

The following amendments to the Canadian proposal also failed to secure the necessary number of votes.

A Syrian amendment which would have asked the Good Offices Committee to report also on technical possibilities for withdrawal of troops in Indonesia to their previous military positions.

An Australian amendment which asked the Consular Committee in Indonesia to continue making its military observers available to the Good Offices Committee.

Mr. C. S. A. Ritchie (Canada), submitting the Canadian proposal, deplored the events in Indonesia. He regarded continuation of hostilities as endangering possibilities of fruitful co-operation between the Netherlands and the free peoples of Indonesia. The Canadian delegation was interested in a cease fire and Mr. Ritchie would therefore vote for the first part of the joint resolution. But he felt that the next step should be establishment of conditions on which permanent peace in Indonesia could be built. He asked the Council to establish a structure for such a peace but the Council needed full information on the present military situation.

The Soviet Union, at a meeting of the Security Council on December 27, submitted a resolution ordering the Netherlands Government to comply with the cease-fire order in Indonesia within twenty-four hours. This resolution also failed for lack of a sufficient number of affirmative votes. Only Syria, China and the Ukraine voted with the Soviet Union in favour.

### **Netherlands Position.**

The view of the Netherlands Government, as stated to the Security Council, is that the military action taken by the Netherlands against the Indonesian Republic is a police action of domestic concern, and, as such, is outside the competence of the Security Council. Dr. Van Roijen, representative of the Netherlands, in the Security Council on December 22, challenged the competence of the Council to deal with the Indonesian question on three counts: (1) The United Nations Charter applied to sovereign states and the Indonesian Republic was not a sovereign state; (2) The matter was within the domestic jurisdiction of the Netherlands and the Security Council could not intervene under Article 2 of the Charter; (3) Finally, events in Indonesia were not threatening international peace and security. Thus, any Council action was precluded.

Dr. Van Roijen added: "My Government firmly stand by their opinion that the Security Council is, under the terms of the Charter, not competent to deal with the Indonesian question. If some members of the Council should hold a different opinion, my Government remains willing, as it was last year, to submit the question of the Council's competence to the International Court of Justice."

The Netherlands delegate charged that the Republicans had been engaged in constant violations of the truce agreement by infiltrations into Netherlands-held territory with acts of terrorism. The Netherlands Government had chosen the present course because the Republican Government was unwilling or unable to enter into binding agreements. It was probably unable to do so due to the influence of "disruptive, irresponsible, revolutionary communist elements."

### **Indonesian View**

Dr. Palar, representing the Indonesian Republic, said the military action launched four days before by the Netherlands against the Indonesian Republic