

Middle East conflict - Lebanon. Security Council documents: Middle East con...

HS L 179:100



National Library
of Sweden

Dag Hammarskjöld's saml.

Middle East conflict 1958 - July 15

SECCO documents

Verbatim Record of the 827-th Meeting

L 179: 100



UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



GENERAL
S/PV.827
15 July 1958
ENGLISH

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 15 July 1958, at 10.30 a.m.

<u>President:</u>	Mr. ARAUJO	Colombia
<u>Members:</u>	Canada	Mr. HALSTEAD
	China	Mr. KIANG
	France	Mr. de VAUCELLES
	Iraq	Mr. ABBASS
	Japan	Mr. MATSUDAIRA
	Panama	Mr. ILLUECA
	Sweden	Mr. JARRING
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. SOBOLEV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Pierson DIXON
	United States of America	Mr. LODGE

This record contains original speeches and interpretations. The final text, containing translations, will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in duplicate, within two working days, to the Chief, Meetings Service, Department of Conference Services, Room 1104, and also incorporated in mimeographed copies of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED AT 0930 HOURS ON 16 JULY 1958,
THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 0930 HOURS ON 18 JULY 1958.

Publication of the final printed records being subject to a rigid schedule, the co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I declare open the 827th meeting of the Security Council.

REPRESENTATION OF IRAQ

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): Point of order.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I recognize the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Before the Security Council proceeds to the adoption of the agenda, I should like to obtain a clarification of the powers of the representative of Iraq. As far as I know, there is a communication to the effect that the revolutionary government of Iraq has recalled the present representative of Iraq and has named a new representative to the United Nations and to the Security Council. Therefore, I should like to have this point clarified.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): According to the rules of procedure, questions relating to the credentials of members of the Council are to be determined by the Secretary-General of the Organization. Consequently I call upon the Secretary-General.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL: It is correct that we received a communication this morning regarding the question of credentials. However, I want to submit for your consideration the following observations.

The communication is signed "Ministry of Foreign Affairs"; that is to say, it is not signed by any person. In the second place, I, as Secretary-General, only have information which stems from Baghdad Radio concerning the establishment of a new cabinet. The third point to which I wish to draw attention is that, according to **article 5 of the ratified Constitution of the Arab Union**

"The King of Iraq shall be head of the Union and, in his absence, the King of Jordan shall be the head."

We have noted the declarations made by King Hussein of Jordan regarding the Government which at present claims to be the Government in Baghdad.

In these circumstances, I have not felt that this cable was in order as credentials.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I am afraid that I cannot fully agree with what has just been said by the Secretary-General regarding the credentials of the representative of Iraq. I note that the Secretary-General has confirmed that there is a communication regarding the appointment by the Iraqi authorities of a new representative to the Security Council. I think that the Security Council would act wisely if it were to consider these new credentials and then confirm them according to the rules.

On the other hand, the Secretary-General offers an explanation which, in my belief, does not accord with the juridical situation. Iraq is an independent country. It has no relation to Jordan, and the King of Jordan has no right to give any orders to the Government of Iraq, and all the more so to the new Government of Iraq, a Government which has proclaimed the overthrow of the former rotten regime and the proclamation of a new authority. It is a Government which has an entire new membership as compared to that of the former Government of a few days ago. It goes without saying that no instructions on the part of the King of Jordan may have force as far as the Security Council is concerned, as far as the United Nations is concerned, and in so far as the representative of Iraq to the Security Council is concerned.

The place of Iraq in the Security Council can be held only by the legitimate representative of Iraq appointed by the legitimate Government of Iraq, and that Government is at present the revolutionary Government in Iraq. It has stated that it has withdrawn the powers of the present representative and that it has appointed a new representative and the name of that representative has been communicated to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

In accordance with the rules of procedure and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council is empowered to accept the representation only of the new representative appointed by the Government of Iraq.

Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): It is my understanding that the credentials of Mr. Abbass as the representative of Iraq in the Security Council have been duly presented to the Secretary-General. There is no doubt that the Government which issued these credentials was the legitimate Government of Iraq. In the view of my Government and my delegation, therefore, Mr. Abbass became fully entitled under rule 16 of our rules of procedure to take his seat in the Council with the same rights as other representatives. He has taken his seat under the authority of this rule, and it is quite clear to me that under rule 17 he may continue to sit unless objection to his credentials has been sustained by a vote of this Council. That seems to me to be the position.

The representative of the Soviet Union has objected on the ground that the lawful Government of Iraq was overthrown yesterday by revolution. Firm information is awaited about the situation in Iraq, but my Government does not recognize any other authority as the lawful Government in Iraq with the right to appoint a representative to the Council. In our view, therefore, the objection to the representative of Iraq's credentials should not be upheld nor should we pursue the question of the alleged credentials of the alleged representative of the revolutionary government.

Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): In the opinion of my delegation the Secretary-General has stated very clearly the situation with regard to the credentials of the representative of the Government of Iraq.

I should like to make a brief comment with regard to the position in which we representatives here now find ourselves. This comment is due to the observations presented by the representative of the Soviet Union. My delegation is of the opinion that the change of government which has occurred in Iraq is not a change of government due to or following upon a constitutional process. The Soviet representative has stated this very clearly. It was a revolutionary movement and we have a revolutionary government. Therefore, this is a de facto Government, a Government which I feel, and I believe that most representatives present here are in the same situation, has not been duly recognized. Under these circumstances, any objection to the credentials of the representative of Iraq would not be valid on the present occasion.

(Mr. Illueca, Panama)

I wish to state for the record this position of my Government, to the effect that we consider the present representative of Iraq to be the legitimate representative.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Some doubts were expressed here to the effect that the new Government of Iraq had appointed a new representative to the United Nations. In order that there should be absolutely no doubt about this, I should like to read out a communication which I imagine has already been distributed among all other members of the Council. It is a communication from Beirut dated today. I will read it in English. It says:

"The new Government of Iraq asked for a postponement of today's scheduled emergency United Nations Security Council meeting until a new Iraqi delegate can arrive in New York.

"A Baghdad radio broadcast said the revolutionary Government had decided to recall Abdul Majid Abbass, the present Iraqi United Nations delegate who represents the King Faisal Government and to send Hashem Jawad to New York instead."

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

Thus it is quite clear from this communication -- which incidentally was confirmed to some extent by the Secretary-General -- that such an action of the Government of Iraq is extant. The Council would therefore act correctly if it were to pay due attention to this action of the Government of Iraq. It was quite obvious that neither the Security Council nor the Secretary-General nor the King of Jordan have the right to speak either for the people of Iraq or for the Government of Iraq. It is only the Iraq people, the Iraq Government, which can appoint or recall their accredited representatives to the various organs of the United Nations, and specifically to this Council.

Doubts were also expressed here that this new Government of Iraq had not yet been recognized by many other governments. This often happens with revolutionary governments. Then time passes and finally they receive due acknowledgement or recognition. The representative of Panama must know this also on the strength of the experience of many Latin American countries where often governments are changed by revolutionary methods or by methods which are not, strictly speaking, constitutional from the point of view of the constitution of the given Latin American State. International law also clearly indicates that no government, for the performance of its duties and functions within its own territory, requires to be recognized by any other government. It is sovereign to decide who will represent it in any other body, in any other organization, and I think that the Security Council would act correctly if in this case it would also act in accordance with the Charter and the accepted usages and norms of international law.

The Soviet delegation considers that the powers of the representative of Iraq sitting today at this table are no longer valid, and Mr. Abbass has no right to represent Iraq on this Council.

Mr. ILLUECA (Panama)(interpretation from Spanish): The representative of the Soviet Union has made certain comments which call for a brief reply from me. The reference made to Latin American democracies is really justified. But fortunately, Latin American people are people who are struggling to forge their own destiny, it is possible to achieve popular changes

in government which, fortunately for our hemisphere, is not drowned in blood by foreign interventions. But I should like to refer to the concrete point of credentials.

I would say that my delegation earnestly wishes legal processes to be followed. The representative of the Soviet Union, in his statement, referred to various details, of which I shall mention two. One fact that he mentioned was a communication from the revolutionary government in Iraq according to which a postponement of two days was requested. This would mean that at the present time there does not exist any need to reach a decision upon a question of credentials. The Council would have to follow a normal procedure and continue with its present sitting.

(Mr. Illueca, Panama)

The Soviet Union representative, furthermore, stated very clearly that generally when a revolutionary change in government occurs one waits a certain length of time for other Governments to recognize the new Government. Why do we use this prudential waiting period? All Governments do this simply because, in doctrine and in practice, in the recognition of Governments, it is necessary to wait for the new Government which has attained power through revolution -- through procedures which are not constitutional, in other words -- to demonstrate to the world that it is in a position to fulfil its international commitments and to maintain public order in its own territory. Now if that waiting period has not yet passed and if we do not have clear and concrete information, it would seem that Mr. Sobolev is inviting the Council to take up a matter which is not pertinent. Therefore, I would ask the President to allow us to continue the formal meeting on our agenda, because from the very statement of the Soviet Union representative one can deduce that we shall not achieve any positive results at this meeting if we follow his suggestion, since we have not met here to seat a new representative of Iraq.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Bearing in mind the report submitted by the Secretary-General, and in accordance with rule 17 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the President is of the opinion that we should continue with our agenda for this meeting, unless a member of the Council wishes to submit to the vote the question of credentials which was raised by the Soviet Union representative.

Since I hear no objection to the opinion I have expressed, I shall take it that the Council agrees to proceed now to consider its agenda.

It was so decided.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Before taking up the question of the adoption of the agenda, I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to applaud and pay a tribute of gratitude to the representative of China, Mr. Tsiang. We congratulate him upon the very fine and intelligent manner in which he presided over the debates of the Security Council during the month when he was President.

Mr. KIANG (China): Mr. President, I will see to it that your kind words are conveyed to Mr. Tsiang as soon as he returns from Washington today. I am sure he will be very grateful for your gracious expression.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

LETTER DATED 22 MAY 1958 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF LEBANON ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING:

"COMPLAINT BY LEBANON IN RESPECT OF A SITUATION ARISING FROM THE INTERVENTION OF THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF LEBANON, THE CONTINUANCE OF WHICH IS LIKELY TO ENDANGER THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY" (S/4007).

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Azkoul, representative of Lebanon, and Mr. Loutfi, representative of the United Arab Republic, took places at the Security Council table.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): The Council meets today to confront difficulties as serious as any in its history. The territorial integrity of Lebanon is increasingly threatened by insurrection stimulated and assisted from outside. Plots against the Kingdom of Jordan which have become evident over the past few months are another sign of serious instability in the relations between nations in the Middle East. And now comes the overthrow in an exceptionally brutal and revolting manner of the legally established Government of Iraq.

I have just heard this morning, before coming over here, of the murder of our esteemed and popular colleague from Iraq here in the United Nations, Mr. Fadhil Jamali. Only a few weeks ago, he was here with us. We heard his voice, we rejoiced in his humour, we were heartened by his fellowship. Now we learn that he was not only murdered, but that his body was actually dragged through the streets of Baghdad. Decent people throughout the world wherever they may be will recoil at this monstrosity.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

In all these circumstances, the President of Lebanon has asked with the unanimous authorization of the Lebanese Government for the help of friendly Governments so as to preserve Lebanon's integrity and independence. The United States has responded positively and affirmatively to this request in the light of the need for immediate action, and we wish the Security Council to be officially advised hereby of this fact. In addition, the United States Government has under active consideration economic assistance to help Lebanon revive its economy.

Our purpose in coming to the assistance of Lebanon is perfectly clear. As President Eisenhower explained this morning, our forces are not there to engage in hostilities of any kind, much less to fight a war. Their presence is designed for the sole purpose of helping the Government of Lebanon at its request in its efforts to stabilize the situation brought on by the threats from outside until such time as the United Nations can take the steps necessary to protect the independence and political integrity of Lebanon. They will afford security to the several thousand Americans who reside in that country. That is the total scope and objective of the United States assistance.

Now I need scarcely say that we are the first to admit that the despatch of United States forces to Lebanon is not an ideal way to solve present problems, and they will be withdrawn as soon as the United Nations can take over. In fact, the United States Government hopes that the United Nations itself will soon be able to assume these responsibilities. We intend to consult with the Secretary-General and with other delegations urgently on a resolution to achieve these objectives. Until then, the presence of United States troops in Lebanon will be a constructive contribution to the objectives the Security Council had in mind when it passed the 11 June resolution dealing with this problem.

Let me now review the recent history of this situation. A little over a month ago, the Government of Lebanon presented a complaint to the Security Council involving

"a situation arising from the intervention of the United Arab Republic in the internal affairs of Lebanon, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security."

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

At that time, various members of the Council drew special attention to Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter which enjoins all members to

"refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State...."

This was one of the fundamental considerations behind the resolution adopted by the Council on the 11 June which called for the urgent despatch of an observation group to proceed to Lebanon so as to ensure that there was no illegal infiltration of personnel or supply of arms or other materiel across the Lebanese borders.

The United Nations Observer Group has thus far been able to achieve limited success. We hope that it will pursue its work in the most effective and energetic way possible. Our forces are being instructed to co-operate with it and to establish liaison immediately upon arrival. This United Nations Group has helped to reduce interference from across the border.

We learn now, however, that with the outbreak of the revolt in Iraq, the infiltration of arms and personnel into Lebanon from the United Arab Republic in an effort to subvert the legally constituted Government has suddenly become much more alarming. This development, coupled with persistent efforts over the past months to subvert the Government of Jordan, must be a cause of grave concern to us all. They place in jeopardy both the independence of Lebanon and that of any Middle Eastern State which seeks to maintain its national integrity free from outside influences and pressures.

It is too early to tell what the outcome of the revolt in Iraq may be. But one thing is clear: the events in both Lebanon and Iraq present grave threats to the integrity of free and independent countries. They demonstrate a ruthlessness of aggressive purposes which tiny Lebanon cannot combat without support from friendly nations.

Observing the course of events in Lebanon and in Iraq, one is constrained to conclude that there are powers at work in the Middle East seeking, in total disregard for national sovereignty and independence, to substitute force or the threat of force for law. If these powers are left unchecked, free to pursue their lawless course, the people of the Middle East will have been denied the solemn guarantees written into the United Nations Charter, and mankind's age-long quest for peace will have been checked and the world will have been plunged into anarchy.

Now we confront here a situation involving outside involvement in an internal revolt against the authorities of the legitimate Government of Lebanon. Under these conditions, the request from the Government of Lebanon to another Member of the United Nations to come to its assistance is entirely consistent with the provisions and purposes of the United Nations Charter. In this situation, therefore, we are proceeding in accordance with the traditional rules of international law, none of which in any way inhibits action of a character which the United States is undertaking in Lebanon.

The United States is acting pursuant to what the United Nations Charter regards as an inherent right, the right of all nations to work together to preserve their independence. The Council should take note that United States Forces went to Lebanon at the specific request of the duly constituted Government of Lebanon. Let me also emphasize again what I have said before, that these forces will remain there only until the United Nations itself is able to assume the necessary responsibilities for ensuring the continued independence of Lebanon.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

There is one further fact which must be recognized: if the United Nations is to succeed in its efforts to maintain international peace and security, it should support the efforts of the legitimate and democratically elected Government to protect itself from aggression from without, even if that aggression is indirect.

The United Nations must be particularly alert in protecting the security of small States from interference by those whose resources and power are larger. This is a principle which has been supported here in this very hall in the past and which should be supported today regardless of who the offender may be.

Lebanon is a Charter Member of the United Nations and has loyally contributed to the work over the past decade. It would be unthinkable now to permit the lawfully constituted Government of Lebanon to fall prey to outside forces which seek to substitute a Government which would serve their purposes in defiance of the principles of the Charter.

There can be no hope for peace in the world unless the United Nations shows this dedication to the Charter's basic principles. All nations, large and small alike, are entitled to have their political independence and territorial integrity respected and maintained. If we vacillate with regard to this proposition, we will open the floodgates to direct and indirect aggression all over the world.

The overthrow of another State by subversion and the fomenting of internal strife is more difficult for the world to combat than is direct military aggression, because the fomenting of internal strife is harder to see with your eyes. But this is not the first time that the United Nations has faced such a problem. The United Nations faced such a problem successfully in Greece in 1946, when Soviet-sponsored insurrection threatened to overwhelm the Greek Government. The United Nations did so unsuccessfully in 1948 when the Communist coup was perpetrated in Czechoslovakia.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

The United Nations sought to provide means for dealing with such aggressive developments in the future when in 1949 and in 1950 it adopted the Essentials of Peace and the Peace through Deeds resolutions of the General Assembly. If the Council will forgive a personal note, I particularly recall the Peace through Deeds resolution because I actively worked to obtain its adoption the first time I was a member of the United States delegation in 1950. I would like to quote one paragraph from the statement I made at that time on behalf of the United States: "The eight-Power resolution not only reaffirms that whatever the weapons used, any aggression is the gravest of all crimes against peace and security in the world. It also freshens, modernizes, brings up to date, and makes more complete our concept of aggression by specifically including the latest form of aggression, to wit, fomenting civil strife."

Let me now quote some of the provisions of this resolution which was adopted here in the General Assembly in 1950. It is very short.

"Condemning the intervention of a State in the internal affairs of another State for the purpose of changing its legally established government by the threat or use of force,

1. Solemnly reaffirms that, whatever the weapons used, any aggression, whether committed openly, or by fomenting civil strife in the interest of a foreign Power, or otherwise, is the gravest of all crimes against peace and security throughout the world;

2. Determines that for the realization of lasting peace and security it is indispensable:

(1) That prompt united action be taken to meet aggression wherever it arises;"

That is the end of the quotation from the resolution of 1950 which I submit applies very definitely to the situation which confronts us today.

(Mr. Lodge, United States of America)

Remember that the Government of Lebanon was a co-sponsor of this resolution and that the present Foreign Minister of Lebanon was its spokesman. Remember that the first representative in the General Assembly to raise the issue of subversion and civil strife was the representative of Greece which was just then overcoming the effects of communist subversion. Remember that the first language for a resolution was introduced on that occasion by the representative of Bolivia. Remember, too, that the resolution in its final form was sponsored by France, Lebanon, Mexico, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, the United States, Bolivia and India. Remember, finally, that the resolution condemning the fomenting of civil strife in the interests of a foreign power, as that is what it did, was adopted by a vote of 50 to 5, the Soviet bloc being significantly against it.

Those are good things to think about today.

In solemnly affirming that any aggression which foments civil strife in the interests of a foreign Power was one of the gravest of all crimes against peace and security throughout the world, the General Assembly clearly had in mind just such a situation as that which we face. The integrity and independence of a nation is as precious when it is attacked from outside by subversion and erosion as when it is attacked in the field by military action.

I conclude now, and I do so by saying to my colleagues of the Security Council to remember this one more fact. The members of the League of Nations tolerated direct and indirect aggression in Europe, in Asia and in Africa during the 1930's, and the tragic result was to strengthen and stimulate aggressive forces in such a way that World War II became inevitable.

The United States, for its part, is determined that history shall not now be repeated. We hope and believe that the action which we are taking will bring stability and that United States forces now being sent into Lebanon at the request of its Government can be promptly withdrawn. We must, however, be prepared to meet the situation whatever the consequences may be.

We strive for a world in which nations great and small can preserve their independence. This is an ideal which is close to the heart of every American and we believe that it is close to the hearts of all free men. We believe that the action which the United States is now taking is consistent with the principles and purposes of the United Nations and will promote the cause of world peace.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL: As the Security Council today resumes the consideration of the complaint of Lebanon, I consider that I owe it to the Council, at this first meeting after 11 June, to give it an account of how I have acted under the mandate given to me in the resolution passed on that date. I find an added reason for doing so at this time in the references of the representative of the United States to the present efforts of the United Nations in Lebanon. I shall naturally leave aside all questions of substance and also the question of the future role and status of the observation operation.

Having heard the charges of the representative of Lebanon concerning interference by the United Arab Republic in the internal affairs of Lebanon and the reply of the representative of the United Arab Republic, we recall that the Security Council passed, on 11 June, a resolution in which it decided to "despatch urgently an observation group to proceed to Lebanon", and authorized the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps for implementation of the resolution. In the resolution the Security Council stated that the aim of the step it was taking was "to ensure that there is no illegal infiltration of personnel or supply of arms or other material across the Lebanese border".

I have in my actions regarding the Lebanese case acted solely with that purpose in view. I have used the tool created for this purpose in the resolution. I have also relied on the authority that the Secretary-General is recognized as having under the Charter.

My actions have had no relation to developments which must be considered as the internal affairs of Lebanon, Nor have I, in my implementation of the resolution, or acting under the Charter, concerned myself with wider international aspects of the problem than those referred to in the resolution. The Secretary-General in this situation obviously is neither an arbiter nor a mediator. However, even with these important restrictions, there has been wide scope for action for the purposes of the resolution, strictly in keeping with United Nations principles and rules.

The Security Council, in deciding to despatch to Lebanon an "observation group", defined not only the character of the operation but also its scope.

(The Secretary-General)

It did so by linking the observation to illegal traffic in arms and infiltration, requesting the Group to keep the Council currently informed of its findings. In taking this stand, the Council defined the limits for authority delegated to the Secretary-General in this case.

I have, in the light of the decision, considered myself free to take all steps necessary for an operation, covering illegal traffic in arms and infiltration, as effective as it could be made as a tool towards ensuring against such traffic or infiltration with its basic character of observation maintained. I have had a free hand as to the structure and organization of the operation but have considered myself as barred from an interpretation of the authority granted which would have implied that I changed the policy, laid down by the Council, by my decisions on the scope of the operation and the authority of the observers.

In fact, had I, by going beyond the reasonable limits of a "group" charged with "observation", or by deciding on terms of reference exceeding observation, changed the observation operation into some kind of police operation, not only would I have overstepped the resolution but I would also have faced a conflict with principles laid down in the Charter. In a police operation, the participants would in this case need the right, if necessary, to take the initiative in the use of force. Such use of force would, however, have belonged to the sphere of Chapter VII of the Charter and could have been granted only by the Security Council itself, directly or by explicit delegation, under conditions spelled out in that chapter.

As to the structure and organization of the Observation Group and its activities, I have at the initial stage acted in close consultation with members of the Security Council and the Representative of Lebanon. My interpretation of the resolution, as presented to them before any action was taken, met with their full approval, including that of the representative of Lebanon. At later stages I have naturally, to a decisive extent, depended upon the judgement of the highly qualified military, political and diplomatic experts of the United Nations who are in the field. The present arrangements are in accordance with their suggestions and meet with their full approval.

I have said before that I have acted solely for the purpose mentioned in the resolution of the Security Council, using the instrument created by the resolution, but using also my authority under the Charter. This means that the

(The Secretary-General)

efforts I have made, of a diplomatic nature, have been guided by the desire to get necessary support for the observation operation, so as to make it possible for it to succeed as a measure against any infiltration or smuggling of arms. It would be premature to give here an account of the activities to which I refer. Their value for the purpose mentioned can be judged only in the light of practical experience in the observation operation and of other developments, as registered by our observers or by other reliable means.

What I have to stress here is that, whatever weight might finally, in the light of the tests to which I have referred, be given to the special efforts in which I have had to engage, it has been a matter of course that I have striven to give to the observation operation the highest possible efficiency. The diplomatic efforts in support of the observation operation, or their outcome, have been in no way permitted to influence my judgement as to the size, scope or mandate of the Observation Group.

My stand on these last-mentioned questions has been determined exclusively by the attitude taken by the Group itself. As I have already said in public, the Observation Group has and will have as many observers as it has asked or might ask for. On the other hand, I have found it very difficult to provide them with observers before they consider themselves ready to absorb them in useful current work. If there would be any impression that restraint has been shown in the build-up of the Observation Group, the explanation of this impression is, therefore, the stand taken by the Group itself regarding its needs and possibilities, and obviously in no way any political considerations, least of all any considerations caused by anticipations of the outcome of any diplomatic efforts in support of the observation operation.

It has already been reported to the Council how the observers have managed to operate within areas which are now outside of Government control. From previous published accounts it has appeared that the Group has been meeting with difficulties north of Tripoli and in the north of the Bekaa region. I can now report to the Council that throughout the northern border areas north of Tripoli arrangements have been made for full freedom of movement and access and that agreement has been reached on the establishment of out-stations in that area. In the region north of Bekaa the Group has this very morning, in a meeting between General Bull and a leader of the opposition forces in that region, formalized its previous requests for full freedom of access.

Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) (interpretation from French): On 6 June 1958, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Lebanon attempted to show here before the Security Council the following three theses:

First of all, that there was and there continues to be mass illegal and unprovoked intervention on the part of the United Arab Republic into the affairs of Lebanon, and that this intervention manifested itself in the following six ways: (a) the supply of large quantities of weapons by the United Arab Republic to subversive elements in Lebanon; (b) the training of elements on the territory of the United Arab Republic and then sending them back to Lebanon; (c) participation in subversive terrorist activities in Lebanon by civilians of the United Arab Republic who have infiltrated into Lebanon and who are residing there; (d) participation of Government elements of the United Arab Republic in subversive terrorist activities and also in the leadership of the rebellion in Lebanon; (e) violent and unprecedented Press campaigns conducted by the United Arab Republic against the Government of Lebanon; and (f) violent and unprecedented radio campaigns by the United Arab Republic in order to incite the people of Lebanon to overthrow their Government;

Secondly, that this intervention aimed at undermining and menacing the independence of Lebanon;

And thirdly, that the situation created by this intervention would, if continued, threaten the maintenance of peace and security in the area.

(Mr. Azkoul, Lebanon)

Following this demonstration and following the statements made by various members of the Council, the Council decided on 11 June 1958, and I quote a part of the resolution, "to dispatch urgently an Observation Group to proceed to Lebanon so as to ensure that there is no illegal infiltration of personnel or supply of arms or other material across the Lebanese borders".

The first report of the observation group was submitted to the Council on 3 July 1948, document S/4040. On 8 July 1958 the Lebanese Government asked the Secretary-General to distribute among all members of the United Nations as an official document of the Security Council its official comments on this first report. This is document S/4043.

The Government of Lebanon wished to draw the attention of the members of the United Nations, and especially those of the Council, to the four following truths: firstly, that the failure of the Observation Group to make a final judgement on the dispatch of men and weapons to Lebanon was not due to the absence of such infiltration but to the following fact: the Observation Group was not able to reach the frontiers that were held by the rebels. It did not have at its disposal air observation means. It was not equipped to carry out observation at night. Finally, it had not yet started to function with the personnel that had been envisaged.

The second thesis was that the observations that were contained in the report confirmed in themselves the charges of Lebanon regarding infiltration of armed men and the dispatch of weapons to Lebanon in the following points:

- a. The group of observers had admitted indirectly that at least a certain number of armed men whom it had observed were not Lebanese;
- b. infiltration of armed men had occurred or was probable in areas where there were ethnical groups on both sides of the Syrian-Lebanese border;
- c. the supplying of rebels in the border areas was due to the proximity of Syria from where they could receive support in men, weapons, and money;
- d. the obstructive tactics used by the rebels in order to prevent the observers from going into the border areas were due to the fact that the rebels wished to conceal the infiltration movements that were occurring. The presence of a company of Syrian troops in uniform on Lebanese territory in a rebel area could be explained only by the fact that these troops were there in order to assist the rebels in one way or another.

The many mortar bombardments, weapons which are used only by regular troops and coming from the Syrian border area, could be carried out only by the Syrian troops or by rebels who had received these weapons from the Syrians. The weapons used by the rebels, because of their quality and their quantity, could only have come from a hostile government that was interested in supplying them.

The third thesis was that despite the presence of the United Nations observers, the sending of armed men and weapons was continuing, and, therefore, the purpose which the Security Council was seeking in sending observers to Lebanon and which would have prevented the dispatch of men and weapons had not yet been achieved.

The fourth thesis was that the interpretation of the action of the Council in its resolution of 11 June which limited the activities of the observers to mere observation showed itself in the light of experience to be inadequate from the point of view of the purposes of the Council and inadequate to face the realities of the situation.

In making these comments, I do not wish to minimize the importance of the presence in Lebanon of the Observation Group and the usefulness of its activities. On the contrary, I would stress here that the Government of Lebanon appreciated the efforts that were made by the Secretary-General in order to mount in so short a period of time the machinery of observation that is at this time operating in Lebanon and also the efforts made by the Observation Group in order to carry out its observation assignments.

The Government of Lebanon sees with satisfaction the expansion of this mechanism and the expansion of its activities, and it will do all it can in order to continue to co-operate fully with it and in order to extend all possible assistance to it.

Since this submission of the official comments of the Government of Lebanon on the first report of the Observation Group, the situation in Lebanon has continuously deteriorated. Convoys of armed men and weapons are entering from Syria into Lebanon, and while the world was appeased by press reports which described the situation as moving towards anarchy, preparations were in course for a major offensive against the Government of Lebanon with a view to overthrowing it.

We have good reasons to think that certain of these infiltrations will be reported to the Council by the Observation Group. The danger which threatens the independence and the integrity of Lebanon has become even more imminent today following the coup d'etat in Iraq which has now had aftereffects in Lebanon.

Faced with this situation, my Government addresses itself again to the Security Council and asks it to take urgently more effective measures than those it has already taken and which might lead to the fulfilment of the purpose which the Council originally set itself and which would lead to the prevention of any material or armed men entering Lebanon from outside.

The Government of Lebanon would like to assert before the Security Council that it is always concerned to seek with the United Nations and within the framework of the United Nations their assistance which it needs in order to uphold its integrity and independence. That is why we are extending this request to the Security Council.

In the face of the danger which threatens the independence of Lebanon and to maintain international peace and security in the Middle East, pending the fulfilment of the action which it requests the Council to take, the Government of Lebanon has decided to implement Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations which recognizes the right of self-defence, individual or collective, and it has requested the direct assistance of friendly countries.

It is understood that this assistance is to be temporary and that it will continue only until the entry into force of the action which we request the Council to take. As soon as this action takes effect or is inaugurated, the forces of friendly countries who will have sent troops to Lebanon will immediately have to evacuate our territory.

The Government of Lebanon, in the face of the gravity of the situation that prevails in Lebanon and in the Middle East, and in the face of the gravity of the measure to which we had recourse, implores the Security Council to follow up urgently the appeal which we are addressing to it with the great anxiety which we feel in the face of a threat to the independence of Lebanon and the maintenance of international peace and security in this important area of the world.

Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): At this stage in our proceedings, I do not intend to do more than to define in brief terms the attitude of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to the serious developments which have led to this emergency meeting of the Security Council today.

The Council has heard of the request made by the President of Lebanon, authorized by the Lebanese Government, for assistance in order to preserve Lebanon's integrity and independence and of the response which has been made by the United States Government. This response to a request from the Government of Lebanon for such assistance is certainly fully consistent with the provisions and purposes of the United Nations Charter and the established rules of international law.

The situation in Lebanon has been occupying the Council since the beginning of last month when we heard the Foreign Minister of Lebanon bring grave charges that the United Arab Republic was intervening in the internal affairs of his country. We have heard that view reaffirmed today by the representative of Lebanon.

It has been the consistent view of Her Majesty's Government that there has been interference from the United Arab Republic in the affairs of Lebanon, and our information is that this interference is continuing despite the efforts of the Observation Group which this Council dispatched to Lebanon so as to ensure that no illegal infiltration took place.

Her Majesty's Government has been giving its full support to the United Nations effort launched under the resolution of 11 June and continues to support that effort. We recognize and deeply appreciate the contribution which the Secretary-General has made and is making.

If the news is confirmed, I should like to join my United States colleague in expressing my deep concern at the murder of Mr. Fadhil Jamali and my horror at the employment of these brutal methods. And this prompts me to say that it has long been our view that for a stable and peaceful world, States must eradicate from their national policies the various methods of subversion and indirect aggression that have been so distressingly current in recent years. We believe profoundly that it is for the United Nations to identify, to condemn and, so far as it can, to arrest these deceptive but highly dangerous tendencies which have so gravely complicated international relations.

(Sir Pierson Dixon, United Kingdom)

Though yesterday's news from Iraq is incomplete and confused, it is clear that there have been extremely disturbing developments in that country and that this illustrates the dangerous nature of the situation with which the Council is at present dealing and of the need for immediate remedial steps. In these circumstances, President Chamoun and the Government of Lebanon have appealed for assistance.

The Council has heard from the representative of the United States the manner and purpose of the response of the United States Government to this appeal. I am authorized to inform the Council that the announcement just made on behalf of the United States by Mr. Lodge has the full support of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): If the Council would agree to the following suggestion, I would implement it immediately. I would call upon the next speaker on my list. Then I would adjourn the meeting and we would meet again at 3 p.m., at which time the meeting would begin with the interpretation which would be given of the statement of the last speaker this morning. If there is no objection to this procedure, I will call on the next speaker.

It was so decided.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Security Council has again been convened in order to consider the problem of Lebanon, this time at the request of the United States delegation.

As we know, a short while ago the Security Council had already considered the Lebanese complaint which contained accusations against the United Arab Republic regarding its alleged interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon. The Observation Group which was sent to Lebanon in accordance with the instructions of the Security Council did not, as we know, confirm these charges that were leveled against the United Arab Republic. The Chairman of the Observation Group, the former representative of Ecuador, Mr. Galo Plaza, said that they had found no proof of mass infiltration on the part of the United Arab Republic in the internal affairs of Lebanon. At a Press conference held in Beirut, Mr. Plaza confirmed that the Group had no proof at all of the infiltration or support of the rebels by the United Arab Republic. He added that he regarded the events in Lebanon as a civil war.

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

It is fitting to add that the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who through a special decision of the Security Council was instructed to follow the operations and activities of the Observation Group, has in numerous statements stressed that the events which took place in Lebanon were the domestic concern of the Lebanese people.

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

What therefore is the reason for this demand of the United States urgently to call the Security Council back into session? In the Lebanon nothing new has happened. To reply to this question, I imagine that we have to consider what happened in the past days in the countries of the Middle East and what lies at the bottom of all these events. The facts show, and they are well known, that in the Lebanon there is in fact a state of civil war. The population of the Lebanon, indignant at the reactionary anti-popular policies of the Government of Chamoun, has risen up in arms in defence of its rights. The people of Lebanon, which are struggling against the tyranny of the colonialist yoke, has joined forces against the regime which is attempting through force to maintain its position and its dominance over the people for the pleasure of the imperialistic desires and interests of certain Western countries. The fact that Chamoun, despite his efforts, was not able to achieve "stabilization in the country", is another proof that the Lebanese authorities are confronting, not infiltrators, which have allegedly infiltrated from the United Arab Republic, but a mass popular movement.

It is difficult to handle or to curb such a mass movement. Even tanks and aircraft and jet planes, which were sent to Lebanon urgently by the Western countries, cannot help. We know that certain Western Powers are attempting to take advantage of events in Lebanon in order to carry out military intervention against the Lebanese people. The leading circles in the United States and the United Kingdom spoke openly of the preparedness of their Governments to send their armed forces to Lebanon, whatever the pretext. We have only to recall the press conference of the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Dulles, on 18 June -- not very long ago -- in which he openly stated the readiness of the United States to send its armed forces to Lebanon. In this connexion he stressed that the American troops might land in Lebanon not only under the flag of the United Nations, but also in a unilateral action. The Secretary of Defence of the United States, Mr. McElroy, went so far as to threaten the use of atom bombs by the United States, in event troops were landed in Lebanon.

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

The facts therefore show that Lebanon was threatened and continues to be threatened, not by the alleged intervention of the United Arab Republic but by direct military intervention on the part of the United States and its Western partners who are seeking through the use of weapons to maintain in power the Government of Chamoun, the policies and practices of which have been denounced emphatically by the Lebanese people.

It is no secret that the United States and also other Western Powers hoped that it might be possible to take advantage of the United Nations observers who were sent to Lebanon in order to justify their interventionist designs against the Lebanese people. However, their hopes were not fulfilled. The Observation Group took an objective stand. It objectively assessed the situation in Lebanon as the domestic affair of the Lebanese people. Yesterday the events in Iraq followed up the events in Lebanon. King Faisal was overthrown and the Iraq Republic was proclaimed.

In the statement of Colonel Aref, the Vice-Premier of the new Government, I read that the Iraqi people, basing itself on the armed forces and its loyal sons, has decided to free the country from the domination of the criminal gang which ruled over the people and over its resources in its own interests and in the interests of its own profit. Aref stated further that the Government of the Iraqi Republic would seek to uphold its procedural links with other Arab and Moslem countries; it would act in accordance with the principles of the United Nations and would stay true to the treaties and compacts that are in line with the interest of the country and the decisions of the Bandung Conference. The events in Iraq are strictly the domestic concern of the Iraqi people who have risen up against foreign domination and who have freed their country from an obsolete reactionary rule of King Faisal.

As we see in the communication of the new Government of Iraq, thousands of cables are coming in from the workers, from youth movements, from teachers associations and from tribal leaders, expressing support and solidarity on the occasion of the victory of the people and the proclamation of the Republic. All these facts show that the peoples of the Arab world, who have embarked upon the course of national emancipation, are seeking to uphold their national independence. They wish to manage their own resources. They wish to conduct

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

a policy that will be true to their own interest without having to look constantly to London or to Washington. In other words, the people of the East wish, like the other peoples of the world, to be masters in their own house. They wish to live in peace with all other peoples of the world and not as might be desired by the organizers of NATO, SEATO and the Baghdad Pact, who have linked their policies to the cold war, to the armaments race and to boundless expansion at the cost of the small peoples and small nations. But this of course does not accord with the interests of the colonial Powers who wish to bind the policies of the Eastern countries both politically and economically.

The reaction in United States Government circles to Iraqi events show that the stake is the very existence of the aggressive blocs in the Middle and Near East and specifically that of the Baghdad Pact. On the other hand, the events in Iraq also threaten the unchallenged domination of the imperialist countries over the economies of these countries. Lately, the sensitivity of the United States and the United Kingdom to the events in Iraq are also dictated by the interests of the oil monopolies in those countries. Hence the desire to impede the Iraqi people from becoming the master in their own house. In all of today's papers the word "oil" reigns supreme. There is an acute smell of oil in the Middle East. Hence the strong reaction of the Government of the United States and the ruling circles of the United States to Iraqi events.

We have just listened to the statement of the representative of the United States regarding the landing of United States armed forces in Lebanese territory. The point is that the United States has decided openly, without covering themselves with any flag, to intervene with armed forces in the domestic affairs of the Arab countries and to trample underfoot those peoples who have risen up in defence of their freedom, not only in Lebanon but also in the other Arab countries.

The representative of the United States, in justification of the aggressive actions of the United States, has referred to the fact that allegedly there is a request to that effect on the part of the present rulers of Lebanon. However, it is no secret that these rulers are merely political puppets of the United States and that these requests, furthermore, are inspired by the State Department of the United States. Under these circumstances, the dispatch of United States troops to Lebanon constitutes an act of aggression against the peoples of the Arab world and is a gross intervention in the domestic affairs of the States of this area. This action is a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations which prohibits the use of force as a means of foreign policy. This action is contrary to the norms and usages and principles of international law, and it is a challenge to all freedom-loving mankind. No reference to the requests of Chamoun can justify this armed act of aggression, for the requests were inspired to that effect in order to justify the intervention of the United States in the domestic affairs of the States of the Arab world. But you cannot justify this.

In substantiation of this intervention, the United States has referred to the Charter of the United Nations. Indeed, the Charter provides for the right to individual or collective self-defence if there is an armed attack upon a Member of the United Nations, pending action by the Security Council in defence of international peace and security. But in this case the situation is quite different. On Lebanon the Security Council is already acting. It has taken a decision which allows for the settlement of the situation inside the country. Nobody has attacked Lebanon and there is not even a threat of armed attack upon Lebanon. It is obvious that this reference to the Charter has absolutely no relevance to this case and that it is merely a manoeuvre in order to cover up the aggressive nature of the armed intervention on the part of the United States against the Arab countries. Lebanon is not threatened by anyone except those who are carrying out armed intervention in order to suppress the people who have risen in arms, and this reference to the United Nations Charter, incidentally, is in itself denounced by the report of the Observation Group, which points out that there is no threat from the outside to Lebanon on the part of the United Arab Republic.

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

The delegation of the Soviet Union considers that the attempt of the United States to cover up its armed intervention against the peoples of the Middle and Near East by invoking self-defence is a mockery of the Charter of the United Nations and is a mockery of the high principles and purposes which underlie our Organization and which are reflected in the Charter.

The resolution of the problems which relate to the Lebanese and the Iraqi States is within the exclusive competence of the peoples of these countries. The domestic affairs or the events that are occurring inside these countries cannot serve as a pretext for intervention on the outside, and any armed intervention on the part of the Western Powers is fraught with the most serious consequences indeed. It carries with it the threat of an acute deterioration of the international situation and can fling the world into the abyss of a new war. The entire responsibility for these consequences will rest totally with the organizers and participants in this armed intervention against the peoples of the Arab world, and it will rest first of all upon the Government of the United States.

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

As regards the Soviet Union, as we have repeatedly stated, we consider that there should be peace in the Middle and Near East area, which is adjacent to our borders. That is why we cannot remain indifferent to foreign intervention in the countries of this area, whatever the cover for that intervention. It is the duty of every State which shows concern for peace to do its best to put an end to the aggression against the peoples of this area.

The Security Council, bearing in mind the special responsibilities that are vested in it under the Charter of the United Nations with regard to questions relating to the maintenance of peace and security, must adopt decisive measures in order to put an end to the armed intervention in the affairs of the Arab countries and in order to ensure peace and security in this part of the world. The Soviet delegation, therefore, moves the following draft resolution:

"The Security Council,

"Having heard the communication of the representative of the United States on the introduction of armed forces into Lebanese territory;

"Considering that this action is a gross intervention in the domestic affairs of the peoples of the Arab countries and therefore is contrary to the aims and principles of the United Nations as expressed in the Charter, and specifically in Article 2, paragraph 7 which prohibits intervention in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State; and

"Bearing in mind that the action of the United States constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security;

"Calls upon the Government of the United States to cease its armed intervention in the domestic affairs of the Arab States and to withdraw forthwith its troops from Lebanese territory."

The Soviet delegation appeals to all members of the Security Council to support this draft resolution. Its adoption would be a step leading to the cessation of this gross intervention in the domestic affairs of the Arab peoples and would overcome the real threat of a new war.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.