

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

*HS L 179:100*



National Library  
of Sweden

Dag Hammarskjöld's samml.

Middle East conflict 1958 - July 17

SECCO documents

Verbatim Record of the 832 Meeting

L 179: 100

UNITED NATIONS  
SECURITY  
COUNCIL



GENERAL  
S/PV.832  
17 July 1958  
ENGLISH

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 17 July 1958, at 8:30 p.m.

<u>President:</u>	Mr. ARAUJO	Colombia
<u>Members:</u>	Canada	Mr. HOLMES
	China	Mr. TSIANG
	France	Mr. de VAUELLES
	Iraq	Mr. ABASS
	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 18 JULY 1958,  
THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 0930 HOURS ON 22 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.

## 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).

LETTER DATED 17 JULY 1958 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF JORDAN ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING:

"COMPLAINT BY THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN OF INTERFERENCE IN ITS DOMESTIC AFFAIRS BY THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC" (S/4053).

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

Mr. de VAUCELLES (France) (interpretation from French):

I would first of all like to refer to the statements that were made at the beginning of this afternoon's meeting by the representatives of Jordan and the United Kingdom. I would say that my Government, which has already acknowledged that the American intervention in Lebanon, at the request of the Lebanese Government, was justified, adopts the same attitude as regards the United Kingdom initiative. In both cases, as Mr. Cabot Lodge pointed out so rightly, you have the same tactics that would achieve, through subversion, the overthrow of a legitimate Government of a country, and its replacement by a regime whose policies would be more in line with the purposes, with the interests of another State. As the representative of Jordan so rightly remarks, his country had already in the past witnessed similar attempts, which justify the appeal that was launched yesterday, for help from friendly nations.

(Mr. de Vaucelles, France)

I should like to stress at this moment something that was mentioned in the statement made today by the representative of the Soviet Union. Mr. Sobolev, basing himself on unspecified reports, said that France was ready to join the United Kingdom and the United States in their action. I do not know upon which reports Mr. Sobolev based himself or to which reports he referred, but as far as I am concerned nothing in my possession leads me to justify such an allegation.

In the course of a statement I made on Tuesday, I had already stated the position of the French Government regarding the Lebanese question. Today, I shall merely recall in outline the views I expressed at that time.

1. The French Government has extremely good reasons to conclude that the Lebanese complaint is well founded.

2. My Government wishes to give its complete help to the Lebanese Government in its efforts to ensure its independence and the freedom of action of its country.

3. My Government also voted in favour of the resolution of 11 June sending to Lebanon observers to ensure that there was no infiltration of personnel or of arms or other materiel from across the Lebanese frontiers.

4. We note that the observers have not been able, at least until the last few days, effeciently to carry out the mission that had been entrusted to them by the Council. In fact, according to their own views, they were unable to visit the greater part of the frontier that they had been told to control. May I here point out that the second interim report of the Observation Group (S/4052) does not in any way belie that conclusion. In fact, in paragraph 3 on page 3 of the English text, this document states that the access to the frontier had been "improved", which does not mean very much, and that the Group "proposes" -- that is in the future -- to create observation posts close to the frontier. The use of such expressions proves that, in the view of the Group itself, the situation is not such as the Council might hope for.

5. Under these conditions, the French Government wishes the efficiency of this Group to be increased and, in order to do so, the means and supplies at the Group's disposal also to be increased. The Observation Group itself recognizes the need for such measures since it requests in its latest report that the number of observers be brought to 200, that it also be given unarmed observers and that a larger number of aircraft and pilots be placed at their disposal. If the provisions of the resolution of 11 June are inadequate to

(Mr. de Vaucelles, France)

enable the Observation Group to fulfil its assignment, my Government is prepared to study with the Government of Lebanon and the members of the Security Council as well as the Secretary-General the additional arrangements that may be arrived at and which are referred to expressly in the draft resolution moved by the delegation of the United States (S/4050/Rev.1).

During my earlier statement, I pointed out that the French Government believed that the decision of the Government of the United States was justified. I noted further the view expressed by President Eisenhower and by the representative of the United States to the effect that the Government of the United States was prepared to withdraw its forces as soon as the United Nations was in a position to assume the necessary responsibility in order to ensure the independence of Lebanon and that, pending that, the United States proposed to co-operate closely with the observers..

That is why my delegation will not be able to vote in favour of the Swedish draft resolution. The French Government believes that there is no reason to suspend the activities of the Observation Group since the United States intervention is not in any way supposed to replace the action of the United Nations and it is to come to an end as soon as the United Nations is able to make the necessary arrangements to assure the closing of the Lebanese frontier to all infiltration.

Under these circumstances, my delegation will vote in favour of the United States proposal. We consider that the adoption of this text which, bearing in mind the present state of affairs, complements the resolution of 11 June of the Security Council, will facilitate the return to calm and constitutional legality in a country whose policy has always been very much in line with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. JARRING (Sweden): In accordance with what I said here yesterday, the Swedish Government has reached a conclusion that the presence of United States troops in Lebanon has completely altered the conditions for the activities of the Observer Group in Lebanon. Even should this Group be instructed not to co-operate with the military forces of the United States, the Swedish Government considers that it is both from a practical point of view superfluous and from a political point of view unsuitable that the United Nations Observers in Lebanon perform their functions in the presence of foreign troops. The Swedish Government has given expression to this position in the draft resolution which I have submitted for the consideration of the Council.

I would, however, like to add that should a plan be worked out which would, inter alia, lead to the withdrawal of United States troops, the whole question would appear in a new light. It is in view of this possibility that the draft resolution exclusively mentions suspension of the activities of the Observer Group until further notice.

Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan): In the light of the new facts revealed by the second interim report of the United Nations Observer Group in Lebanon, I should like to elaborate on my statement made yesterday in order to make clear the position of my country.

First of all, it is inappropriate and regrettable indeed that the United States has taken measures to intervene in the dispute in Lebanon by sending its own armed forces to Lebanon while the Security Council is still examining Lebanon's complaint. It is true that the said dispatch of forces was made in response to the request of the Government of Lebanon. However, it cannot be denied that intervention by a State in the disputes of another State could have unfavourable repercussions directly or indirectly, and the Government and the people of my country sincerely hope that the stationing of United States troops in Lebanon will come to an end as soon as possible.

Secondly, a solution to the Lebanese question should, therefore, be sought only through the machinery of the United Nations. The question of the existence of infiltration into Lebanon or of a threat to the security of Lebanon and the

(Mr. Matsudaira, Japan)

measures to be taken on the basis of the existence of such infiltration or threat should be determined by the United Nations; and it is not desirable that one country should take on its own judgement specific measures on these matters without waiting for such determination by the United Nations.

Thirdly, in view of the foregoing, it is necessary that the United Nations should promptly take such practical measures as would enable an early withdrawal of the United States forces which are already in Lebanon. The United Nations should seriously examine the circumstances which have made it necessary for the United States to dispatch its forces to Lebanon and should take such measures as are appropriate to cope with the situation. This would be the only way to prevent deterioration of the present situation. Mere disapproval of the dispatch of forces by the United States would not contribute to a solution of the problem. Speedy and constructive measures are also required in order to maintain the prestige of the United Nations.

(Mr. Matsudaira, Japan)

In concluding, may I state again that my country shares the ardent desire of all friendly nations for peace and stability in the Middle East. We are convinced that the sending of armed forces, as has been done by the United States, would be liable to complicate the situation and would not help to contribute to the attainment of our common objective; however, inasmuch as the dispatch of United States troops is an accomplished fact, we have no other recourse than to seek a prompt withdrawal of the United States forces through the implementation of appropriate measures by the United Nations. It is for these considerations that we would support, with some misgivings, the United States draft resolution which is intended to enable such measures to be taken.

May I add, however, that my delegation is trying to prepare a draft resolution of its own, in an endeavour to contribute to the clarification of the debate.

Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): There were two statements in the speech of the representative of the Soviet Union earlier today on which I am obliged to make a brief comment.

In the first place, Mr. Sobolev appeared to suggest that in some way the British Prime Minister had deceived the British Parliament -- an extraordinary suggestion -- though I confess that I would not expect a representative of the Soviet Union to understand the principles of democratic politics as they are practised in the United Kingdom or our constitutional procedures.

The facts about the appeal for assistance from Jordan are precisely as the Prime Minister stated them in the House of Commons. Moreover, there was no constitutional impropriety, as the representative of the Soviet Union appeared to imply, in the Government's taking decisions during the night and reporting them to Parliament the following day. In our democracy the Government is permanently answerable to Parliament and takes all its decisions in that knowledge. I take exception to the imputation brought by the representative of the Soviet Union against the British Prime Minister and to this unwarrantable incursion into our internal affairs.

(Sir Pierson Dixon, United Kingdom)

Secondly, the representative of the Soviet Union suggested that British action in Jordan was intervention made over the heads of the Government of Jordan for reasons connected with British economic interests in the Middle East. Here again, I would not expect a representative of the Soviet Union to understand the motives for our action. It does not surprise me that a Soviet representative should attribute it to considerations of pure egotism. The United Kingdom Government, faced by an appeal of this kind from any government with which it was in friendly relations, would of course give it the most serious consideration. In the case of the appeal from the Government of Jordan the urgency of that Government's need was so apparent that my Government felt that it could neither refuse to respond to it nor hesitate in its action.

As to the remainder of the speech of the representative of the Soviet Union, it would be useless for me to discuss it point by point since we evidently approach these great issues in international conduct from opposite poles. The same fundamental misunderstanding became apparent in his earlier speeches on the Lebanese complaint. We consider that incitement to revolt and underhand methods of stimulating an opposition to overthrow the legal government to be wrong and dangerous. The Soviet representative appears to believe in it and to applaud it. We want stability and peace and abhor revolution and incitement to revolution. The Soviet representative appears to consider these things the natural state of affairs for the world.

We consider that what has been happening in Lebanon in the last few weeks amounts to outside interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign country. Mr. Sobolev entirely overlooks the original interference from outside, the basis from which the resolution of 11 June implicitly proceeded, and he brands as aggression the steps taken by the United States to supplement the efforts of the United Nations in response to an appeal from the Head of the Lebanese State and the Lebanese Government. The Soviet representative in fact inverts the real position in order to sustain his own complaints. These, I think, will be sufficient reasons to explain why I am in disagreement with the Soviet draft resolution.

(Sir Pierson Dixon, United Kingdom)

As regards the United States draft resolution, S/4050/Rev.1, we have noted with particular interest the proposal that the Secretary-General should immediately consult the Government of Lebanon and other Member States as appropriate, with a view to making arrangements for additional measures, including the contribution and use of contingents as may be necessary, to protect the territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon. We support the United States draft resolution.

We have also been glad to learn from the reports of the Observation Group and the statements of the Secretary-General to the Council that the Group is now in a position to have access to the frontier areas and are planning an expansion of their activities which would certainly place them in a more effective position than they were in the earlier stages of their mission.

I shall need time to reflect on the further statement just made by the representative of Sweden and on the draft resolution which he introduced in document S/4054. At first sight his proposal, which we have this moment seen, does not accord with my own conception of the role, the important role, which we visualize for the United Nations Observation Group. But any observation, any proposal from the Government of Sweden merits meticulous attention, and it would only be consonant with our special and cordial relations with Sweden that we should take time to give its proposal the necessary consideration.

We have also heard from the representative of Japan that he is preparing a draft resolution. We shall study this with interest and due attention when he submits it for our consideration.

Mr. ABBASS (Iraq): I would have preferred not to speak at all on this occasion. As a matter of fact, I did not even prepare a speech. The issues are clear to me and they did not merit much argumentation and waste of time. Besides, I have no taste for sarcasm and no desire to indulge in accusations and counter-accusations. The times are too grave for such indulgences. I believe in the decency and cleanliness of diplomatic language, especially in such an illustrious gathering.

However, some remarks by several of the representatives here made it necessary for me to say a few words in clarification. Both the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic have made the contention that the Arab Union no longer exists. I submit that the Arab Union is a federation constituted according to a written constitution ratified by the duly elected Parliaments of both Jordan and Iraq. I hold here that the recent events in Iraq do not override any constitutional procedure. As a matter of fact, the Constitution of the Union itself shows the manner in which the Union and the Constitution could be modified or changed. This is why I maintain that no change has taken place and that the Arab Union as a constitutional entity still exists.

My second point is the following. There were insinuations that the recent events of rendering friendly help to Jordan and Lebanon might lead in some way to some designs of aggression from Jordan against Iraq. The argument is clear. No question of aggression could arise between Jordan and Iraq. They are parts of the same Union. This is out of the question.

I come to another point which was very much contested here, and that is the right of independent States to seek the help of friendly Governments in order to maintain their independence and territorial integrity. I submit with humility that more than fifteen years ago I taught my students at the School of Law in Baghdad that the legally constituted Governments of independent States have the inherent right to ask for and receive help from friendly States, and that that in no way would infringe on their sovereignty. As a matter of fact, there are so many sovereign States, whose sovereignty is not questioned at all, who have foreign troops stationed on their territory through friendly arrangements.

(Mr. Abbass, Iraq)

I also note with satisfaction the declaration of both the representative of the United States and the representative of the United Kingdom that the friendly help they are rendering to the legally constituted Government of friendly States will be terminated and their troops immediately withdrawn when the United Nations takes effective measures to safeguard the independence and territorial integrity of the friendly Powers who sought their help. However, I would like to add that at this moment I would like to call upon both the United States and the United Kingdom to make a declaration in this gathering that the forces sent at the request of the friendly Governments of independent States would withdraw immediately when the legally constituted Governments of the States concerned would indicate clearly that they are no longer needed.

I know that this could be inferred from the statements of both delegations. Yet, I would like to put it on record that I call again for a very clear and unequivocal statement that the forces sent at the request of the friendly Governments of Lebanon and Jordan will be withdrawn, and without prejudice to the action of the United Nations, when the legally constituted Governments of Lebanon and Jordan would indicate to our friends that they are no longer needed.

Mr. TOUKAN (Jordan): I should like to make a few remarks regarding some of the statements made by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic. Mr. Sobolev said that British troops were sent into Jordan apparently at the request of King Hussein. This was also repeated by the representative of the United Arab Republic. I should like to make it clear that the British troops landed in Jordan not only at the request of the King but also at the request of the Government of Jordan, with the approval of His Majesty King Hussein, and in accordance with the unanimous decision of the Jordan National Assembly.

The representative of the Soviet Union went on to say that it was the British Intelligence that was responsible for uncovering the attempt by the United Arab Republic to overthrow the regime in Jordan, just as has happened in Iraq. I should like to inform the Soviet representative as well as the representative of the United Arab Republic that the number of attempted coups d'état that occurred in Jordan, starting in April last year, and adding the most recent attempt which was supposed to take place simultaneously with that in Iraq, plus the movement of United Arab Republic troops on the northern Jordan borders, are sufficient in themselves to prove the threat that forced Jordan to seek aid urgently from the United Kingdom and the United States of America, using the right of nations embodied in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which gives States full right to ask for help for the defence of their sovereignty and independence if threatened by aggression.

As for the statements made by the representative of the United Arab Republic, I think that he himself knows deep in his heart the truth about his country's subversive activities in Jordan, so that what he has told us here might not be all that is in his mind. The representative of the United Arab Republic is fully aware of what Jordan and the King of Jordan went through in order to achieve full independence and freedom. He also knows full well that Jordan and its King were the first to come to the aid of Egypt when that country was subjected to aggression in 1956. Jordan is still the same and the King of Jordan is still the same King. So how can the United Arab Republic's representative say that Jordan was placing herself again under the yoke of imperialism? No, Jordan will never be dominated again, not by anyone. But the sad experiences

(Mr. Toukan, Jordan)

which Jordan has gone through and the attempt after attempt of the United Arab Republic to create a situation in Jordan not dissimilar to that in Lebanon and in Iraq, as well as the movement of troops across our borders in the north, have forced us to use our right, and full right, of self-defence provided for in Article 51 of the Charter.

As to what was said by the representative of the United Arab Republic and the representative of the Soviet Union regarding the dissolution of the Arab Union, I will limit myself now to endorsing fully the statement made by the representative of Iraq.

This is the whole truth of why we asked for help from both the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

Mr. LODGE (United States): I will not take the time of the Council to reply to the Soviet Union's latest attack on the United States, which recently have been coming at the rate of one a day. It is an all too typical Soviet Communist offering, and uses the stale, old-fashioned phrases which Soviet Communists have been using for generations. For example, it refers to what it calls American monopolies, yet it is an undisputed fact that monopoly has been against the law in the United States for more than fifty years, and our anti-monopoly laws are vigorously enforced by our Department of Justice. Indeed, I might say parenthetically, that the Soviet Union consists of monopolies of all kinds, dealing with all forms of activity. Indeed, it, in itself, is a huge monopoly. The only interesting thing about the Soviet speech is what it left out, which is the desire of the United States, expressed many times by me in the last few days, to withdraw from Lebanon as soon as the United Nations can take over. That is the important thing and that is what he did not talk about.

The inclusion of this statement in Mr. Sobolev's speech, would, I realize, have been bad propaganda from a Soviet viewpoint, but it is the truth, nonetheless, and some day the Soviet Union will learn that the truth is the best propaganda, that in the end the truth is mighty and will prevail.

Now I would like to make the formal motion that the United States resolution be given priority over the Soviet resolution, at whatever time the voting may commence, whether today or tomorrow.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I cannot pass over in silence one statement which Mr. Lodge has been repeating day in and day out. This contention is that the Government of the United States is burning with desire to withdraw its troops from Lebanon. But the question arises, who prevents them from doing so? Why cannot the American troops, today, tomorrow perhaps at the latest, be withdrawn from Lebanon? What stops them from being withdrawn? When they came to Lebanon, they did not ask the opinion of the United Nations whether they should go there or not. The sanction of the United Nations for the introduction of American troops into Lebanon was not requested. Why then do they need the sanction of the United Nations to withdraw them? It would seem that an order on the part of President Eisenhower would suffice, and the matter would be settled. However,

there has been as yet no such order on the part of President Eisenhower, and therefore we may be forgiven if we doubt the sincerity of the Government of the United States, when it states its readiness to withdraw its troops from Lebanon as soon as possible.

In this connexion, I think it might be appropriate to uncover one fallacy which is being repeatedly stated here in the Council by the representative of the United States, and which is being persistently injected into the debate here. It is being repeated by some other representatives -- and here I am referring specifically to the representative of France. It is the contention to the effect that the United Nations was not concerned with the position of Lebanon until now. In the draft resolution of the United States, there is a paragraph which says:

"Noting further the statement of the representative of the United States that the United States Force will remain in Lebanon only until the United Nations itself is able to assume the necessary responsibility to ensure the continued independence of Lebanon."

This is the last paragraph of the preamble. I would invite you to ponder this statement: "The troops of the United States will remain in Lebanon until the United Nations itself is able to assume the necessary responsibility to ensure the continued independence of Lebanon."

It would follow from this statement that the United Nations hitherto has not done anything about Lebanon, and that it has not assumed any responsibility in regard to Lebanon. But that is not so. That is contrary to what happened just a few days ago in this very Council -- something with which the whole world is au courant.

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

Let us recall the facts. There was a specific complaint by Lebanon to the Security Council. The Council considered this complaint. The Council did not decide anything with regard to the substance of that complaint, but it assumed responsibility for the situation in Lebanon by sending a group of observers there. Is that not so? Of course it is so.

The Security Council, one of the main organs of the United Nations, assumed responsibility in Lebanon and sent a group of observers there with definite powers and functions in the belief that this measure would secure such a settlement of the situation in Lebanon which would accord with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. That is how I understand the situation.

Why are we then suddenly told now that until the United Nations assumes the necessary responsibility United States troops will remain? Mr. Lodge, I submit that the United Nations has already assumed responsibility in Lebanon with the agreement, incidentally, of the United States because the representative of the United States voted in favour of the resolution under which the Security Council assumed definite responsibility over the situation in Lebanon.

The trouble is that the United States chose to ignore this responsibility of the United Nations and took unilateral action which is not only counter to the decision of the Security Council in this question of Lebanon, but is also a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. That is something which, I think, has to stay firmly anchored in the record.

The Swedish delegation has now moved a draft resolution (S/4054) which, in essence, says:

"Considering that the action now taken by the United States Government has substantially altered the conditions under which the Security Council decided on 11 June 1958 to send observers to Lebanon,

"Requests the Secretary-General to suspend the activities of the observers in Lebanon until further notice."

In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, the Swedish proposal is completely justified by the present state of affairs. This proposal is both appropriate and timely. Indeed the retention of United Nations observers under the present conditions when United States troops are in Lebanon would be a tacit covering-up

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

by the United Nations of the armed intervention on the part of the United States in the domestic affairs of Lebanon. It is obvious that the Security Council cannot countenance such a situation. The Swedish delegation acted quite correctly in moving now that the action of United Nations observers be temporarily suspended. We will therefore vote in favour of the Swedish draft resolution.

We consider that the Secretary-General of the United Nations will also have to draw appropriate conclusions regarding the activities of the United Nations Observation Group following the arrival of United States troops in Lebanon. We assume that his conclusions will not differ from those which the delegation of Sweden arrived at.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Speaking about the Swedish draft resolution, the distinguished delegate of the Soviet Union said, if I understood him correctly, that he supposed that my conclusions, as to the future work and position of the Observation Group, would be substantially the same as those of the Swedish Government. I do not know exactly on what assumptions that supposition was based. I think I put in black and white my views on that very question both in the initial statement at the morning meeting of the Council yesterday and in the covering note to the additional interim report from the Observation Group which was circulated today. The Council will remember that in that covering note I fully endorsed the proposal of the Observation Group.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the remarks which the Secretary-General just made, I must perhaps say this is the result of translation problems. I did not say that the Secretary-General had reached the same conclusions as the Government of Sweden. I expressed the hope that the Secretary-General would arrive at his conclusions from the situation which has arisen in Lebanon, and I expressed the hope that his conclusions would not differ considerably from the conclusions at which the Government of Sweden has already arrived.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): There are still five names on my list of speakers. Furthermore, a new draft resolution has been submitted and we have news of yet another which is now being drafted.

Accordingly, on the basis of a request from several members of the Council, I should like to propose that we now adjourn, thus giving all members of the Council the opportunity to talk over the new draft proposals which are before us and any which may be presented subsequently. This would indeed meet the convenience of the delegation of Colombia, for example, which learned only this afternoon of the Swedish draft resolution and does not yet know what will be contained in the draft resolution which we understand is being prepared by the Japanese delegation. I would suggest that we adjourn now and meet again tomorrow morning at 10.30.

Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): I understand that among the names included in the list of speakers are the names of the representative of Lebanon and myself, the representative of Panama. As I understand that the statement of the representative of Lebanon would not be interpreted consecutively and as I intend to be extremely brief, I wonder, Mr President, whether you would consider continuing this meeting and allowing me to make a very brief statement after we have listened to the representative of Lebanon.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): In the presentation of an adjournment motion in connexion with this particular meeting, the President had requested the representative of the United Kingdom to be good enough to postpone until tomorrow's meeting the statement that he wished to make concerning the statement that was made by the representative of Iraq. Therefore, if the representative of Panama has no objection, we could continue the meeting but first, of course, we would listen to the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom who wishes to make a brief statement, then we would listen to the representative of Panama and then adjourn the meeting.

Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I am grateful to you for your permission and to the Council for its indulgence, which allows me to intervene very briefly to answer a point raised by the representative of Iraq this evening.

After recognizing that the action of the United Kingdom in responding to the request for assistance which it had received from the Government of Jordan had been fully justified, the representative then asked, if I understood him correctly, that for the purpose of the record I should give a clear declaration that Her Majesty's Government would withdraw its troops if the legally-constituted Government of Jordan requested it to do so. I can, of course, make unequivocally the declaration for which the representative of Iraq has asked.

Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): My country, like all the republics of Latin America, has the greatest of faith in the work of the United Nations in connexion with the maintenance of peace and security in the world. Therefore, in these very difficult and critical times in the history of humanity, a peaceful solution to this dramatic crisis in the Near East requires from all of the statesmen of the world from all the Powers -- great and small -- ~~that~~ the greatest of efforts should be made so that we might be able to solve this problem and avoid another international conflict which would have the most terrible consequences for the world in the political and economic fields. For these reasons and for many other reasons, we sincerely hope that every possible effort will be made to strengthen the United Nations because on the United Nations, ~~on~~ this noble Organization depends not only peace and international security, but also the survival of humanity.

The delegation of Panama will vote in favour of any action which tends to strengthen the United Nations and which helps to sustain the noble ideals of the United Nations. Therefore, tonight, we raise our voices in the hope that we shall find a solution to the problem of the Middle East within the framework of the United Nations Charter and in conformity with its principles and purposes.

(Mr. Illueca, Panama)

The delegation of Panama takes this opportunity to declare its regret that this very grave situation in the Near East has required an urgent measure to be taken by a friendly Power. Nevertheless, the delegation of Panama feels that paragraph 3 of the operative part of the United States draft resolution in its original form (S/4050), which has now become paragraph 2 of the revised United States draft resolution (S/4050/Rev.1) would place the United Nations in the position of being able to take efficient measures for the establishment of peace in the Middle East and would restore the confidence of the world in the United Nations as far as the maintenance of peace and security in the world is concerned.

If we carry out the request contained in paragraph 2 of the operative part of this draft resolution, it would lead to an immediate withdrawal of United States troops in Lebanon and would leave the whole of the situation fully in the hands of the United Nations. It is with this understanding that the delegation of Panama has decided to offer its approval and vote to the United States draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Security Council will meet again tomorrow at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 10.25 p.m.