

area. As we have reason believe any Aramco entry into disputed area would be at point remote from area British operations and probably be of a few days duration we feel British parties should ignore presence Aramco. Furthermore, should entry take place we believe it possible arrange via Aramco that Saudi guards accompanying Aramco party be unarmed and in such event we would hope British parties would likewise be unarmed. ⁵

DULLES

⁴ At 2:37 p. m. on the same day the Department of State received telegram 184 from Dhahran, May 22, not printed. It informed the Department that Aramco had received a confirmed request from the Saudi Arabian Government on that date to send its work parties into the disputed area. The Consulate General did not know if Saudi Arabian military guards would go with the party, but expected them to do so. (886A.2553/5-2254)

Telegram 200 to Dhahran, sent at 1:33 a. m., May 23, not printed, repeated as 6285 to London and 327 to Jidda, instructed the Consulate General to seek a delay of at least 5 days in the departure of the Aramco party. It also requested the Embassy in London to act on telegram 6277 with all possible speed. (780.022/5-2354)

No. 1564

780.022/5-2454: Telegram

*The Ambassador in the United Kingdom (Aldrich) to the
Department of State* ¹

SECRET PRIORITY

LONDON, May 24, 1954--7 p. m.

5314. Butterworth took Hoover with him to see Permanent Under Secretary Kirkpatrick and represented the considerations contained Department 6277 ² as amended by pertinent part of Deptel 6285. ³ There ensued a discussion which lasted for more than an hour during which Kirkpatrick reviewed the history of the Buraimi dispute emphasizing particularly that Saudi Arabia had continuously extended its territorial claims and that the 1949 line was only put forward after Aramco had obtained information of the likely discovery of oil by the British companies which had been operating since 1936 although suspended during the war. Kirkpatrick vehemently rejected suggestion that IPC should suspend operations on the grounds that the territory was not technically in dispute. He drew the distinction that the territory was merely claimed by Saudi Arabia and was strictly speaking not a disputed area at all. He made it quite clear that if only for reasons of pres-

¹ Repeated to Jidda and Dhahran.

² *Supra*.

³ Not printed, but see footnote 5, *supra*.