

UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

S/4079
5 August 1958
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

LETTER DATED 5 AUGUST 1958 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF
THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS ADDRESSED TO
THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

On the instructions of the Soviet Government I am sending you herewith the texts of messages dated 5 August 1958 from Mr. N.S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, in reply to the messages sent on 31 July 1958 by Mr. Harold Macmillan, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and by Mr. Charles A. de Gaulle, President of the Council of Ministers of France, and to the message sent on 1 August 1958 by Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America.

I should be grateful if you would have these texts circulated as United Nations documents to all the States Members of the United Nations.

(Signed) A. SOBOLEV
Permanent Representative of the
USSR to the United Nations

MESSAGE FROM MR. N.S. KHRUSHCHEV, CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL
OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR, ADDRESSED TO MR. H. MACMILLAN,
PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

Moscow, 5 August 1958

Sir,

On 31 July, I received your reply to my message of 28 July concerning the situation now prevailing in the Near and Middle East.

In previous messages from the Soviet Government we gave factual proof that it is the armed intervention of the United States and of the United Kingdom in Lebanon and Jordan that has brought about a situation dangerous to peace in the Near and Middle East. Accordingly, the assertion in your message that the Soviet Government's appraisal of the measures taken by the United Kingdom and by the United States Governments has no foundation in fact is completely at variance with the true state of affairs.

In your message of 31 July, you claim that you still adhere to the position set out in your message of 22 July concerning a meeting of heads of Governments to discuss the situation in the Near and Middle East and that you have never departed from this proposal. We cannot agree with this, however, since what you proposed in your message of 26 July and what you are proposing now amounts to a refusal to support a meeting of heads of Governments which the United Kingdom Government previously advocated.

You are now proposing to call a meeting of the Security Council for this purpose, and not a meeting of heads of Governments. The whole world is aware, however, that the Security Council, which has had the situation in Lebanon and Jordan under discussion for a considerable time, has not yet been able to take effective measures to solve this problem.

The wish of the Governments of the United States and of the United Kingdom to steer the discussion of the situation in the Near and Middle East into this channel of fruitless debate is particularly evident from the message Mr. Eisenhower addressed to me on 1 August, in which the President of the United States quite unequivocally speaks of discussing this question at a regular meeting of the Security Council.

With regard to your reference to the possibility of arranging "less formal" meetings of heads of Governments, it is obvious from the aforementioned message

from Mr. Eisenhower that the United States Government will not even admit the possibility of a meeting of heads of Governments which would not take the form of a regular meeting of the Security Council, although it is well known that the existing state of affairs in the Security Council, in which the majority of its members are States participating in aggressive blocs and the great People's Republic of China is not represented, makes it impossible for this body to reach objective conclusions on the question of foreign armed intervention in the countries of the Arab East.

Since the very start of the United States and United Kingdom intervention in the Near and Middle East, the Soviet Union has advocated the adoption of immediate measures to check the aggression, to secure the withdrawal of foreign forces from Lebanon and Jordan, to prevent the intervention from spreading and to eliminate the dangerous tension caused by the actions of the United Kingdom and the United States. To that end, the Soviet Government proposed to call a meeting of the heads of the Governments of the five Powers, the USSR, the United Kingdom, the United States, France and India, in which the Secretary-General of the United Nations would take part.

We regret that you and the President of the United States have not found it possible to accept this proposal and that you continue to insist that the situation in the Near and Middle East should, as heretofore, be considered in the Security Council, a body which is not in a position to solve the problem objectively. A positive decision has not therefore been taken on calling a meeting of the heads of the Governments of the five Powers with the participation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Although the Governments of the United Kingdom and of the United States have made it impossible to convene a meeting of the five Powers and are directly responsible for this state of affairs, it is now clearly apparent that the demands of the peoples for the immediate convening of such a meeting in order to end the armed intervention in Jordan and Lebanon and the determination of peace-loving States to halt aggression in the Near and Middle East have forced those who embarked on this armed intervention to refrain at the present juncture from planning any extension of aggression to other countries and primarily to the Republic of Iraq and the United Arab Republic.

It is no accident, therefore, that the Western Powers, including the United Kingdom and the United States, have been obliged to recognize the Republic of Iraq, whose establishment the aggressors originally alleged to be a threat to peace in the Near and Middle East.

This does not mean, however, that the danger of the extension and aggravation of the conflict in that area has been eliminated or that the security of the Republic of Iraq and the other Arab States has been ensured. The forces of the interventionists have not yet been withdrawn from Jordan and Lebanon. Furthermore, fresh contingents of foreign troops are arriving in that area and further military measures are being taken in the countries of the Baghdad Pact. The question of the complete cessation of armed intervention in the Near and Middle East and of the establishment of conditions which would protect the peoples of that area against foreign intervention still calls for speedy settlement.

The foreign forces must be withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan without delay, as their presence there constitutes a continuing threat to the peace and independence of the peoples concerned and a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, which cannot be condoned by any State Member of the United Nations.

In these circumstances, the Soviet Government considers it essential to pursue its efforts to maintain and strengthen peace in the Near and Middle East. Since the Governments of the United Kingdom and of the United States have abandoned the idea of calling a meeting of the heads of the Governments of the five Powers and since, as we have already pointed out, the Security Council has shown itself unable to achieve a peaceful solution of the problem of the Near and Middle East, the Government of the Soviet Union, with a view to ensuring that the necessary steps to halt aggression are taken without delay, has instructed its representative to the United Nations to request the convening of a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to discuss the question of the withdrawal of United Kingdom forces from Jordan and United States forces from Lebanon.

The Soviet Government hopes that consideration of this question in the General Assembly, where large and small States alike are represented, will make it possible to find means of removing the military danger that has arisen in the Near and Middle East as a result of the actions of the United Kingdom and the United States and will bring tranquillity to that region.

I think you will agree with me, Sir, that the events in the Near and Middle East, which have confronted the world with the threat of general war with all the untold miseries it would inflict upon the peoples lend particular urgency to the question of establishing conditions for the peaceful co-existence of States and for putting an end to the "cold war" which is poisoning the whole international atmosphere. The Soviet Union and all peace-loving countries are working for the day when no great Power will be able to commit aggression, even against a small country.

It is therefore essential that the great Powers should agree to refrain from any action which would lead mankind to the brink of military catastrophe. We consider that all possible steps should be taken to develop contacts and relations between the statesmen of all countries. Personal meetings between the leaders of States can lessen the existing tension, promote the growth of confidence and mutual understanding among States and hasten the thawing of the ice of the "cold war". The Soviet Government attaches particular importance to such contacts and, as you know, it proposed as early as December 1957 that a meeting of statesmen should be convened at the highest level.

We are convinced that, given the efforts of all participants, a summit meeting, with the composition we proposed earlier would help to find ways and means to banish the "cold war" and to make the outbreak of a shooting war impossible. Let us do everything in our power to see that such a meeting, for which all the peoples of the world are waiting, is not postponed indefinitely.

We await your agreement to our proposal for a summit meeting and are prepared to take part in such a meeting at any time. It is in the interests of all States, great and small, that a summit meeting should be convened at the earliest opportunity.

In conclusion, I should like to express the hope that the United Kingdom Government will support the proposal to convene a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which might be a useful step towards the relaxation of tension and would pave the way for a summit meeting at an earlier date.

I have the honour to be, etc.,

(Signed) N. KHRUSHCHEV

MESSAGE FROM MR. N.S. KHRUSHCHEV, CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF
MINISTERS OF THE USSR, ADDRESSED TO MR. CHARLES DE GAULLE,
PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF FRANCE

Moscow, 5 August 1958

Sir,

In your message in reply to my letter to you of 28 July you state that the French Government agrees to the Soviet Government's proposal to convene a meeting of the heads of Governments to consider the situation in the Near and Middle East.

We are compelled to note that neither Mr. Eisenhower, the President of the United States, nor Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, agree to a meeting of the heads of Governments of the five Powers to consider this question; they propose a meeting of the Security Council. In these circumstances, we are now faced with the fact that there is no agreement among the great Powers concerning a meeting of the heads of Governments. As a result of the policy followed by the United States with the support of the United Kingdom and certain other countries, the Security Council in its present form has so far proved incapable of discharging its function of suppressing armed aggression in the Near and Middle East.

From the very outset the Soviet Union condemned the United States aggression against Lebanon and the United Kingdom aggression against Jordan, warned of the impending threat of intervention against Iraq and other countries of the Arab East and proposed an immediate meeting of the heads of the Governments of the USSR, France, the United States, the United Kingdom and India with the participation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations with a view to taking prompt action to eliminate the situation that has arisen in the Near and Middle East, which constitutes a danger to peace.

Although the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have made it impossible to convene a meeting of the five Powers, it is now clearly apparent that the demands of the peoples for the immediate convening of such a meeting in order to end the armed intervention in Lebanon and Jordan and the determination of peace-loving States to halt aggression in the Near and Middle East

/...

have forced those who embarked on this armed intervention to refrain at the present juncture from extending their aggression to other countries and primarily to the Republic of Iraq and the United Arab Republic. It is no accident, therefore, that the Western Powers, including the United States and the United Kingdom, have been obliged to recognize the Republic of Iraq, whose establishment the aggressors originally alleged to be a threat to peace in the Near and Middle East.

This does not mean, however, that the danger of the extension and aggravation of the conflict in that area has been eliminated or that the security of Iraq and the other Arab States has been ensured. As you are aware, the armed forces of the aggressors have not yet been withdrawn from either Lebanon or Jordan. Furthermore, both the United States and the United Kingdom are continuing to build up their armed forces in this region and further military measures are being taken in the countries of the Baghdad Pact.

The question of the complete cessation of armed intervention in the Near and Middle East and of the establishment of conditions which would protect the peoples of that area from foreign intervention still calls for speedy settlement. The foreign forces must be withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan without delay, as their presence there constitutes a continuing threat to the peace and independence of the peoples concerned and a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter which cannot be condoned by a single Member of the United Nations. Accordingly, the Soviet Union categorically insists that these forces should be withdrawn forthwith from the aforementioned countries. This demand has the support of all peace-loving peoples.

A situation has arisen in which, as experience has shown and as you yourself are aware, the Security Council has proved unable to deal with the problem of eliminating armed conflict in the Near and Middle East and we cannot reach agreement on a meeting of the heads of Governments to settle this question because of the negative attitude taken by the United States and the United Kingdom. How can this situation be solved? The Soviet Union considers that a special session of the United Nations General Assembly must be convened to consider and settle the question of the immediate withdrawal of United States forces from Lebanon and of United Kingdom forces from Jordan.

The Soviet Government has, therefore, instructed its Permanent Representative to the United Nations to request that a special session of the United Nations General Assembly should be convened to discuss this question. The Soviet Government hopes that its consideration in the General Assembly, where large and small States alike are represented, will make it possible to find means of removing the military danger that has arisen in the Near and Middle East as a result of the actions of the United States and the United Kingdom and will bring tranquillity to that region.

I think, Sir, you will agree with me that the events in the Near and Middle East, which have confronted the world with the threat of general war with all the untold miseries it would inflict upon the peoples, lend particular urgency to the question of establishing conditions for the peaceful co-existence of States and for putting an end to the "cold war" which is poisoning the whole international atmosphere. The Soviet Union and all peace-loving countries are working for the day when no great Power will be able to commit aggression, even against a small country. With this end in view the great Powers should agree to refrain from any action which would lead mankind to the brink of military catastrophe.

The Soviet Government considers that all possible steps should be taken to develop contacts and relations between the statesmen of all countries. Personal meetings between the leaders of States can lessen **the existing tension**, promote the growth of confidence and mutual understanding between States and has been the thawing of the ice of the "cold war". We attach particular importance to such contacts and, as you know, as early as December 1957, we proposed that a meeting of statesmen should be convened at the highest level. We are convinced that given the efforts of all participants, such a summit meeting, with the composition we proposed earlier, would help to find ways and means to banish the cold war and to make the outbreak of a shooting war impossible.

Let us do everything in our power to see that such meeting, for which all the peoples of the world are waiting, is not postponed indefinitely. We await your agreement to our proposal for a summit meeting and are prepared to take part in such a meeting at any time. It is in the interests of all States, great and small, that a summit meeting should be convened at the earliest opportunity.

/...

In conclusion, I should like to express the hope that the French Government will support the proposal to convene a special session of the United Nations General Assembly, which might be a useful step towards the relaxation of tension and would pave the way for a summit meeting at an early date.

I have the honour to be, etc.

(Signed) N. KHRUSHCHEV

MESSAGE FROM MR. N.S. KHRUSHCHEV, CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF
MINISTERS OF THE USSR, ADDRESSED TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Moscow, 5 August 1958

Sir,

I have received your message of 1 August. I fully agree with the views you express regarding the value of personal correspondence between heads of Governments. In present circumstances it is essential that such personal correspondence should contribute to the fundamental objective of the peoples - the preservation of peace and peaceful co-existence between States irrespective of their social systems.

I also agree with you that our present correspondence is unusual. I should like to make it quite clear that this unusual correspondence is the result of the unusual steps which the United States and the United Kingdom have taken in the Near and Middle East. The United States and the United Kingdom have committed a breach of the peace in that area by invading Lebanon and Jordan with their forces.

You refer in your message to the need to seek the assistance of the United Nations and the Security Council in the situation which has developed in the Near and Middle East. You rightly say that the United Nations was created out of the travail of World War II. As we all know mankind's hopes for the maintenance of peace are bound up with the work of the United Nations and its Security Council, which bears the principal responsibility for the maintenance of peace throughout the world.

It was precisely because it recognized this function of the United Nations that the Soviet Government, at the very start of the aggression against the Arab countries by the United States and the United Kingdom, submitted a proposal to the Security Council that the forces of the interventionists should be withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan and that a special session of the General Assembly should be called on this question. However, the United States, the United Kingdom and some other countries which are currently members of the Security Council prevented the Council from taking a decision designed to restore the situation in the Near and Middle East to normal. Frankly, it must be recognized that the policy pursued by the United States, which is supported by the United Kingdom and, unfortunately, by certain other States, is in fact undermining this international Organization

/...

and making the Security Council powerless to discharge its functions. Examples are not far to seek. Did not the United States order its forces to invade Lebanon, in disregard of the Security Council? Do you deny that the United States Government, by landing its forces, presented the Security Council with a fait accompli? Can such acts be said to strengthen the United Nations or the Security Council?

If we consider the present composition of the Security Council, we are forced to conclude that, under pressure from the United States, this organ has in effect developed into a sort of committee which is mainly composed of countries belonging to NATO, the Baghdad Pact and SEATO and on which the seat of the lawful representative of the great Chinese People's Republic is occupied by the representative of Chiang Kai-shek, a political ghost.

The policy of ignoring the People's Republic of China does not make sense. This great Power exists, is growing and is developing, whether certain States recognize it or not. If common sense prevailed and the Chinese People's Republic took its rightful place in the United Nations, this would be duly appreciated by all peoples, for the peoples understand that without the Chinese People's Republic the Security Council and the United Nations cannot be the fully effective organ for preserving peace and security which the United Nations Charter requires.

Thus a situation has arisen in which the Security Council is virtually paralysed and is unable to take any decision which would effectively promote the preservation of peace throughout the world, independently of the will of the United States of America.

I have no wish to engage in an argument with you at this stage. Nevertheless, I cannot ignore some assertions in your message which distort the Soviet Union's foreign policy and aims. You allege, for example, that the Soviet Union has imposed its political domination over the countries of Eastern Europe. This assertion does not of course surprise us, but it is utterly groundless. We have already heard all this more than once from Mr. Dulles, the United States Secretary of State. Such assertions, however, will gain no conviction from frequent repetition. The peoples of Eastern Europe have freely chosen their present way of life and will allow no-one to change it. You have made repeated references

/...

to your support for the small nations. To be consistent, however, you should recognize in practice that peoples have the right to take independent decisions and to establish whatever form of government best serves their interests. In practice, however, this is not the case. Whenever a change occurs anywhere which upsets the state of affairs convenient to the United States Government, you represent this change as something brought about, not by the will of the peoples, but by the will of someone else.

But it is surely impossible to close one's eyes to the fact that we are living in an era of great revolutionary changes, an era in which the structure of society is being reorganized on new foundations. This movement, which originated in the Soviet Union, is now assuming increasingly wide proportions. It has extended to China, the countries of Eastern Europe, North Korea and North Viet-Nam. At the same time the peoples of many countries in Asia and Africa, who have been subjected to harsh oppression by the imperialist Powers, have won their national independence in a struggle against oppressors, both alien and indigenous. The peoples of various other countries on these continents are locked in a struggle for national liberation and there is no doubt that they will win the day; no foreign colonizers' bayonets can prevent this, for the era of colonialism is over. Such is the inevitable course of history; such is the will of the people.

No State which is genuinely concerned to protect the independence and security of the small countries can arrogate to itself the right to intervene in those countries' affairs and proclaim this or that "doctrine" with such an end in view. This being so, however, what is the justification for the proclamation by the United States Government of the doctrine which bears your name and for its intervention in the affairs of the countries of the Near and Middle East? For example, when the people of Lebanon, incensed at the policy of its President who had become the servant of the United States of America instead of the servant of his own people, demanded his removal, that President, who had lost his people's confidence, only had to appeal to you, in violation of his country's Constitution, for the United States Government to set the United States Sixth Fleet in motion, to throw its assault units into Lebanon, and to begin introducing "order" there

in accordance with the aforementioned doctrine, The United Kingdom Government headed by Mr. Macmillan used an appeal by the King of Jordan, who has no following whatever among his people, as a pretext for intervention by its armed forces in Jordan's domestic affairs.

There are still those in the United States of America who boast of the fact that the United States Government intervened in the affairs of Guatemala and expelled the lawfully elected Government and President. Surely this is not another illustration of what you mean by concern for small countries and respect for their independence and dignity?

If this is so, Mr. President, our ideas evidently differ regarding the rights of the small nations. In the generally accepted language of politics, such actions on the part of the United States Government constitute a violation of the rights of the small nations and the imposition on them of its own domination, against which the peoples of all countries whose independence is infringed by the United States of America and the United Kingdom are waging an unremitting struggle.

If we were to quote other similar instances, without even going far back into the past - the very recent landing of United States troops in Cuba is a case in point - we should have a great deal to say, and our message would be much lengthier.

I am compelled to refer to your assessment of events in the Near and Middle East. You assert that the problem of the Middle East is not one of aggression by the United States but rather of indirect aggression. The fact that you refer to indirect aggression of some kind, Mr. President, means that, in common with us and the overwhelming majority of other countries, you apparently regard the introduction of foreign troops into the territory of others as an act of direct aggression. This is not open to question. That is why, throughout the world, the introduction of United States troops into Lebanon and United Kingdom troops into Jordan is rightly regarded as direct aggression. With regard to the allusions in your message to some sort of indirect aggression, reference to such an imaginary danger can only be regarded as an attempt to mask the direct aggression of the United States.

And indeed the allegations of indirect aggression threatening Lebanon are refuted by the two well-known reports of the United Nations observers specially sent to Lebanon by the Security Council.

In these circumstances, Mr. President, we do not understand by what right the United States Government assumes the mantle of the arbiter and judge, and maintains that there has been some kind of indirect aggression in Lebanon. It is evident from this that you do not recognize the right of the peoples of the Near and Middle East to handle their own affairs and to organize their States along lines which serve their own interests. Thus, Mr. President, you are guilty of direct contradiction of your own assertions concerning regard for the desires, the dignity and the security of the smaller countries.

The whole world knows that domestic events in Lebanon, Iraq and Jordan reflect the wrath of the peoples of those countries, who have revolted against the system imposed on them by the imperialist colonizers. In Iraq the people rebelled when they could no longer endure the oppression and excesses of the lackeys of foreign States. Now the United States and other Western Powers have recognized the Republican Government of Iraq. Hence you, Mr. President, and your allies have recognized that the Iraqi people have the right to change the existing order.

Thus your assertions about some form of indirect aggression are wholly without foundation, and merely divert attention from the real aggression in the Near and Middle East which was committed by the United States and the United Kingdom.

We regret, Mr. President, that you do not agree to the holding of a meeting of heads of Governments at Moscow, and that you referred in this connexion to the angry demonstration by the inhabitants of Moscow near the United States Embassy against United States armed intervention in Lebanon. This demonstration was a completely spontaneous expression of the Soviet people's sympathy for a victim of aggression. Your reference to this occurrence is particularly unconvincing in view of the fact that the United States Government itself so far refuses to take steps to ensure normal working conditions for the Permanent Soviet Mission to the United Nations and has not put a stop to the systematic acts of provocation against that Mission on the part of certain elements in New York which, it stands to reason, inevitably influenced the feelings of the Soviet people who took part in the demonstration.

/...

Mr. President, it is not our people that started such demonstrations. It would be desirable to call a halt to such occurrences in the United States. Our people would attach due weight to this.

I should like to point out that our people assess events correctly and are well able to distinguish between the acts of hired hooligans against the Permanent Soviet Mission in New York and the genuine feelings of the American people. We entertain the most friendly feelings for the people of the United States and are anxious to develop broad cultural and economic ties between our countries. We want our respective peoples to know each other better, and to join forces to preserve and strengthen peace and to end the estrangement between countries, so that all States may live with one another on a basis of genuine good-neighbourliness. The Soviet people's attitude to the American people is well known. We might point out that, at the time when irresponsible elements, paid out of certain funds set up for the purpose of subversive activity against States that do not belong to the aggressive blocs in which the United States plays a leading part, were creating an uproar outside the building of the Permanent Soviet Mission in New York, American scientists, specialists, sportsmen, tourists and even Mr. Adlai Stevenson, a well-known public figure in the United States, were being received in the USSR with the Soviet people's usual cordiality and hospitality.

I wish now to return to the main point, to what at this juncture should have been the only subject of our present correspondence: namely the adoption, as speedily as possible, of effective measures to end the armed intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near and Middle East. You consider it essential that the consideration of this question should be entrusted to the United Nations Security Council. Unhappily, as I have already pointed out, the present situation of the Security Council, in which it is to all intents and purposes subordinated to United States foreign policy and most of the representatives of countries who attend its meetings are not free to take any action which deviates from the United States position, prevents us from regarding your proposal as the right one. The policy of the United States in regard to the Security Council is undermining its chances of adopting effective measures to protect peace and to halt aggression. It is destroying the effectiveness of the Security Council as an instrument of peace.

/...

The United Nations and its Security Council are essential international organs and should reflect the peace-loving aspirations of the peoples. However, the United States Government is using the Council for its own selfish interests, through the representatives of countries belonging to military blocs in which the United States occupies the dominant position. In reality the United States of America is trying to reduce the Security Council to the position of a subsidiary organ of the United States Department of State. How can we close our eyes to the true position and ignore the fact that the Security Council, as now composed, is in no position to reach objective conclusions on the situation in the Near and Middle East?

No, Mr. President; for the sake of preserving world peace and strengthening security, we need a sane approach which would pave the way for a positive decision and would ensure that peace prevailed.

Since the very start of the United States and United Kingdom intervention in the Near and Middle East, the Soviet Union has advocated the adoption of immediate measures to check the aggression, to secure the withdrawal of foreign forces from Lebanon and Jordan, to prevent the intervention from spreading, and to eliminate the dangerous tension caused by the actions of the United States and the United Kingdom. To that end, we proposed to call a meeting of the heads of the Governments of the five Powers, the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and India, with the participation of Mr. Hammarskjold, the Secretary-General of the United Nations. We regret that you and Mr. Macmillan have not found it possible to accept this proposal and that a positive decision has not therefore been taken on calling a meeting of the heads of the Governments of the five Powers with the participation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Although the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have made it impossible to convene a meeting of the five Powers and are directly responsible for this state of affairs, it is now clearly apparent that the demands of the peoples for the immediate convening of such a meeting in order to end the armed intervention in Lebanon and Jordan and the determination of peace-loving

States to halt aggression in the Near and Middle East have forced those who embarked on this armed intervention to refrain at the present juncture from extending the aggression to other countries and primarily to the Republic of Iraq and the United Arab Republic. It is no accident, therefore, that the Western Powers, including the United States and the United Kingdom, have been obliged to recognize the Republic of Iraq, whose establishment the aggressors originally alleged to be a threat to peace in the Near and Middle East. This does not mean, however, that the danger of the extension and aggravation of the conflict in that area has been eliminated or that the security of the Republic of Iraq and the other Arab States has been ensured. The forces of the interventionists have not yet been withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan. Furthermore, fresh contingents of foreign troops are arriving in that area and further military measures are being taken in the countries of the Baghdad Pact.

The question of the complete cessation of armed intervention in the Near and Middle East and of the establishment of conditions which would protect the peoples of that area against foreign intervention still calls for speedy settlement. The foreign forces must be withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan without delay, as their presence constitutes a continuing threat to peace and to the independence of the peoples concerned and a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, which cannot be condoned by a single Member of the United Nations.

In these circumstances, the Soviet Government considers it essential to pursue its efforts to maintain and strengthen peace in the Near and Middle East. Since the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have abandoned the idea of calling a meeting of the heads of the Governments of the five Powers and since, as we have already pointed out, the Security Council has shown itself unable to achieve a peaceful solution of the problem of the Near and Middle East, the Government of the Soviet Union, with a view to ensuring that the necessary steps to halt aggression are taken without delay, has instructed its representative to the United Nations to request the convening of a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to discuss the question of the withdrawal of United States forces from Lebanon and United Kingdom forces from Jordan.

The Soviet Government hopes that consideration of this question in the General Assembly, where large and small States alike are represented, will make it possible to find means of removing the military danger that has arisen in the Near and Middle East as a result of the actions of the United States and the United Kingdom and will bring tranquillity to that region.

I think that you will agree with me, Sir, that the events in the Near and Middle East, which have confronted the world with the threat of general war with all the untold miseries it would inflict on the peoples, lend particular urgency to the question of establishing conditions for the peaceful co-existence of States and for putting an end to the "cold war", which is contaminating the whole international atmosphere. The Soviet Union and all peace-loving countries are working for the day when no great Power will be able to commit aggression, even against a small country. Aggression by a small country against a great Power is quite out of the question. A small country does not possess the divisions you mention, Mr. President, in your message. We have to take account of realities and practical possibilities. A world war can be unleashed by a great Power with large numbers of divisions and many atomic and hydrogen weapons, rockets, bombers and other means of destruction, but not by a small country. Accordingly; it is precisely the great Powers which must agree to refrain from any action that would bring the world to the brink of military catastrophe.

The Soviet Government considers that all possible steps should be taken to develop contacts and relations between the statesmen of all countries. Personal meetings between the leaders of States can lessen the existing tension, promote the growth of confidence and mutual understanding among States and hasten the thawing of the ice of the "cold war".

We attach particular importance to such contacts and, as you know, as early as December 1957, we proposed a meeting of statesmen at the highest level. We are convinced that, given the efforts of all participants, such a summit meeting, with the composition we proposed earlier, would help to find ways and means to banish the "cold war" and to make impossible the outbreak of a shooting war.

Let us do everything within our power to see that this meeting, for which all peoples of the world are waiting, is not postponed indefinitely. We await your agreement to our proposal for a summit meeting and are prepared to take part in such a meeting at any time. It is in the interests of all States, great and small, that a summit meeting should be convened at the earliest opportunity.

In conclusion, I should like to express the hope that the United States Government will support the proposal to convene a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which might be a useful step towards the relaxation of tension and would pave the way for a summit meeting at an earlier date.

I have the honour to be, etc.

(Signed) N. KHRUSHCHEV

