

Soviet position was supported by the Cuban representative, who had been invited to participate in the Council discussions. Milder criticism of United States action in the Dominican Republic was expressed by the representatives of France, Uruguay, Jordan and the Ivory Coast.

In his initial reply to these charges, the United States representative referred to the request to safeguard American lives, stated that Communist leaders had taken control of what was initially a democratic movement and declared that the American nations would not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western hemisphere. He also gave assurances that, in accordance with Article 54 of the Charter, the United States would keep the Council fully informed of the measures taken in relation to the Dominican crisis. The United States received varying degrees of support from China, Britain and Bolivia.

Shortly after the landing of United States troops, the Organization of American States initiated efforts to obtain a settlement of the crisis, including the dispatch of its Secretary-General to Santo Domingo and the establishment of an Inter-American Peace Force, to which a number of OAS members, including the United States, contributed. The United States representative maintained before the Council that the measures taken by the United States in conjunction with the OAS were consistent with the purpose and letter of the United Nations Charter and particularly with Article 33, which calls upon the parties to any dispute which threatens international peace and security to seek first a solution by peaceful means, including "resort to regional agencies or arrangements". He also reminded the Council of the provisions of Article 52, which specifically recognizes the role of regional agencies in the settlement of local disputes. In supporting the policy of the United States, he insisted that the Inter-American Peace Force was maintaining an attitude of strict impartiality in the civil conflict. These statements were sharply disputed by the Soviet and Cuban representatives, who claimed that United States and OAS policies in Santo Domingo constituted enforcement action and were therefore illegal, as such action could not be taken without the authorization of the Security Council.

Representatives of the Government of Colonel Caamano and of the Government of General Imbert, the opposing factions, were invited to present their views to the Security Council on the Dominican crisis. The Security Council treated both factions on an equal footing and declined to pass judgment on their competing claims to represent formally the Dominican Republic in the United Nations.

Debate on the respective peace-keeping responsibilities of the United Nations and the OAS in the Dominican Republic became more heated fol-