

that the representative of the first member of the Security Council, in the English alphabetical order of the names of the members of the Council, should act as temporary Chairman.

The Security Council held its first meeting on January 17, 1946, at Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, London. After the 23rd meeting on February 16, the Council adjourned for transfer to New York. The meetings of the Council were held at Hunter College, New York, from March 25 to the early part of August 1946, and at Lake Success, New York, beginning on August 28, 1946.

Article 30 of the Charter authorizes the Security Council to adopt its own rules of procedure. At its first meeting on January 17, the Council set up a Committee of Experts to examine and report on the Provisional Rules of Procedure recommended by the Preparatory Commission.

Article 4 of the Charter authorizes the Security Council to recommend to the General Assembly new Members of the United Nations. At its 42nd meeting the Council set up a Committee on the Admission of New Members. Up to June 30, 1947, the Council had received eleven applications for membership, which were referred to the Committee on the Admission of New Members for examination. The Council recommended four of the applicants

to the General Assembly for membership in the United Nations.

At its second meeting on January 25, the Council adopted a directive to the Military Staff Committee, which first assembled in London on February 3, 1946. The Committee was transferred to New York in March 1946.

The Atomic Energy Commission, which was established by a resolution of the General Assembly at its seventeenth meeting on January 24, 1946, and was to receive directions from the Security Council in matters affecting security and submit its reports and recommendations to the Security Council, held its first meeting on June 14, 1946, at Hunter College, New York.

The Commission for Conventional Armaments, composed of representatives of all members of the Security Council, was established by the Security Council on February 13, 1947, to make proposals for the general regulation and reduction of armaments and armed forces, and proposals for practical and effective safeguards in this connection. The Commission may propose studies to be undertaken by the Military Staff Committee and other organs of the United Nations, but it may not deal with matters that are being dealt with by the Atomic Energy Commission. The Commission for Conventional Armaments held its first meeting at Lake Success on March 24, 1947.

C. POLITICAL AND SECURITY QUESTIONS

In fulfilling its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council from January 1946 to June 1947 considered the following major political and security questions:¹

- The Iranian Question
- The Greek Question (Soviet Complaint)
- The Indonesian Question
- The Syrian and Lebanese Question
- The Spanish Question
- The Greek Question (Ukrainian Complaint)
- The Greek Question (Greek Complaint)
- The General Regulation and Reduction of Armaments and Information on Armed Forces of the United Nations
- Free Territory of Trieste
- Incidents in the Corfu Channel
- Trusteeship of former Japanese Mandated Islands
- Special Agreements under Article 43 of the Charter and Organization of the United Nations Armed Forces

1. THE IRANIAN QUESTION

a. Consideration of the Iranian Communication dated January 19, 1946

By a letter dated January 19, 1946, addressed to the Acting Secretary General, the head of the Iranian delegation to the United Nations stated:

(1) that owing to interferences of the U.S.S.R., through the medium of its officials and armed forces, in the internal affairs of Iran a situation had arisen which might lead to international friction, and

(2) that in accordance with Article 33 of

¹For fuller accounts of these questions, see the Report of the Security Council to the General Assembly (Document S/172); for complete accounts, see the Journal of the Security Council, Nos. 1-42; Security Council Official Records, Nos. 1-22; and Verbatim Records of the Security Council (Documents S/P.V. 81-149).

the Charter the Iranian Government had repeatedly tried to negotiate with the Government of the U.S.S.R., but had met with no success. He therefore requested the Acting Secretary-General, in accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Charter, to bring the matter to the attention of the Council so that the Council might investigate the situation and recommend appropriate terms of settlement.

At the second meeting of the Security Council, on January 25, it was agreed without objection to include the Iranian application in the Council's agenda.

The representative of Egypt considered that the right of a complainant to participate in the Council's discussions followed from Article 31. He moved that the three States which had at that time presented complaints should be invited to participate in the discussions of the Security Council concerning these complaints. This resolution was adopted unanimously.

The position of the representative of Iran was expressed in a letter dated January 26, 1946, addressed to the President of the Council, in speeches at the third and fifth meetings and in a memorandum submitted at the third meeting.

The representative of Iran contended that the U.S.S.R. authorities had interfered in the internal affairs of Iran in breach of international law, the Tripartite Treaty of Alliance between the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom and Iran, dated January 29, 1942, and the Three-Power Declaration of December 1943 by the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom and the United States, and in violation of the principles set out in the Preamble of the Charter. Article IV (1) of the Tripartite Treaty provided that:

The Allied Powers may maintain in Iranian territory land, sea and air forces in such number as they consider necessary. . . .

It is understood that the presence of these forces on Iranian territory does not constitute a military occupation and will disturb as little as possible the administration and the security forces of Iran, the economic life of the country, the normal movements of the population and the application of Iranian laws and regulations.

Nevertheless, the Iranian Government had been prevented from exercising any power whatsoever in Azerbaijan; the security forces of Iran had been prevented from exercising their proper function of suppressing disorders; the Soviet authorities had disrupted

the economic life of the country by setting up, at the frontier of the so-called Soviet zone, internal barriers which merchandise and civilians were allowed to pass only at the discretion of the Soviet authorities; no armed forces of the Iranian Government were allowed to proceed beyond these limits. The Soviet authorities had prevented the Iranian authorities from applying Iranian laws in these areas, and had encouraged and supported disloyal agitators who were launching the so-called movement for autonomy in Azerbaijan. On November 18, 1945, the Iranian Government dispatched infantry and gendarmes as reinforcements to Azerbaijan. On November 19, 1945, Soviet army authorities had prevented this contingent from proceeding further than Sharif Abad.

By two notes dated November 22 and 23, 1945, the Iranian Government requested that the Soviet authorities be immediately instructed to give the Iranian contingents free passage. On November 26, 1945, the Soviet Government's reply stated that arrival of additional Iranian armed forces at that time would cause disturbances and bloodshed. The Soviet note denied allegations of interference made by the Iranian Government. As interpreted by the Iranian representative, it stated that similar interferences would not take place. On December 1, 1945, the Iranian Government addressed a reply to the Government of the U.S.S.R. expressing satisfaction at this and other assurances. As interpreted by the Iranian representative, this note did not agree that there had been no Soviet interferences; it did not conclude negotiations, but maintained the request that Iranian forces should be given free passage. On December 15, 1945, the Iranian Government, in notes addressed to the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom and the United States Ambassadors, asked that foreign military forces should not interfere with the free movement of Iranian security forces. In December 1945 the Iranian Prime Minister offered to visit Moscow to arrive at a settlement.

In conclusion the Iranian representative submitted that his Government had sought a solution by negotiation, in accordance with Article 33, but the Government of the U.S.S.R. had either failed to reply or had refused to admit that the Iranian Government's complaints were well founded. Accordingly, the matter had properly been brought to the

Council's attention under Article 35. If the Council so recommended, the Iranian Government was willing to enter into direct negotiations. However, the matter must remain on the agenda, progress reports should be made and results reported within a reasonable time.

The position of the U.S.S.R. was set forth in a letter dated January 24, 1946, addressed to the President of the Council, and in speeches at the second, third and fifth meetings on January 25, 28 and 30, 1946.

The representative of the U.S.S.R. denied interference in the internal affairs of Iran and stated that events in the province of Azerbaijan resulted from popular aspirations for national autonomy within the limits of the Iranian State. These events had nothing to do with the presence of the Soviet forces. He contended that successful negotiations had taken place between the U.S.S.R. and Iranian Governments. According to the Iranian note of December 1, 1945, the Iranian Government was satisfied with the results of the negotiations of November 1945. Negotiations had not been continued after December 1, 1945, because the Iranian Government did not desire them. The Iranian notes of December 13 and 15, 1945, did not deal with the earlier claims, but raised entirely new questions.

In conclusion the representative of the U.S.S.R. argued that there was no foundation for consideration by the Council of the substance of the Iranian communication. The Charter required Members to attempt to settle disputes by negotiations, etc., and it was stated that the Council might call upon parties to settle disputes by the means indicated in Article 33. It was apparent that the Council could not call on the U.S.S.R. to take any steps provided for in Article 33. Article 34 related to a dispute or situation of quite a different order. Article 36 was inapplicable, since the U.S.S.R. considered bilateral negotiations the only acceptable means of settling such questions between neighboring countries. Article 37 applied only where the parties had been unable to come to an agreement. The U.S.S.R. was willing to resume direct negotiations with the Iranian Government.

After hearing views expressed by the representatives of Australia, China, France, the Netherlands, Poland, the United Kingdom and the United States, the Council on January 30 adopted unanimously a resolution introduced

by the representative of the United Kingdom and amended by the representative of the U.S.S.R. The resolution, in its final form, read:

THE COUNCIL,

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

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

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

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

b. Iranian Communication dated March 18, 1946

By a letter dated March 18, 1946, addressed to the President of the Council, the Iranian Ambassador to the United States stated that, pursuant to Article 35 (1), Iran brought to the attention of the Council a dispute between Iran and the U.S.S.R., the continuance of which was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. This dispute had arisen by reason of new developments since the adoption by the Council of the resolution of January 30, 1946. The U.S.S.R. was maintaining troops in Iranian territory after March 2, 1946, contrary to the provisions of Article V of the Tripartite Treaty of Alliance of January 29, 1942. Furthermore, the U.S.S.R. was continuing to interfere in the internal affairs of Iran through the medium of its agents, officials and armed forces. These acts were in violation of the Tripartite Treaty, the Three-Power Declaration and the Charter.

c. Proposal by the Representative of the U.S.S.R. that the Iranian Communication should not be placed on the Council's Agenda

At the 25th meeting of the Security Council on March 26, 1943, the representative of the U.S.S.R. stated that, pursuant to the Council's resolution of January 30, negotiations between the U.S.S.R. and Iranian Governments had resulted in an understanding regarding the evacuation of Soviet troops still in Iran. It was already known that the evacuation of these troops had begun on March 2, 1946. As regards the evacuation of troops still remaining in

certain zones of Iran, in accordance with an understanding reached between the U.S.S.R. and Iranian Governments, the evacuation had begun on March 24, 1946, and would probably end within five or six weeks from that date, unless unforeseen circumstances arose.

The effect of Articles 34 and 35 was that any Member of the United Nations might bring to the Council's attention any dispute or situation which was considered to threaten the maintenance of international peace and security. It could not be suggested that the situation in Iran could be regarded as a threat of that nature. Therefore, the conditions necessary for the inclusion of the Iranian question in the agenda had not been satisfied.

Several representatives expressed the view that the Iranian representative should be heard before the Council decided the matter.

At the 26th meeting of the Security Council on March 26, 1946, the above mentioned proposal by the representative of the U.S.S.R. was rejected by 9 votes to 2 and the Iranian question placed on the Council's agenda.

- d. Proposal by the Representative of the U.S.S.R. to postpone until April 10, 1946, consideration of the Iranian Communication dated March 18, 1946

By a letter dated March 19, 1946, addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of the U.S.S.R. had requested that the Security Council postpone consideration of the Iranian communication of March 18, 1946, to April 10, 1946. He stated that the Iranian communication was not expected by the Soviet Government, since its negotiations with the Iranian Government were being conducted at that time. For this reason the Soviet Government was not then prepared to take part in the discussion of the Iranian communication; and some time was required to enable the Soviet Government to make the necessary preparations concerning this question.

By a letter dated March 20, 1946, addressed to the Secretary-General, the Iranian Ambassador to the United States stated that it was his Government's earnest hope that consideration of its communication would not be delayed. He pointed out that negotiations under the resolution of January 30, 1946, had failed. Meanwhile, March 2, 1946, the date fixed by the Tripartite Treaty, had passed, and the Soviet troops had not been withdrawn. The situation was very grave, and further delay

would inevitably result in increased harm to the interests of Iran.

At the 27th meeting, the proposal of the representative of the U.S.S.R. to postpone consideration of the Iranian communication until April 10, 1946, received two votes and was declared lost. The representative of the U.S.S.R. stated that he was unable to participate further in the Council's discussion of the Iranian question, since his proposal had not been accepted. He then left the Council Chamber. The representative of the U.S.S.R. did not attend the next three meetings (the 28th, 29th and 30th) at which the Council discussed the Iranian question. He resumed participation in the Council's discussions of the Iranian question at the 32nd meeting on April 15, 1946.

The following proposal of the representative of Egypt was adopted by 8 votes at the 27th meeting of the Security Council:

That the Council receive the complaint of the Iranian Government embodied in its letter dated March 18th addressed to the Secretary-General and ask the Iranian representative to appear before the Council to hear his point of view concerning the question of postponement requested by the Soviet representative, and subsequently that the Council take such action as it deems fit.

Pursuant to the above resolution, the Iranian Ambassador was invited to participate in the discussion. He reported that, pursuant to the resolution of January 30, 1946, the Iranian Government had sent a delegation to Moscow, headed by the Prime Minister. The delegation had requested the Soviet Government to refrain from interference in the internal affairs of Iran and to ensure the prompt evacuation of Soviet troops. The Soviet officials did not agree to these requests and proposed: (1) the stationing of Soviet troops in Iran for an indefinite period; (2) the recognition of the internal autonomy of Azerbaijan; and (3) the setting up of a Soviet-Iranian joint stock oil company.

The Iranian Prime Minister rejected these demands and the U.S.S.R. officially withdrew its proposals.

In conclusion the Iranian Ambassador informed the Council that, to his knowledge, no positive results had been achieved in negotiations under the resolution of January 30, 1946. He stated that he had no instructions to agree to postponement.

e. Request by the Secretary-General for Information Concerning Soviet-Iranian Negotiations and Replies

At the 28th meeting of the Security Council on March 29, 1946 the representatives present unanimously endorsed the suggestion of the representative of the United States that the President of the Council request the Secretary-General to ascertain at once from the U.S.S.R. and Iranian Governments, through their representatives, and report to the Council at its meeting on Wednesday, April 3, the existing status of the negotiations between the two Governments, and particularly whether or not the reported withdrawal of Soviet troops was conditioned upon the conclusion of agreements between the two Governments on other subjects.

In accordance with the President's instructions, the Secretary-General requested from the Iranian Ambassador and the representative of the U.S.S.R. the above information.

By a letter dated April 3, 1946, addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of the U.S.S.R. stated on behalf of his Government that negotiations had already led to an understanding concerning the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Iran; the withdrawal was renewed on March 24, 1946, and would be completed within a period of one and a half months. Thus the question concerning the evacuation of Soviet troops raised before the Council by the Iranian Government on March 18 was solved by the understanding reached between the U.S.S.R. and Iranian Governments. As to the other questions, they were not connected with the question of the withdrawal of Soviet troops. As was known, the question concerning an oil concession or a joint stock company was raised in 1944, independently of the question of the evacuation of Soviet troops.

By a letter dated April 2, 1946, addressed to the Secretary-General, the Iranian Ambassador stated that, with regard to Soviet interference in the internal affairs of Iran, negotiations pursuant to the resolution of January 30, 1946, had achieved no positive results. Interference had continued, and the Iranian Government was still prevented from exercising any authority in the province of Azerbaijan. Regarding the withdrawal of Soviet troops, there had been and could be no negotiations.

As to the question whether withdrawal was conditional upon the conclusion of other agreements, the Iranian Ambassador gave a detailed account of conversations in Teheran since the arrival of the new Soviet Ambassador. These conversations referred, inter alia, to the formation of a joint Soviet-Iranian oil corporation, and to the formation of an autonomous government in Azerbaijan. After these subjects had been discussed, the Soviet Ambassador confirmed the promise to evacuate Iran, but on the condition that no unforeseen circumstances should occur.

In conclusion the Iranian Ambassador stated that, according to the latest information from his Government, despatched on April 1, 1946, no understanding had been reached. The Iranian Prime Minister stated that he could not accept any conditions attached to the complete withdrawal of Soviet forces.

The Soviet and Iranian replies were read at the 29th meeting on April 3, 1946, and in answer to a question the Iranian Ambassador stated that if the representative of the U.S.S.R. withdrew the condition concerning unforeseen circumstances, Iran would not at that time press the matter, provided that the communication remained on the Council's agenda.

f. Resolution of April 4, 1946

After discussion, the following resolution proposed by the representative of the United States was adopted by 9 votes at the 30th meeting held on April 4, (the representative of the U.S.S.R. did not attend this meeting):

Taking note of the statements by the Iranian representative that the Iranian appeal to the Council arises from the presence of Soviet troops in Iran and their continued presence there beyond the date stipulated for their withdrawal in the Tripartite Treaty of 29 January 1942;

taking note of the replies dated 3 April of the Soviet Government and the Iranian Government pursuant to the request of the Secretary-General for information as to the state of the negotiations between the two Governments and as to whether the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Iran is conditional upon agreement on other subjects;

and in particular taking note of and relying upon the assurances of the Soviet Government that the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Iran has already commenced;

that it is the intention of the Soviet Government to proceed with the withdrawal of its troops as rapidly as possible;

that the Soviet Government expects the withdrawal of all Soviet troops from the whole of Iran to be completed within five or six weeks;

and that the proposals under negotiation between the Iranian Government and the Soviet Government "are not connected with the withdrawal of Soviet troops";

being solicitous to avoid any possibility of the presence of Soviet troops in Iran being used to influence the course of the negotiations between the Governments of Iran and the Soviet Union; and recognizing that the withdrawal of all Soviet troops from the whole of Iran cannot be completed in a substantially shorter period of time than that within which the Soviet Government has declared it to be its intention to complete such withdrawal;

RESOLVED that the Council defer further proceedings on the Iranian appeal until 6 May, at which time the Soviet Government and the Iranian Government are requested to report to the Council whether the withdrawal of all Soviet troops from the whole of Iran has been completed and at which time the Council shall consider what, if any, further proceedings on the Iranian appeal are required;

PROVIDED, however, that if in the meantime either the Soviet Government or the Iranian Government or any member of the Security Council reports to the Secretary-General any developments which may retard or threaten to retard the prompt withdrawal of Soviet troops from Iran, in accordance with the assurances of the Soviet Union to the Council, the Secretary-General shall immediately call to the attention of the Council such reports, which shall be considered as the first item on the agenda.

The representative of Australia abstained from voting. He pointed out that the resolution did not deal with the first Iranian communication concerning interference by Soviet troops and agents in the internal affairs of Iran.

- g. Proposal by the Representative of the U.S.S.R. that the Iranian Question be removed from the Council's Agenda

By a letter dated April 6, 1946, addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of the U.S.S.R. proposed that the Iranian question be removed from the agenda of the Council. He pointed out that, as was known from the joint U.S.S.R.-Iranian communique published on April 4, 1946, an understanding on all points had been reached between the Soviet and the Iranian Governments. The Council had no reason further to consider the Iranian question on May 6 and the resolution adopted on April 4 was incorrect and illegal, being in conflict with the Charter.

By a letter dated April 9, 1946, addressed to the Secretary-General, the Iranian Ambassador stated that it was his Government's desire that the question remain on the Council's agenda, as provided by the resolution adopted on April 4. By a letter dated April 15, 1946, addressed to the President of the Council, the Iranian Ambassador stated that on April 14 his Government had instructed him to make the following statement before the Council:

As a result of the signature of the agreement between the Iranian Government and the Government of the Soviet Union, it has been agreed that the Red Army evacuate all Persian Territory by the 6th May 1946. The Iranian Government has no doubt that this agreement will be carried out, but at the same time has not the right to fix the course the Security Council should take.

On April 15, 1946, he had received a further telegram from his Government, reading as follows:

In view of the fact that the Soviet Ambassador has again today 14 April, categorically reiterated that the unconditional evacuation of Iranian territory by the Red Army will be completed by 6th May 1946 it is necessary that you immediately inform the Security Council that the Iranian Government has complete confidence in the word and pledge of the Soviet Government and for this reason withdraws its complaint from the Security Council.

At the 33rd meeting, held on April 18, 1946, the Secretary-General submitted a letter to the President of the Council, setting out his views with respect to the legal aspects of the retention of the Iranian question on the agenda. He recalled that the powers conferred on the Council under Chapter VI of the Charter were defined in Articles 33, 34, 36, 37 and 38. He noted that the Council could be seized of a dispute or situation in one of three ways:

- (1) under Article 35, by a State;
- (2) under Article 34, by the Council itself;
- (3) under Article 99, by the Secretary-General.

In the Iranian case, Article 99 was not applicable. Article 34 was not applicable, since the Council had not ordered an investigation, which was the only action possible under that Article.

The Council had originally been seized of the dispute under Article 35 (1). Since Iran had withdrawn its complaint, the Council could

not take action under Articles 33, 86, 37 or 38, as the necessary conditions for applying these Articles (namely, a dispute between two or more parties) did not exist.

It was therefore arguable that, following withdrawal by the Iranian representative, the question was automatically removed from the agenda, unless:

(1) the Council voted an investigation under Article 34; or

(2) a member brought it up as a situation or dispute under Article 35; or

(3) the Council proceeded under Article 36 (1), which appeared to require a preliminary finding that a dispute existed under Article 33, or that there was "a situation of like nature."

An argument which could be made against the view of automatic removal from the agenda was that once a matter was brought to the attention of the Council, it was no longer a matter solely between the original parties, but one in which the Council collectively had an interest, as representing the whole of the United Nations. However, it appeared that the only way in which, under the Charter, the Council could exercise that interest, was under Article 34, or under Article 36 (1). Since the Council had not chosen to invoke Article 34 in the only way in which it could be invoked, that is, through voting an investigation, and had not chosen to invoke Article 36 (1), by deciding that a dispute existed under Article 33 or that there was a situation of like nature, it might well be that there was no way in which it could remain seized of the matter.

The Council referred the Secretary-General's letter to the Committee of Experts, and the report of the Chairman of the Committee of Experts was considered at the 36th meeting on April 23, 1946. The report stated that the Committee of Experts had decided, by reason of the technical nature of its competence, to study from an abstract point of view the problem whether the Council could remain seized of a matter if the interested parties had requested its withdrawal.

There was agreement in principle that, when a matter had been submitted to the Council by a party, it could not be withdrawn from the list of matters of which the Council was seized without a decision by the Council.

In the discussions of the Committee of Experts, the representatives of Australia, Brazil, China, Egypt, Mexico, the Netherlands, the

United Kingdom and the United States had considered that the Secretary-General's letter had put the problem on too narrow a basis, since it referred only to a dispute and since it treated such a dispute merely as a law suit between two parties. Such a definition implied an inexact understanding, in the first place, of the functions of the Council (which was not a court of justice), and in the second place of the nature of its competence, which included the consideration of situations, and which in any case far exceeded the narrow framework within which the letter would tend to confine it. Some of these representatives observed that, for the Council to drop the matter, it was not enough for the parties to the dispute to have come to an agreement. The problem should not be regarded from a purely legalistic point of view. In view of Articles 1 and 24, the Council might hold that even after an agreement had been reached between the parties, circumstances might continue to exist (for example, the conditions under which the agreement had been negotiated) which might still leave room for fears regarding the maintenance of peace and which justified the question being retained among the matters entrusted to its care. The Council might find it necessary to remain seized of the matter until the whole or part of the agreement had been executed, or even longer. The decision by which the Council was seized of a question was absolutely independent of and distinct from the measures which it might decide to take under Article 34. Several representatives questioned the argument in the letter which seemed to imply that unless the Council took a decision under Article 34 or 36, it could not remain seized of a dispute the withdrawal of which had been requested. Several representatives considered that Article 35 (1) proved that the action of the Council in its role as guardian of the peace was quite independent of the strictly legal circumstances in which a dispute occurred, since, according to that text, it was not necessarily a party to a dispute which had to bring it to the Council.

On the other hand, the representatives of France, Poland and the U.S.S.R. had considered that the rules governing the procedure for the withdrawal of a question submitted to the Council varied according to whether a dispute or a situation were involved. The notion of a dispute was of a subjective nature, and it was essentially a conflict between two

or more States, which existed only by virtue of the opposition between the interested parties. If all of the parties to a dispute had reached an agreement, the threat to the maintenance of peace from the prolongation of such a dispute thereby disappeared, and if they asked the Council to drop the dispute, the Council was bound to do so. On the other hand, a situation had an objective character, existing independently of the Member which had brought it to the Council's attention. The Council could remain seized of a situation even if that Member declared its desire to withdraw its communication. If the dispute originally submitted to the Council had reached the point where other parties were concerned, or if a new situation had arisen out of the original dispute, the question became a different one from that originally submitted to the Council. It could be brought to the attention of the Council by a Member of the United Nations under Article 35 (1), or else the Council itself might take it up under Article 34.

Accordingly, the Committee of Experts was unable to formulate a common opinion on the question put to it by the Council.

At the 36th meeting of the Council, the representative of France said that it would be unwise to establish the precedent that a Member of the United Nations which had submitted a communication to the Council could not withdraw its communication. He therefore proposed the following resolution:

THE SECURITY COUNCIL,

Having again considered at its meetings of 15 and 16 April the question which it had placed on its agenda on 26 March at the request of the Government of Iran and which formed the subject of its resolution of 4 April;

TAKES NOTE of the letter dated 14 April addressed to it by the representative of the Government of Iran in which the latter informs the Security Council of the withdrawal of his complaint;

NOTES that an agreement has been reached between the two Governments concerned;

REQUESTS the Secretary-General to collect the necessary information in order to complete the Security Council's report to the Assembly, in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter, on the manner in which it dealt with the case placed on its agenda on 26 March last at the request, now withdrawn, of the Government of Iran.

The representatives of Poland and the U.S.S.R. supported the French proposal, while the representatives of Australia, Brazil, China, Egypt, Mexico, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States maintained that the Council was master of its own agenda and had power to keep the Iranian question on the agenda despite the Iranian withdrawal of its complaint. The resolution submitted by the representative of France received three votes and was declared lost.

In connection with this vote, the representative of the U.S.S.R. stated that, in view of the existence of the agreement between the Soviet and Iranian Governments on all questions in dispute, and in view of the Iranian Government's withdrawal of its appeal to the Council, the Soviet delegation considered that the Council's decision to retain the Iranian question on its agenda was contrary to the Charter. For these reasons, the Soviet delegation did not consider it possible to take any further part in the discussion of the Iranian question in the Council.

h. Report by the Representative of Iran under Resolution of April 4, 1946

By a letter dated May 6, 1946, addressed to the President of the Council, the Iranian Ambassador stated that, pursuant to the Council's resolution of April 4, 1946, investigations made by responsible officials of the Iranian Government showed that Soviet troops had been completely evacuated from the provinces of Khorassan, Gorgan, Mazanderan and Gilan. Because of the interference previously complained of, the Iranian Government had been unable to exercise effective authority within Azerbaijan since November 7, 1945, and from that time had had no opportunity to ascertain conditions in Azerbaijan through its own officials. The Iranian Government had been unable to verify by direct observation reports that the evacuation from Azerbaijan had been proceeding and would be completed by May 7, 1946.

The Soviet Government made no report pursuant to the resolution of April 4, 1946.

i. Resolution of May 8, 1946

At the 40th meeting held on May 8, 1946, the Council considered the above report of the Iranian Ambassador. The representative of the U.S.S.R. was absent from this meeting. In view of the incomplete nature of the report,

the representative of the United States proposed the following resolution:

THE SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLVES,

in view of the statement made by the Iranian Government in its preliminary report of 6 May, submitted in compliance with the resolution of 4 April 1946, that it was not able as of 6 May to state whether the withdrawal of all Soviet troops from the whole of Iran had been completed,

to defer further proceedings on the Iranian matter in order that the Government of Iran may have time in which to ascertain through its official representatives whether all Soviet troops have been withdrawn from the whole of Iran;

that the Iranian Government be requested to submit a complete report on the subject to the Security Council immediately upon the receipt of the information which will enable it so to do; and that in case it is unable to obtain such information by 20 May, it report on that day such information as is available to it at that time;

and that immediately following the receipt from the Iranian Government of the report requested, the Council shall consider what further proceedings are required.

The resolution was adopted by ten votes.

- j. Report by the Representative of Iran under Resolutions of April 4, 1946, and May 8, 1946

By letters dated May 20 and May 21, 1946, addressed to the President of the Council, the Iranian Ambassador submitted reports in compliance with the resolutions of April 4 and May 8, 1946. In his letter dated May 20, 1946, the Iranian Ambassador stated that the information then available to him was to the effect that, as a consequence of the interference previously complained of, the Iranian Government was still prevented from exercising any effective authority in the province of Azerbaijan, and that Soviet interferences in the internal affairs of Iran had not ceased. Therefore, it had not been possible to make such investigation as was required to establish that all Soviet troops had been withdrawn from the whole of Iran.

In his letter dated May 21, 1946, the Iranian Ambassador communicated the text of a telegram received by him that afternoon from the Iranian Prime Minister. The telegram stated that the Iranian Prime Minister had dispatched a commission of investigation, which in the course of one week had investigated carefully regions of Azerbaijan such

as the following important centres: Tabriz and its suburbs, Marand, Jolfa, Khoy, Salmas, Maju, Rezacyeh and Mianduab. Telegraphic reports were to the effect that no trace whatever of Soviet troops, equipment or means of transport was found, and that, according to trustworthy local people who were questioned in all these places, Soviet troops evacuated Azerbaijan on May 6, 1946.

- k. Resolution of May 22, 1946

At the 43rd meeting held on May 22, 1946, the Iranian Ambassador participated in the discussion.

The Council adopted by 9 votes to 1 the following resolution proposed by the representative of the Netherlands:

The discussion of the Iranian question is adjourned until a date in the near future, the Council to be called together at the request of any of its members.

The Council remained seized of the Iranian question.

- I. Report by Iranian Ambassador

By a letter dated December 5, 1946, addressed to the Secretary-General, the Iranian Ambassador in Washington, D. C., forwarded a report concerning the state of affairs in the Province of Azerbaijan: The letter stated:

My Government has instructed me to submit this report in connection with the complaints previously made to the Security Council against interferences in the internal affairs of Iran. It will be recalled that a result of these interferences is that the Central Government has been denied the exercise of effective control in the Province of Azerbaijan. Unfortunately, in spite of every effort to remove by conciliatory means the consequences of these interferences, the Central Government has not yet been able to re-establish its authority in that Province.

Elections to provide for the selection of the Madjless, our National Legislature, have been called to take place throughout Iran beginning December 7th. In order to assure that the election procedures are duly followed, it has been arranged that military forces shall be stationed in all the provinces of Iran. Those in control of affairs in Azerbaijan have objected to the entry of such Government forces into that Province. The Soviet Ambassador at Teheran, acting under instructions from his Government, has given friendly admonition that the movement of Government forces into this part of Iran may result in disturbances

within that Province and on the Persian borders adjacent to Russia, and advised that the Government's plans be abandoned.

It is, of course, the duty of my Government to exercise its sovereign responsibilities, and to assure that the elections are carried out impartially, in Azerbaijan as well as in the rest of Iran; and my Government for that purpose must station its troops in Azerbaijan no less than in other parts of the Country. It is hoped that this will not be used as a pretext for hostile demonstrations, but my Government will not fail to take the action necessary to maintain law and order throughout Iran even though disturbances may be threatened.

The decision of the Security Council to remain seized of the questions raised by the complaints of Iran has demonstrated its concern regarding the consequences of the interferences that have occurred in the past. My Government has, therefore, felt it to be its duty to furnish the information contained in this report in order that the Council may be in a position better to interpret the course of events in the Northwestern portion of my Country.

2. THE GREEK QUESTION (SOVIET COMPLAINT)

a. Communication of the U.S.S.R. dated January 21, 1946

By a letter dated January 21, 1946, the acting chief of the Soviet delegation, under Article 35 of the Charter, requested the Security Council to discuss the situation in Greece on the grounds that the presence of British troops in Greece after the termination of the war meant interference in the internal affairs of Greece and caused extraordinary tension fraught with grave consequences both for the Greek people and for the maintenance of peace and security.

The Greek question was considered at the sixth meeting of the Security Council on February 1, 1946. A representative of Greece was asked to participate, without vote, in the discussions.

The representative of the U.S.S.R. was first asked to make an oral statement. He recalled that in a memorandum submitted by the Soviet delegation on January 21, 1946, during the Berlin Conference there were four main questions of substance: (1) a very tense situation prevailed in Greece, which might have very unhappy consequences not only for the Greek population, but also for peace and security; (2) the presence in Greece of British troops was not necessitated by circumstances, because there was no need to protect these communications as in the case of troops

in defeated countries; (3) the presence of British troops in Greece had become a means of pressure on the political situation in the country; and (4) these circumstances had resulted very often in support of reactionary elements in the country against democratic ones.

The Soviet representative reminded the Council that in September 1945, during the first session of the London meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, the Soviet Government had submitted a second memorandum on the situation in Greece. Finally, during the Moscow Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs in December 1945, the situation in Greece was brought up again and linked with the presence of British troops in Greece.

The representative of the U.S.S.R. described the activities of the Monarchist-Fascist organization known as "X" and stated that the Monarchists, helped by foreign elements, had created a reign of terror directed against the democratic population of the country.

He argued that there were no reasons for the presence of British troops in Greece and insisted upon the quick and unconditional withdrawal of British troops from that country.

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that the Greek question was discussed at Yalta and Marshal Stalin had expressed his complete confidence in the British policy in Greece. At Potsdam the U.S.S.R. circulated a memorandum and the attacks on British policy in Greece were really started. On July 31, 1945, Mr. Molotov, after reading a memorandum circulated by Mr. Eden, agreed to drop the matter. But it was significant that whenever the problem of Greece arose in any negotiations with the U.S.S.R. it had always come about when the problem of Roumania, Bulgaria or Poland had been under discussion.

Early in 1944 there was a meeting of Greek political leaders in the Levant and an all-party Government was formed. It was agreed that as there were no police, no army and no civil service list, British administrators and troops, with Marshal Stalin's agreement, should go to Greece to help revive the country, turn the Germans out and seek to get order and civil government in operation.

When the British went into Greece, a civil war broke out. From information received, the war was started primarily by the Communists seeking to obtain a minority government