of Colombia (S/684) and the United States (S/685). The representative of Belgium submitted an amendment (S/688) to the United States draft resolution. The representative of Colombia later withdrew his draft resolution.

At the 260th through 263rd meetings (2 to 5 March 1948), the Security Council continued consideration of the two aforementioned reports of the United Nations Palestine Commission. At the 262nd meeting, the President requested that the representatives of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics consult together in an effort to formulate a mutually acceptable version of the United States draft resolution (S/685). At the 263rd meeting, representatives of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics reported on the

results of their consultations, and the representative of the United States amended his draft resolution accordingly. The representative of Belgium announced that he would accept certain of the changes made in the United States amended draft resolution for incorporation in the Belgian amendment (S/688). Thereupon, the Belgian amendment as revised was put to the vote paragraph by paragraph but, failing to obtain the required number of affirmative votes, was not adopted. The amended United States draft resolution was also voted upon paragraph by paragraph. The preamble, the first part of paragraph 2, providing for consultation between the permanent members, and the final paragraph calling on all Governments to prevent disorders, were adopted. The accepted paragraphs of the amended United States draft resolution (S/691), put to the vote as a whole, were adopted by 8 votes, with 3 abstentions (Argentina, Syria, United Kingdom).

At the 267th meeting (16 March), the Council heard statements by the representatives of Lebanon and Syria.

At the 270th meeting (19 March), members of the Council who had participated in the consultations among the permanent members reported on the results of their discussion. Discussion was continued at the 272nd, 274th, 275th and 277th meetings (22 March to 1 April 1948). At the 277th meeting, a draft resolution (S/704) introduced by the representative of the United States, as amended by the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, calling for a truce in Palestine was adopted unanimously. Another draft resolution (S/705) introduced by the representative of the United States, requesting the Secretary-General to convoke a special session of the General Assembly regarding Palestine, was adopted by 9 votes, with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). The Secretary-General announced that the special session would be convoked on 16 April 1948.

The representative of Colombia introduced a draft resolution at the 282nd meeting (15 April) containing the terms of a truce in Palestine. This resolution as amended (S/723) was adopted at the 283rd meeting (17 April 1948) by 9 votes, with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

At the 287th meeting (23 April), a draft resolution (S/727) introduced by the representative of the United States and calling for the establishment of a Truce Commission to supervise the implementation of the resolution adopted by the Council on 17 April (S/723) was adopted by 8 votes, with 3 abstentions (Colombia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

/At the 289th

At the 289th meeting (7 May 1948), the President informed the Council that a cable (S/730) had been received from the Jewish Agency concerning the invasion of Palestine by foreign forces, and that information had been requested from the Palestine Truce Commission on this matter. (The Commission's reply and a statement from the Mandatory Powers are contained in document S/733).

At the 291st meeting (12 May), the President drew the attention of the Council to two cablegrams (S/741 and S/742) from the Truce Commission in Palestine concerning negotiations for a truce in Jerusalem. The Council approved the general outlines of the reply to be made by the President.

At the 292nd meeting (15 May), the President brought to the attention of the Council a letter and enclosed cablegram received from the Jewish Agency for Palestine (S/744) and also a cablegram from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt (S/743) concerning the armed intervention in Palestine of the Government of Egypt.

At the 293rd meeting (17 May), the representative of the United States introduced a draft resolution (S/749) describing the situation existing in Palestine as a threat to the peace and breach of the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter, and ordering a cease-fire within thirty-six hours after adoption of the resolution. The representative of the United States also submitted a list of questions, which he proposed should be addressed to all parties concerned, to obtain additional information. This questionnaire was studied at the 294th and 295th meetings (18 May), adopted as amended (S/753) and addressed to the parties concerned, with a request for a prompt reply.

At the 296th meeting (18 May), the representative of the United Kingdom introduced an amendment (S/755), to the United States proposal for a cease-fire order (S/749). Their proposal was studied at the 297th to 299th and 301st meetings (20 to 22 May), and the draft resolution as amended was adopted by 8 votes, with 3 abstentions (Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) at the 302nd meeting (22 May).

At the 303rd meeting (24 May), the President announced that the reply of the Provisional Government of Israel (S/779) accepting the terms of the Security Council resolution of 22 May had been received. It was agreed, at the request of the Arab States, because of communication difficulties which had been encountered by their Governments, to extend by forty-eight hours the time-limit imposed by that resolution. At the 305th meeting (26 May), the representative of Iraq, acting on behalf of all the Arab States, submitted a reply (S/792) to the Council resolution of 22 May.

At the 306th meeting (27 May), the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted a draft proposal, subsequently revised, which set forth that the Security Council, considering that its resolution of 22 May had not been carried out, in view of the refusal of the Arab States to comply with it, and considering that military operations in Palestine were increasing and that as a result the situation in Palestine constituted a threat to peace and security within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter, ordered the States involved in the Palestine conflict to secure the cessation of military operations within thirty-six hours after the adoption of the resolution (S/794/Rev.2). The representative of the United Kingdom also submitted a draft resolution (S/795/Rev.2) calling for a cessation of all acts of armed force for a period of four weeks, during which time the United Nations Mediator would contact the parties with a view to making recommendations to the Security Council for an eventual settlement in Palestine. At the 308th meeting (28 May) the representative of France introduced a draft resolution (S/798/Rev.2) calling for the cessation of hostilities in Jerusalem.

At the 310th meeting (29 May), the Council voted on two proposals before it. The revised proposal of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (S/794/Rev.2) was rejected. The draft resolution of the United Kingdom (S/795/Rev.2) as amended by the United States, France and Canada, was voted upon paragraph by paragraph, and adopted (S/801). The representative of France then announced that he would not insist that a vote be taken on his proposal (S/798/Rev.2).

At the 311th meeting (2 June 1948), the President drew the Council's attention to the replies of the parties to the resolution of 29 May. The President declared that their acceptance was to be considered as unconditional; and it was agreed that the time-limit for the actual cessation of hostilities should be fixed by the United Nations Mediator,

/that this

that this time-limit should be as short as possible, and that all parties concerned should comply with the Mediator's instructions in these matters.

At the 313th meeting (3 June), it was agreed that the Mediator should be given full authority to act within the terms of the resolution and interpret it in a way he deemed correct. Only if that interpretation were challenged should the matter be submitted to the Council.

At the two following meetings (314th and 317th, of 7 and 10 June), the Council discussed the question of the military observers. The truce in Palestine went into effect on 11 June.

At the 320th meeting (15 June), it was agreed that all communications from interested parties should be submitted to the Mediator and that he should exercise the discretion of reporting to the Security Council such complaints and their disposition as he deemed appropriate. It was understood that this procedure would not preclude the parties from addressing any communications directly to the Council. It was also agreed to request Member States to report on steps taken in the implementation of the resolution of 29 May.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted a draft resolution (S/841) providing for the appointment of military observers by States Members of the Security Council wishing to participate in the designation of such observers, excluding Syria, and limiting their number of such observers to fifty persons. This draft resolution was rejected by a vote of 2 in favour (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and 9 abstentions.

At the 331st meeting (7 July 1948), the Council voted on a draft resolution (S/867) submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom appealing to the parties to accept a prolongation of the truce. The resolution was adopted by 8 votes, with 3 abstentions (Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

It was agreed that the President should send a cablegram to the Arab States requesting immediate information on the actual situation in Palestine and in particular on their attitude towards the observance and prolongation of the truce.

At the 333rd meeting (13 July), the United Nations Mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte, presented an oral report to the Council supplementing his previously submitted written report (S/888) on the situation in Palestine.

At the 334th meeting (13 July), the representative of the United States submitted a draft resolution (S/890) describing the situation in Palestine as a threat to the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter, and ordering the Governments and authorities concerned, pursuant to Article 40 of the Charter, to desist from further military action and to issue cease-fire orders to this effect to their forces. The representative of Syria introduced a draft resolution (S/894) requesting the International Court of Justice to give an advisory legal opinion as to the international status of Palestine after the termination of the Mandate.

The United States draft resolution and the various amendments presented were discussed at the 335th to 337th meetings (14 and 15 July).

At the 338th meeting (15 July), the United States draft resolution as amended was adopted by 7 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions (Argentina, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

At the 339th meeting (27 July), the Council continued discussion on the Syrian draft resolution (S/894). The representative of Colombia submitted an amendment (S/921), which specified that the request should not delay or impair the normal course of mediation.

At the 340th meeting (27 July), the Syrian draft resolution as amended was voted upon and rejected by a vote of 6 in favour, 1 against (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) and 4 abstentions (Canada, France, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States). At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom submitted a draft resolution (S/923) designed to support the demand of the Palestine Truce Commission for the release of five employees of the Jerusalem Electric Corporation who had been abducted by the Irgun Zvai Leumi, and calling for their surrender to the Truce Commission in Jerusalem.

At the 343rd meeting (2 August 1948) the Council decided to request the Mediator and the Governments and authorities concerned to supply information regarding the following questions: (1) the question of Jewish displaced persons; (2) the question of Arab refugees in Palestine and neighbouring countries; (3) the question of relief and assistance to both Arab refugees and Jewish displaced persons; (4) the question of Jewish refugees detained on Cyprus.

At the 349th meeting (13 August), following the receipt of a cablegram (S/963) from the United Nations Mediator concerning the destruction of the pumping station at Latrun, the Council requested the Mediator to take all necessary steps to ensure the water supply for the population of Jerusalem.

/By cablegram

By cablegram dated 18 August (S/977), the Mediator informed the Security Council that further deterioration of the situation in Jerusalem might lead to a general resumption of hostilities, and he therefore requested that the Council take prompt action with a view to giving effect to its resolution of 15 July. At the 354th meeting (19 August), in response to this request, the representatives of Canada, France, the United Kingdom and the United States jointly submitted a draft resolution concerning truce violations which was voted on paragraph by paragraph and adopted (S/983).

In connexion with the Mediator's report regarding the demilitarization of Jerusalem (S/979), it was decided to cable him that the Council relied on him to make all efforts to achieve speedy results in the matter, to which the Security Council attached serious importance.

The Council also decided to transmit the record of its discussion on the question of Palestinian-Arab refugees and Jewish displaced persons to the Economic and Social Council and the International Refugee Organization.

By cablegram dated 17 September 1948 (S/1002), Dr. Ralph Bunche, personal representative of the Secretary-General, informed the Security Council of the assassination in Jerusalem of Count Folke Bernadotte, United Nations Mediator, and Colonel Sérot of the French Air Forces, a United Nations observer.

At the 358th meeting (18 September), the Council paid tribute to Count Bernadotte and Colonel Sérot and adopted a resolution (S/1006) requesting the Secretary-General to keep the flag of the United Nations at half-mast for a period of three days, authorizing the Secretary-General to meet all expenses connected with the death and burial of the United Nations Mediator, and resolving to be represented at the interment by the President of the Council or the person whom he might appoint for the occasion. The Council also approved two cablegrams (S/1003) which the Acting Secretary-General had sent on 17 September empowering Dr. Bunche to assume full authority for the Palestine Mission until further notice and requesting General Lundstrom, Chief of Staff of the Mediator to make the fullest investigation of the circumstances of the shooting.

At the 365th meeting (14 October 1948), the Council considered documents S/1018, S/1022, and S/1023 concerning the assassination of the Mediator and the supervision of the truce. A draft resolution (S/1032) was submitted by the representatives of China and the United Kingdom requesting the Provisional Government of Israel to submit, at an early date, an account of the progress made in the investigation of the assassinations. This resolution, as amended by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, was adopted at the 367th meeting.

At the 367th meeting (19 October) the Council adopted a resolution (S/1044) endorsing the conclusions of the Acting Mediator's report concerning the situation in the Negeb (S/1042), stating that the indispensable condition to the restoration of the situation was an immediate and effective cease-fire, and setting forth conditions which might be considered as the basis for further negotiations designed to ensure that similar outbreaks would not occur again and that the truce would be fully observed in the Negeb.

By letter dated 23 October (S/1049), the Acting Mediator informed the Council of the replies of the Egyptian Government and of the Provisional Government of Israel to the Security Council resolution of 19 October and to his subsequent communication fixing the time for the simultaneous cease-fire in the Negeb at 12 noon, 22 October 1948.

After discussion at the 373rd and 374th meetings (26 and 28 October), the delegations of China and the United Kingdom introduced a draft resolution (S/1059) endorsing the Mediator's order of 25 October calling for a withdrawal of military forces to the positions occupied on 14 October, and appointing a committee of the Council to examine urgently and to report on the measures which it would be appropriate to take under Article 41 of the Charter, if either party or both should refuse to comply with that order. At the 375th meeting (29 October), a number of amendments to this draft resolution were submitted (S/1059/Rev.1 and Rev.2, S/1061) and a sub-committee (Sub-Committee 16) was established (S/1062) to prepare a revised draft resolution in consultation with the Acting Mediator. Sub-Committee 16, submitted its report (S/1064) on 2 November 1948.

During the Council's discussion of the report at the 376th and 377th meetings (4 November) amendments to the draft resolution contained therein were submitted by the representative of the United States (S/1067); and the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic submitted a new draft resolution (S/1068). The United States amendments were adopted and the draft resolution as a whole (S/1070) was then adopted by 9 votes to 1 (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) with 1 abstention (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). The resolution called for a withdrawal of the forces which had advanced beyond the position held on 14 October and for establishment of a permanent truce line. A committee of seven members of the Council (the five permanent members with Belgium and Colombia) was appointed to give advice to the Acting Mediator, if required, and to report to the Council.

/The Ukrainian

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic draft resolution was rejected by a vote of 2 in favour (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), 1 against (Syria), and 3 abstentions.

Following upon the discussion of a question from the representative of Lebanon, the representative of the United Kingdom submitted a draft resolution (S/1069) providing for the extension of the scope of the truce resolution to the situation in northern Palestine. The Council adjourned without taking a decision on the United Kingdom proposal.

At the request of the Acting Mediator, the Security Council held its 378th and 379th meetings in private (9 and 10 November), after which the Council resumed public discussion at the 380th and 381st meetings (15 and 16 November) to consider the draft resolution (S/1069) submitted by the United Kingdom representative at the 377th meeting and the suggestions of the Acting Mediator submitted in the form of a draft resolution (S/1076), at the 378th meeting, together with the amendments (S/1077) submitted by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. A new joint draft resolution (S/1079) introduced by the Canadian representative, supported by the representatives of France and Belgium, called upon the parties to seek agreement forthwith by negotiations, conducted either directly or through the Acting Mediator with a view to the immediate establishment of an armistice.

During the discussion, the representative of the United Kingdom withdrew his draft resolution. The suggestions of the Acting Mediator, as amended and endorsed by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were rejected by a vote of 2 in favour (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), and 9 abstentions. An amendment submitted to the joint draft resolution by the representative of Syria, which would have applied the Council's resolution of 4 November (S/1070) to the Galilee area, was rejected by a vote of 3 in favour and 8 abstentions. The joint draft resolution (S/1030) was adopted paragraph by paragraph, by 8 votes, with the representatives of Syria, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics abstaining, except on the fourth and fifth paragraphs, which the representative of Syria voted against.

In letters dated 1 December 1948 (S/1095 and S/1096), the permanent representative of Egypt and the Chairman of the delegation of Lebanon requested that the question of the implementation of the Council's resolution of 4 November be placed on the agenda of the Council's 383rd meeting, to be held on 2 December. These letters were discussed at the meeting, but the proposal for the inclusion of this item was not adopted.

/At the 394th

At the 394th through 396th meetings (27 to 29 December 1948) the Council considered various communications (S/1126, S/1147, S/1151, S/1152 and S/1153) reporting alleged truce violations by the Israeli forces. The representative of the United Kingdom submitted a draft resolution (S/1163 and S/1167) and the representative of France submitted amendments thereto (S/1160).

At the 396th meeting, the Council voted on the United Kingdom draft resolution and the amendments thereto, paragraph by paragraph. The resolution as amended (S/1169) was adopted by 8 votes with 3 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States). The resolution called upon the parties in the southern Palestine hostilities to order an immediate cease-fire and to implement without further delay the resolution of 4 November and the instructions issued by the Acting Mediator in accordance with sub-paragraph (1) of the fifth paragraph of that resolution. The resolution also instructed the Committee appointed on 4 November to meet on 7 January 1949, to consider the situation in southern Palestine, and to report on compliance with the present resolution and with the resolutions of 4 and 16 November 1948.

By letter dated 6 January 1949 (S/1187), the Acting Mediator informed the President of the Security Council that the Government of Egypt and the Provisional Government of Israel had unconditionally accepted a proposal providing for a cease-fire, to be immediately followed by direct negotiations under United Nations chairmanship on the implementation of the resolutions of 4 and 16 November.

By cablegram dated 23 February 1949, the Acting Mediator informed the Council that an armistice agreement between Egypt and Israel was being signed on 24 February at Rhodes (S/1264 and S/1264/Add.1).

By cablegram dated 11 March 1949 (S/1284), the Acting Mediator informed the Security Council that Israel and Transjordan signed a General Cease-Fire Agreement on 11 March at Rhodes.

By cablegram dated 23 March 1949 (S/1296/Corr.1 and Add.1), the Acting Mediator informed the Security Council that a General Armistice Agreement was signed by Israel and Lebanon on that day.

By cablegram dated 3 April 1949 (S/1312), the Acting Mediator informed the Security Council that a General Armistice Agreement had been signed between the Hashemite Jordan Kingdom and Israel.

By letter dated 19 April 1949 (S/1310 and A/638), the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council the second progress report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission on Palestine.

/By letter

By letter dated 3 May 1949 (S/1315), the representative of Israel transmitted to the Security Council a report on the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte and Colonel André S  rot.

By letter dated 21 June 1949 (S/1341 and A/927), the Palestine Conciliation Commission submitted its third progress report.

By cablegram dated 20 July 1949 (S/1353), the United Nations Acting Mediator on Palestine informed the Security Council that a General Armistice Agreement had been signed by Syria and Israel on that day.

13. THE INDIA-PAKISTAN QUESTION

By letter dated 1 January 1948 (S/628), the representative of India, under Article 35 of the Charter, drew the attention of the Council to the situation in Jammu and Kashmir and requested the Security Council to ask the Government of Pakistan to stop giving any assistance to the invaders of Jammu and Kashmir.

The Security Council admitted this question to its agenda at the 226th meeting (6 January 1948). Representatives of the Governments of India and Pakistan were, in pursuance of Article 31 of the Charter, invited to participate in the discussion without vote. At the request of the representative of Pakistan, the Council postponed further consideration of the question until a meeting to be held not later than 15 January.

In a letter dated 15 January (S/646 and Corr.1), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan answered the application made to the Council by the representative of India.

At the 227th through 229th meetings (14 to 17 January), the Security Council heard statements by the representatives of the two parties concerned. At the 229th meeting, a draft resolution submitted by the representative of Belgium (S/651) and calling upon the parties to take all measures to improve the situation was adopted by 9 votes with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). The representative of the United Kingdom then proposed that the President of the Council meet with the representatives of the two Governments concerned so as to find some common ground for a settlement.

Consideration of this question continued at the 230th to 232nd, and 234th and 235th meetings (20 to 24 January). At the 230th meeting, the President reported to the Council on the conversation he had had with the two parties and introduced a draft resolution (S/654) which had the support of the parties. This resolution, establishing a Commission of three members to investigate and exercise any mediatory influence, was adopted by 9 votes with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

By letter dated 20 January (S/655), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan requested that the Security Council, at as early a date as possible, consider the situations, other than that of Kashmir and Jammu, mentioned in his previous letter (S/646 and Corr.1). The letter of 20 January was included in the provisional agenda of the 231st meeting. The Council, at that meeting, decided to refer to the question under consideration as "the India-Pakistan question".

The question was considered further at the 236th to 242nd meetings (28 January to 6 February 1948) and the 243rd to 246th meetings (10 to 12 February 1948). At the 246th meeting, the Council concurred with a request of the representative of India to postpone indefinitely the consideration of the situation in Jammu and Kashmir (S/628) in order to give the representative of India an opportunity to return to India for consultation with his Government.

At the 250th and 257th meetings (18 and 26 February), the Security Council considered aspects of the India-Pakistan question other than those relating to the situation in Jammu and Kashmir.

Discussion on the Jammu and Kashmir situation was taken up at the 264th, 265th and 269th meetings (5, 10 and 18 March 1948). The representative of China introduced a draft resolution (S/699) based on his consultations with the delegations of India and Pakistan. At the 284th to 286th meetings (17, 19 and 21 April 1948), the Council considered a revised draft resolution (S/726) submitted jointly by the representatives of Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia, the United Kingdom and the United States outlining the terms of a general settlement of the dispute. At the 286th meeting the draft resolution was voted on paragraph by paragraph, and adopted. This resolution increased to five the membership of the United Nations Commission established by the resolution of 20 January and recommended detailed measure
/concerning

concerning the restoration of peace and order, and the holding of a plebiscite. At the 287th meeting (23 April), the nomination of Belgium and Colombia to the Commission provided for in the resolution was approved by 7 votes, with 4 abstentions (Belgium, Colombia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Discussion continued at the 289th and 290th meetings (7 May 1948) and the President designated the United States of America to complete the membership of the Commission.

At the 312th meeting (3 June 1948), the representative of Syria introduced a draft resolution (S/818) which was adopted, as amended (S/819) by 8 votes, with 3 abstentions (China, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). The resolution directed the Commission of Mediation to proceed without delay to the areas of dispute, and to study and report to the Council, when it considered appropriate, on the matters raised in the letter dated 15 January 1948 (S/646 and Corr.1) from the Foreign Minister for Pakistan, in the order outlined in paragraph D of the resolution of 20 January.

At the 315th meeting (8 June), it was agreed that the President would prepare a reply to the communication (S/825) from the Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs of the Government of India.

A resolution for a cease-fire order and truce agreement was adopted on 13 August by the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan. Its correspondence with the two Governments in connexion with this resolution was distributed (S/995) at the Commission's request.

At the 382nd meeting (25 November 1948), the Council discussed an interim report from the Commission for India and Pakistan (S/1100) and a letter dated 22 November (S/1087) from the Chairman of the Commission concerning the situation in Kashmir. At the close of the discussion, the President stated that it was the sense of the Council that the Commission's task of bringing about a peaceful settlement of the dispute should receive the confirmed support of the Council; furthermore, the Council should endorse the recent appeal made by the Commission to the Governments of India and Pakistan to refrain from any action which might aggravate the military and political situation and thus endanger the negotiations being directed towards preparation of a peaceful settlement.

At the 399th meeting (13 January 1949), the Council received and took note of the second interim report of the Commission for India and Pakistan (S. 196) stating that the parties had accepted its resolution and that a cease-fire order had been put into effect on 1 January 1949. It was agreed that the Commission should return at its earliest convenience to the Indian sub-continent to ensure the implementation of the accepted resolutions.

14. THE CZECHOSLOVAK QUESTION

By letter dated 12 March 1948 (S/694), the permanent representative of Chile to the United Nations requested that, in accordance with Article 34 of the Charter, the Security Council "investigate the events reported by the permanent representative of Czechoslovakia, Dr. Jan Papanek, which constitute a threat to international peace and security".

At the 268th meeting (17 March), this item was admitted to the agenda and the representative of Chile was invited to participate in the discussion, in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter. The representative of Chile requested that, in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, the Council should invite Dr. Jan Papanek to supply it with information.

At the 272nd meeting (22 March), at the request of the representative of Argentina, and in accordance with rule 38 of the provisional rules of procedure, the proposal of the representative of Chile to invite Dr. Papanek to supply the Security Council with information, in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, was adopted by 9 votes to 2.

Discussion continued at the 273rd, 276th and 278th meetings (23 and 31 March and 6 April 1948). The draft resolution (S/711) introduced by the representative of the United States, inviting the Government of Czechoslovakia to participate in the discussion of this question, was adopted by 9 votes, with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). In response to the invitation, the Government of Czechoslovakia stated that it did not find it possible to take part in the discussion (S/718).

At the 281st meeting (12 April), the representative of Chile submitted a draft resolution proposing that a sub-committee of the Council be appointed to hear statements and testimony relative to this question, and to submit a report thereon to the Security Council as soon as possible.

/Discussion

Discussion continued at the 288th meeting (29 April) and further consideration was postponed until Thursday, 6 May 1948.

At the 300th meeting (21 May), the proposal to invite Dr. Papanek to supply the Council with additional information was adopted by 8 votes to 2 (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republic with 1 abstention (Argentina).

At the 303rd meeting (24 May), the Council voted on the question of whether the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Chile was to be regarded as a matter of procedure. The result of the vote was 8 to 2, with 1 abstention. The President interpreted this decision as a vote to regard the draft resolution as a matter of substance, since a permanent member (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) had voted against the proposal. Several representatives opposed this ruling and the President then submitted it to the vote. Six votes were cast to nullify the ruling, two votes to uphold it and three members abstained. The President announced that his ruling stood. The Chilean draft resolution, as completed by the representative of Argentina, was then put to the vote and received 9 votes in favour and 2 against (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). Since a permanent member voted in the negative, the draft was rejected.

At the 305th meeting (26 May), the representative of Argentina submitted a draft resolution (S/782) proposing that the Committee of Experts be entrusted with the task of obtaining further evidence regarding the situation and report back to the Council at the earliest opportunity.

15. THE QUESTION OF THE FREE TERRITORY OF TRIESTE

By letter dated 29 July 1948 (S/927), the representative of Yugoslavia requested the Security Council to consider the question of the independence and integrity of the Free Territory of Trieste, and in particular to examine the legality of certain agreements concluded by the administration of the British-United States zone of the Free Territory with the Government of Italy. He further requested the Council to declare the above-mentioned agreements to be violations of provisions of the Treaty of Peace with Italy pertaining to the Free Territory of Trieste, to undertake the measures which the Yugoslav Government considered necessary and sufficient to nullify the agreements, and to assure that the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom respected their international obligations, thus guaranteeing the independence of the Free Territory of Trieste.

At the 344th meeting (4 August 1948), the Council, after having admitted this question to the agenda, invited the representative of Yugoslavia to participate in the discussion, and began its consideration of the matter.

Discussion continued at the 345th, 346th and 348th meetings (10 and 13 August). At the 348th meeting, the representative of Yugoslavia submitted a draft resolution (S/968) by which the Council would determine that a series of agreements concluded between the Allied Military Command and the Government of Italy were in contradiction to certain obligations undertaken by the Allied and Associated Powers and Italy under the Treaty of Peace with Italy, would declare these agreements incompatible with the status of the Free Territory of Trieste and therefore null and void, and would call upon the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States to avoid any future action contrary to the Treaty.

Discussion continued at the 350th, 353rd and 354th meetings (16 and 19 August). At the 353rd meeting, the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic submitted a draft resolution (S/980) to the effect that the Security Council considered it urgently necessary to settle the question of the appointment of the Governor of the Free Territory of Trieste. At the 354th meeting, the Council voted on the proposals before it. The Yugoslav draft resolution (S/968) was rejected by a vote of 2 in favour (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and 9 abstentions. The Ukrainian draft resolution (S/980) was also rejected, by a vote of 4 in favour (China, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and 6 abstentions with the United Kingdom delegation not participating in the voting.

By memorandum dated 24 October 1948 (S/1054), the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia drew the Security Council's attention to fresh violations of the provisions of the Peace Treaty with Italy committed by the Allied Military Administration of the British-United States zone of the Free Territory of Trieste.

A letter dated 1 November 1948 (S/1066) from the permanent representative of Yugoslavia to the United Nations transmitted the annual report of the Yugoslav Military Government on the administration of the Yugoslav zone of the Free Territory of Trieste.

16. THE HYDERABAD QUESTION

By a cable (S/986) dated 21 August 1948, confirmed by a letter of the same date, the Secretary-General of the Department of External Affairs of the Government of Hyderabad communicated to the President of the Security Council his Government's request that the dispute which had arisen between Hyderabad and India, be brought to the Council's attention, in accordance with Article 35, paragraph 2, of the Charter. On 8 September 1948, he communicated a request (S/996) by the Government of Hyderabad that it should become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

By cable (S/998) dated 12 September, the Government of Hyderabad requested that its complaint be put on the agenda as soon as possible, in view of Indian preparations for an imminent invasion of Hyderabad. Another cable (S/1000) of 13 September stated that the invasion was taking place and hostilities had broken out in various parts of Hyderabad.

On 15 September, the Government of Hyderabad submitted a memorandum (S/1001) in support of its application to the Council.

The communications of 21 August and 12 and 13 September (S/986, S/998 and S/1000) were placed on the provisional agenda of the 357th meeting (16 September). At that meeting, the Council decided by 8 votes in favour, with 3 abstentions, to include the question in its agenda. Several representatives made the reservation that this action did not prejudice the Council's competence or any of the merits of the case. The representatives of Hyderabad and India then made statements.

The discussion was continued at the 359th meeting (20 September).

By communications dated 22 September (S/1011), the Nizam of Hyderabad requested the Secretary-General to note that the complaint made by his Government to the Security Council had been withdrawn by him and that the delegation to the Security Council had ceased to have any authority to represent him or his State.

By note dated 24 September (S/1015), the Hyderabad delegation gave its views on the situation in Hyderabad and stated that it was imperative that the Security Council review the situation.

The Council considered these communications at the 360th meeting (28 September) and heard statements by the representatives of Hyderabad and India.

By letter dated 6 October 1948 (S/1027), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan requested that Pakistan be permitted to participate in the discussion of the Hyderabad question.

/By letter

By letter dated 11 October (S/1031), the Head of the Hyderabad delegation informed the President of the Council that he did not propose to ask that the delegation be represented at the next Council meeting on the question.

By letter dated 20 November 1948 (S/1084), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan requested the Council to deal with the question at an early date.

On 24 November, the leader of the Indian delegation informed the President of the Council that the Indian delegation dealing with the Hyderabad question had been withdrawn (S/1089). At its 382nd and 383rd meetings (25 November and 2 December), the Council discussed certain procedural questions.

By letter dated 6 December (S/1109), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan requested that a meeting of the Council be called as soon as possible to enable it to deal with this question before its adjournment.

By letter dated 10 December (S/1115), the Government of India informed the Security Council that conditions in Hyderabad were peaceful and normal. In the circumstances, India did not propose to send a representative to the Council to discuss the Hyderabad question.

In a letter dated 12 December (S/1118), the Head of the Hyderabad delegation stated that it was clear that the Nizam was virtually a prisoner of the Indian military authorities. Under the circumstances, his delegation considered it to be its duty to reassert its authority as originally appointed.

In a letter (S/1124) dated 13 December, the representative of India transmitted to the President of the Council a factual report on the situation in Hyderabad. The report was made without prejudice to the question of the Council's competence.

At the 384th meeting (15 December), the representative of Pakistan was invited to participate in the discussion of this question. Further consideration was postponed until after the Council's return to Lake Success.

By letter (S/1317) dated 4 May 1949, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan requested an early meeting to consider the situation.

The representative of India, in a letter (S/1324) dated 18 May 1949, submitted that the question should be removed from the agenda.

The Council heard statements by the representatives of India and Pakistan at the 425th and 426th meetings (19 and 24 May).

17. IDENTIC NOTIFICATIONS DATED 29 SEPTEMBER 1948 FROM THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC, THE UNITED KINGDOM AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

On 29 September 1948, the Secretary-General received identic notifications (S/1020) from the Governments of the French Republic, the United Kingdom and the United States of America drawing attention to the serious situation which had arisen as a result of the unilateral imposition by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of restrictions on transport and communications between the Western Zones of Occupation in Germany and Berlin. The notifications stated that this action by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was contrary to its obligations under Article 2 of the Charter and created a threat to the peace within the meaning of Chapter VII of the Charter. The three Governments requested that the Security Council consider this question at the earliest opportunity.

The identic notifications were placed on the provisional agenda of the 361st meeting (4 October 1948) but the adoption of the agenda was opposed by the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. After further discussion at the 362nd meeting (5 October), the agenda was adopted by 9 votes to 2, whereupon the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic stated that the Council majority's adoption of this question for consideration constituted a violation of Article 107 of the Charter and that accordingly their delegations would not participate in the consideration of this question in the Security Council.

Discussion began at the 363rd meeting (6 October) and continued at the 364th meeting on the same date.

The Council further considered these notifications at the 366th meeting (15 October). The President requested certain additional information and the Council adjourned until 19 October to allow an opportunity for the representatives concerned to prepare the information.

At the 368th meeting (19 October), the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States furnished the information requested by the President.

At the 370th meeting (22 October), a draft resolution (S/1048) was submitted by the representatives of Argentina, Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia and Syria, and the Council adjourned the discussion until 25 October.

/At the

At the 372nd meeting (25 October) this joint draft resolution was put to the vote. It received 9 votes in favour and 2 against (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) but was rejected since one of the negative votes was cast by a permanent member of the Council.

By letter dated 4 May 1949 (S/1316), the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States informed the Security Council that their respective Governments had concluded an agreement with the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics providing for the lifting of restrictions on communications, transportation and trade with Berlin.

18. APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN TO BECOME A PARTY TO THE STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

By letter dated 24 March 1949 (S/1298 and Corr.1), the Principality of Liechtenstein made application to become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. At the 423rd meeting (3 April 1949), the Council considered this matter and decided by a vote of 9 in favour with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) to refer the matter to the Security Council Committee of Experts.

