

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



**733rd
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 13 August 1958,
at 10.30 p.m.

THIRD EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

New York

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 5:	
Questions considered by the Security Council at its 838th meeting on 7 August 1958 (<i>continued</i>).....	7
Address by Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America.....	7

President: Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).

AGENDA ITEM 5

Questions considered by the Security Council at its 838th meeting on 7 August 1958 (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its 732nd meeting, we shall begin today the consideration of the item which is before the third emergency special session.

Address by Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America

2. Mr. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER (President of the United States of America): Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, Members of the General Assembly, and guests: First, may I express my gratitude for the generosity of your welcome.

3. It has been almost five years since I had the honour of addressing this Assembly [*470th meeting*]. I then spoke of atomic power and urged that we should find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man should not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life. Since then, great strides have been taken in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Tragically little has been done to eliminate the use of atomic and nuclear power for weapons purposes. That is a danger.

4. That danger in turn gives rise to another danger—the danger that nations under aggressive leadership will seek to exploit man's horror of war by confronting the nations, particularly small nations, with an apparent choice between supine surrender, or war. This tactic reappeared during the recent Near East crisis. Some might call it "ballistic blackmail".

5. In most communities it is illegal to cry "fire" in a crowded assembly. Should it not be considered serious international misconduct to manufacture a general war scare in an effort to achieve local political aims?

6. Pressures such as these will never be successfully practised against America, but they do create dangers which could effect each and every one of us. That is why I have asked for the privilege of again addressing

you. The immediate reason is two small countries—Lebanon and Jordan. The cause is one of universal concern.

7. The lawful and freely elected Government of Lebanon, feeling itself endangered by civil strife fomented from without, sent the United States a desperate call for instant help. We responded to that call.

8. On the basis of that response an effort has been made to create a war hysteria. The impression is sought to be created that if small nations are assisted in their desire to survive, that endangers the peace. This is truly an "upside down" portrayal. If it is made an international crime to help a small nation maintain its independence, then indeed the possibilities of conquest are unlimited. We will have nullified the provision of our Charter which recognizes the inherent right of collective self-defence. We will have let loose forces that could generate great disasters.

9. The United Nations has, of course, a primary responsibility to maintain not only international peace but also "security". That is an important fact. But we must not evade a second fact, namely, that in the circumstances of the world since 1945 the United Nations has sometimes been blocked in its attempt to fulfil that function.

10. Respect for the liberty and freedom of all nations has always been a guiding principle of the United States. This respect has been consistently demonstrated by our unswerving adherence to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly in its opposition to aggression, direct or indirect. Sometimes we have made that demonstration in terms of collective measures called for by the United Nations. Sometimes we have done so pursuant to what the Charter calls "the inherent right of . . . collective self-defence".

11. I recall the moments of clear danger we have faced since the end of the Second World War—Iran, Greece and Turkey, the Berlin blockade, Korea, the Straits of Taiwan. A common principle guided the position of the United States on all of these occasions. That principle was that aggression, direct or indirect, must be checked before it gathered sufficient momentum to destroy us all—aggressor and defender alike. It was this principle that was applied once again when the urgent appeals of the Governments of Lebanon and Jordan were answered.

12. I would be less than candid if I did not tell you that the United States reserves, within the spirit of the Charter, the right to answer the legitimate appeal of any nation, particularly small nations. I doubt that a single free Government in all the world would willingly forgo the right to ask for help if its sovereignty were imperilled. But I must again emphasize that the United States seeks always to keep within the spirit of the Charter.

13. Thus when President Truman responded in 1947 to the urgent plea of Greece, the United States stipu-

lated that our assistance would be withdrawn whenever the United Nations felt that its action could take the place of ours. Similarly, when the United States responded to the urgent plea of Lebanon, we went at once to the Security Council and sought United Nations assistance for Lebanon, so as to permit the withdrawal of United States forces.

14. United Nations action would have been taken and United States forces already withdrawn, had it not been that two draft resolutions, one proposed by the United States [*S/4050/Rev.1*], the other proposed by Japan [*S/4055/Rev.1*], failed to be adopted by the Council because of one negative vote—a veto.

15. But nothing that I have said is to be construed as indicating that I regard the *status quo* as sacrosanct. Change is indeed the law of life and of progress. But when change reflects the will of the people, then change can and should be brought about in peaceful ways.

16. In this context the United States respects the right of every Arab nation of the Near East to live in freedom without domination from any source, far or near.

17. In the same context, we believe that the Charter of the United Nations places on all of us certain solemn obligations. Without respect for each other's sovereignty and the exercise of great care in the means by which new patterns of international life are achieved, the projection of the peaceful vision of the Charter would become a mockery.

18. Let me turn now specifically to the problem of Lebanon. When the United States military assistance began moving into Lebanon, I reported to the American people that we had immediately reacted to the plea of Lebanon because the situation was such that only prompt action would suffice.

19. I repeat to you the solemn pledge I then made. Our assistance to Lebanon has but one single purpose—that is the purpose of the Charter and of such historic resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly as the "Essentials-of-peace" resolution of 1949 [*resolution 290 (IV)*] and the "Peace-through-deeds" resolution of 1950 [*resolution 380 (V)*]. These denounce, as a form of aggression and as an international crime, the fomenting of civil strife in the interest of a foreign Power. We want to prevent that crime—or at least prevent its having fatal consequences. We have no other purpose whatsoever.

20. The United States troops will be totally withdrawn whenever this is requested by the duly constituted Government of Lebanon or whenever, through action by the United Nations or otherwise, Lebanon is no longer exposed to the original danger.

21. It is my earnest hope that this Assembly, free of the veto, will consider how it can assure the continued independence and integrity of Lebanon. Thus the political destiny of the Lebanese people will continue to lie in their own hands. The United States delegation will support measures to this end.

22. Another urgent problem is Jordan. If we do not act promptly in Jordan a further dangerous crisis may result, for the method of indirect aggression discernible in Jordan may lead to conflicts endangering the peace.

23. We must recognize that peace in this area is fragile, and we must also recognize that the end of peace in Jordan could have consequences of a far-reaching nature. The United Nations has a particular responsibility in this matter, since it sponsored the Palestine Armistice Agreements upon which peace in the area

rests and since it also sponsors the care of the Palestine refugees. I hope this Assembly will be able to give expression to the interest of the United Nations in preserving the peace in Jordan.

24. There is another matter which this Assembly should face in seeking to promote stability in the Near East. That is the question of inflammatory propaganda. The United Nations General Assembly has on three occasions—in 1947, 1949 and 1950—adopted resolutions designed to stop the projecting of irresponsible broadcasts from one nation into the homes of citizens of other nations [*resolutions 110 (II)*, *290 (IV)* and *381 (V)*], thereby "fomenting civil strife and subverting the will of the people in any State". That is stated in the language of resolution 290 (IV). We all know that these resolutions have recently been violated in many directions in the Near East.

25. If we, the United States, are one of those who have been at fault, we stand ready to be corrected.

26. I believe that this Assembly should reaffirm its enunciated policy and should consider means for monitoring the radio broadcasts directed across national frontiers in the troubled Near East area. It should then examine complaints from these nations which consider their national security jeopardized by external propaganda.

27. The countries of this area should also be freed from armed pressure and infiltration coming across their borders. When such interference threatens, they should be able to get from the United Nations prompt and effective action to help safeguard their independence. This requires that adequate machinery be available to make the United Nations presence manifest in the area of trouble.

28. Therefore, I believe that this Assembly should take action looking towards the creation of a stand-by United Nations peace force. The need for such a force in being is clearly demonstrated by recent events involving imminent danger to the integrity of two Member States.

29. I understand that this general subject is to be discussed at the thirteenth session of the General Assembly and that our distinguished Secretary-General has taken an initiative in this matter. Recent events clearly demonstrate that this is a matter for urgent and positive action.

30. I have proposed four areas of action for the consideration of the Assembly—in respect to Lebanon, to Jordan, to subversive propaganda, and to a stand-by United Nations force. These measures, basically, are designed to do one thing: to preserve the right of a nation and its people to determine their own destiny, consistent with the obligation to respect the rights of others. This clearly applies to the great surge of Arab nationalism.

31. Let me state the position of my country unmistakably. The peoples of the Arab nations of the Near East clearly possess the right of determining and expressing their own destiny. Other nations should not interfere so long as this expression is found in ways compatible with international peace and security.

32. However, here as in other areas we have an opportunity to share in a great international task. That is the task of assisting the peoples of that area, under programmes which they may desire, to make further progress toward the goals of human welfare they have set for themselves. Only on the basis of progressing

economies can truly independent Governments sustain themselves. This is a real challenge to the Arab people and to all of us.

33. To help the Arab countries fulfil these aspirations, here is what I propose: first, that consultations be immediately undertaken by the Secretary-General with the Arab nations of the Near East to ascertain whether an agreement can be reached to establish an Arab development institution on a regional basis; secondly, that these consultations consider the composition and the possible functions of a regional Arab development institution, whose task would be to accelerate progress in such fields as industry, agriculture, water supply, health and education, among others; thirdly, other nations and private organizations which might be prepared to support this institution should also be consulted at an appropriate time.

34. Should the Arab States agree on the usefulness of such a soundly organized regional institution, and should they be prepared to support it with their own resources, the United States would also be prepared to support it. The institution would be set up to provide loans to the Arab States as well as the technical assistance required in the formulation of development projects. The institution should be governed by the Arab States themselves. This proposal for a regional Arab development institution can, I believe, be realized on a basis which would attract international capital, both public and private.

35. I also believe that the best and quickest way to achieve the most desirable result would be for the Secretary-General to make two parallel approaches: first, to consult with the Arab States of the Near East to determine an area of agreement; then to invite the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which has vast experience in this field, to make available its facilities for the planning of the organizational and operational techniques needed to establish the institution on a progressive course.

36. I hope it is clear that I am not suggesting a position of leadership for my own country in the work of creating such an institution. If this institution is to be a success, the function of leadership must belong to the Arab States themselves.

37. I would hope that high on the agenda of this institution would be action to meet one of the major challenges of the Near East, the great common shortage—water. Much scientific and engineering work is already under way in the field of water development. For instance, atomic isotopes now permit us to chart the courses of the great underground rivers. And new horizons are opening in the desalting of water. The ancient problem of water is on the threshold of solution. Energy, determination and science will carry it over that threshold.

38. Another great challenge that faces the area is disease. Already there is substantial effort among the peoples and Governments of the Near East to conquer disease and disability. But much more remains to be done. The United States is prepared to join with other Governments and the World Health Organization in an all-out, joint attack on preventable disease in the Near East.

39. But to see the desert blossom again and preventable disease conquered is only a first step. As I look into the future I see the emergence of modern Arab States that would bring to this century contributions surpassing those we cannot forget from the past. We re-

member that Western arithmetic and algebra owe much to Arab mathematicians and that much of the foundation of the world's medical science and astronomy was laid by Arab scholars. Above all, we remember that three of the world's great religions were born in the Near East.

40. But a true Arab renaissance can only develop in a healthy human setting. Material progress should not be an overriding objective in itself; it is an important condition for achieving higher human, cultural and spiritual objectives.

41. But I repeat, if this vision of the modern Arab community is to come to life, the goals must be Arab goals.

42. With the assistance of the United Nations, the countries of the Near East now have a unique opportunity to advance, in freedom, their security and their political and economic interests. If a plan for peace of the kind I am proposing can be carried forward, in a few short years we may be able to look back on the Lebanon and Jordan crises as the beginning of a great new prosperous era of Arab history.

43. But there is an important consideration which must remain in mind today and in the future. If there is an end to external interference in the internal affairs of the Arab States of the Near East; if an adequate United Nations peace force is in existence; if a regional development institution exists and is at work on the basic projects and programmes designed to lift the living standards of the area; then with this good prospect, and indeed as a necessary condition for its fulfilment, I hope and believe that the nations of the area, intellectually and emotionally, will no longer feel the need to seek national security through spiralling military build-ups. These lead not only to economic impotence, but to war.

44. Perhaps the nations involved in the 1948 hostilities may, as a first step, wish to call for a United Nations study of the flow of heavy armaments to those nations. My country would be glad to support the establishment of an appropriate United Nations body to examine this problem. That body would discuss it individually with these countries and see what arms-control arrangements could be worked out, under which the security of all these nations could be maintained more effectively than under a continued wasteful, dangerous competition in armaments. I recognize that any such arrangements must reflect these countries' own views.

45. I have tried to present to you the framework of a plan for peace in the Near East. It would provide a setting of political order in response to the rights of the people in each nation; which would avoid the dangers of a regional arms race; which would permit the peoples of the Near East to devote their energies wholeheartedly to the tasks of development and human progress in the widest sense.

46. It is important that the six elements of this programme be viewed as a whole. They are:

- (1) United Nations concern for Lebanon;
- (2) United Nations measures to preserve peace in Jordan;
- (3) An end to the fomenting from without of civil strife;
- (4) A United Nations peace force;
- (5) A regional economic development plan to assist and accelerate improvement in the living standards of the people in these Arab nations;

- (6) Steps to avoid a new arms-race spiral in the area. To have solidity, the different elements of this plan for peace and progress should be considered and acted on together, as integral elements of a single concerted effort.
47. Therefore, I hope that this Assembly will seek simultaneously to set in motion measures that would create a climate of security in the Near East consonant with the principles of the United Nations Charter, and to create the framework for a common effort to raise the standard of living of the Arab peoples.
48. But the peoples of the Near East are not alone in their ambition for independence and development. We are living in a time when the whole world has become alive to the possibilities for modernizing their societies.
49. The United States Government has been steadily enlarging its allocations to foreign economic development in response to these world-wide hopes. We have joined in partnership with such groupings as the Organization of American States and the Colombo Plan; and we are working on methods to strengthen these regional arrangements. For example, in the case of the Organization of American States, we are consulting with our sister republics of this hemisphere to strengthen its role in economic development. And the Government of the United States has not been alone in supporting development efforts. The British Commonwealth, the countries of Western Europe, and Japan have all made significant contributions.
50. But in many parts of the world both geography and wise economic planning favour national rather than regional development programmes. The United States will, of course, continue its firm support of such national programmes. Only where the desire for a regional approach is clearly manifested and where the advantage of a regional over a national approach is evident will the United States change to regional methods.
51. The United States is proud of the scope and variety of its development activities throughout the world. Those who know our history will realize that this is no sudden, new policy of our Government. Ever since its birth, the United States has gladly shared its wealth with others. This it has done without thought of conquest or economic domination. After victory in two world wars and the expenditure of vast treasure there is no world map, either geographic or economic, on which anyone can find that the force of American arms or the power of the American Treasury has absorbed any foreign land or political or economic system. As we cherish our freedom, we believe in freedom for others.
52. The things I have talked about today are real and they await our grasp. Within the Near East and within this Assembly are the forces of good sense, of restraint, and of wisdom to make, with time and patience, a framework of political order and of peace in that region.
53. But we also know that all these possibilities are shadowed, all our hopes are dimmed, by the fact of the arms race in nuclear weapons—a contest which drains off our best talents and vast resources, straining the nerves of all our peoples.
54. As I look out on this Assembly, with so many of you representing new nations, one thought above all impresses me. The world that is being remade on our planet is going to be a world of many mature nations. As one after another of these new nations moves through the difficult transition to modernization and learns the methods of growth, from this travail new levels of prosperity and productivity will emerge.
55. This world of individual nations is not going to be controlled by any one Power or group of Powers. This world is not going to be committed to any one ideology. Please believe me when I say that the dream of world domination by one Power or of world conformity is an impossible dream.
56. The nature of today's weapons, the nature of modern communications, and the widening circle of new nations make it plain that we must, in the end, be a world community of open societies. And the concept of the open society is the ultimate key to a system of arms control we can all trust.
57. We must, then, seek with new vigour, new initiative, the path to a peace based on the effective control of armaments, on economic advancement and on the freedom of all peoples to be ruled by governments of their choice. Only thus can we exercise the full capacity God has given us to enrich the lives of the individual human beings who are our ultimate concern, our responsibility and our strength.
58. In this memorable task there lies enough work and enough reward to satisfy the energies and ambitions of all leaders, everywhere.
59. The PRESIDENT: I am certain that I speak for the representatives in this hall when I express appreciation to the President of the United States for the address he has delivered on the important issues that confront us today and for the consideration of which an emergency special session of the General Assembly was summoned at the request of the Security Council [A/3866]. I am glad that the President can remain seated with us while I outline a few of the things which we have to do.
60. As I stated at the opening of the meeting and following the decision taken at the previous meeting, the Assembly begins today the substantive debate on the item before it. In order that this debate may develop efficiently and for the convenience of all delegations, I respectfully request the representatives that they inform the Secretariat when they wish to speak so that their names may be inscribed on the list of speakers, and plenary meetings arranged accordingly.
61. I again express appreciation to the President of the United States for having joined with us today. The meeting will now be suspended for ten minutes while I escort the President of the United States from the hall.
- The meeting was suspended at 11.30 a.m. and resumed at 11.40 a.m.*
62. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): It became necessary to call this emergency special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations as a result of the armed intervention undertaken by the United States in Lebanon and by the United Kingdom in Jordan. Two great Powers, which are, moreover, permanent members of the Security Council, and consequently bear, together with the other States which are permanent members of the Council, a special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace, have acted in violation of peace. The fundamental rules of international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter have been flouted. The landing of United States and United Kingdom forces in Lebanon and Jordan, respectively, has created a dangerous situation.
63. The leaders of the United States and the United Kingdom, who so frequently and readily talk of their devotion to the purposes of the United Nations, have

in fact displayed a disregard for this international Organization and its Charter, by undertaking, behind the back of the United Nations, an armed invasion of the Near East, designed to consolidate their domination of that region, to retain control over its natural wealth and to reimpose the colonial system upon the peoples of the Arab countries, who for centuries have languished under foreign oppression.

64. Of course, the statesmen of the United States and the United Kingdom who are responsible for this policy are fully aware that in our times military intervention in the domestic affairs of other States cannot fail to evoke a decisive reaction from the powerful forces which hold the cause of peace dear. That is why those who organized the intervention against Lebanon and Jordan are strenuously endeavouring to make their activities superficially acceptable. They have put forward all manner of pretexts, one more unfounded than the next, to justify these actions.

65. For instance, it has been asserted that the military occupation of Lebanon by the United States and of Jordan by the United Kingdom was needed to preserve the independence of these countries and to protect them against machinations of some kind on the part of the United Arab Republic. Reference has been made to domestic events in Iraq, as a consequence of which that country was proclaimed a republic and dissolved the federation with Jordan, which had been established as a result of imperialist intrigues in the Middle East directed against the independence of the Arab peoples.

66. An attempt was also made to justify the landing of the United States and United Kingdom forces on the ground that it was undertaken at the request of the President of Lebanon and the King of Jordan. And, of course, it has been said that soldiers, arms, tanks, warships and military aircraft had to be dispatched to ensure the safety of the citizens of the United States and the United Kingdom, although it is well known that not a single American citizen in Lebanon and not a single British subject in Jordan received so much as a scratch or was even threatened. This is simply the argument which colonialists have used for many decades as a screen for their coercive activities against the peoples of the East.

67. What can we say about all these arguments which are being used to justify intervention in Lebanon and Jordan?

68. Inasmuch as the military action taken by the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near East constitutes a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and other generally recognized rules of international law, the arguments which are now being adduced *ex post facto* in defence of this action are absolutely unfounded and entirely contrary to the facts.

69. Indeed, although a great deal has been said about the alleged interference of the United Arab Republic in the affairs of Lebanon and Jordan, no one in Washington or London has been able to adduce any facts in regard to such interference. As is well known, the authoritative United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon, sent to that country in accordance with a Security Council resolution [S/4023]—for which, incidentally, the United States and the United Kingdom voted—has, in two reports based on an on-the-spot study of the situation [S/4069, S/4085], absolutely refuted the assertion that there has been any interference whatever by the United Arab Republic. As we know, Mr. Hammarskjöld, the Secretary-General of the United

Nations, who went to Lebanon, came to the same conclusion.

70. But the Government of the United States has disregarded the conclusions of United Nations representatives, because these conclusions do not suit those who prepared and carried out the intervention in the Near East.

71. It has been said that events in Iraq were one of the reasons allegedly necessitating the dispatch of United States and United Kingdom forces to the Near East. If specific proof were needed of the absurdity of such assertions, this has been provided by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom themselves. Literally a few days after the United States representative had, at the 831st meeting of the Security Council, expatiated on the "mob rule"—I repeat the words "mob rule"—in Iraq and after the domestic events in that country had been used as the main pretext for introducing foreign forces into Lebanon and Jordan, the United States and the United Kingdom announced their recognition of the Government of the Republic of Iraq.

72. Attempts to give the intervention by the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near East an appearance of legality by referring to requests for the landing of troops from Mr. Chamoun, the then President of Lebanon, and from King Hussein of Jordan are also obviously unfounded. As we know, these appeals from Mr. Chamoun and King Hussein for the landing of United States and United Kingdom troops were made in contravention of the provisions of the Constitutions of Lebanon and Jordan. This has been pointed out by many statesmen from these countries, including Mr. Osseiran, the President of the Lebanese Parliament, who strongly censured Mr. Chamoun's illegal action in his letter which was circulated to States Members of the United Nations. Moreover, many eminent persons in Western countries openly admit that the "requests" from Mr. Chamoun and King Hussein to the United States and the United Kingdom were directly inspired by the Governments of those countries.

73. In connexion with the United States Government's present attempts to represent the invasion of Lebanon by United States troops as a fully legitimate measure and virtually as an act of benevolence towards the Lebanese people, I should like to remind you of an international instrument of which the United States Government is a signatory. Article 17 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, signed at Bogotá on 30 April 1948, reads as follows:

"The territory of a State is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever. . . ."¹

Apparently, Washington feels that it can censure on paper the military occupation of States when the United States is trying to build up a bloc of countries under its auspices and wishes to reassure the participants regarding its own intentions; in practice, however, such occupation is declared to be absolutely legitimate where the countries of Asia and Africa are concerned and special "doctrines" are even elaborated to provide for the introduction of troops into these countries.

74. In order to present the full picture, it must be pointed out that the United States Government does not adhere to its proclaimed principle of censuring military

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 119 (1952), p. 56.

occupation even with regard to countries of the Western hemisphere, a fact which was quite clearly demonstrated by the dispatch of United States forces to one of the Latin American countries in July 1958.

75. However eloquently these statesmen of the United States and the United Kingdom may try to delude world public opinion concerning the real motives for their armed intervention in Lebanon and Jordan, no patchwork of false pretexts can conceal the shameful fact of the absolutely unprovoked armed intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom against the Arab peoples.

76. In order to justify the introduction of foreign troops into the territory of two sovereign Arab States, an attempt is also being made to use Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, relating to the right of States to collective self-defence. Reference to the Charter in this context is extremely far-fetched, as is evident from the fact that, under the said Article 51, the right of collective self-defence may be invoked only "if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations". I repeat the words "if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations". But even the United States and the United Kingdom Governments cannot assert that an armed attack has been committed by any other State against Lebanon and Jordan. If Article 51 of the Charter is to be invoked at all, it could justifiably be invoked to repel the armed intervention undertaken by the United States and the United Kingdom against Lebanon and Jordan.

77. Finally, in order to justify the armed intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom, the myth has been circulated of "indirect aggression" allegedly threatening Lebanon and Jordan from every side, from the East, from the South and from the North—from every side except the West, that is to say, the side from which the armed forces of the aggressors actually entered Lebanon and Jordan. This talk of "indirect aggression" is simply a propaganda slogan, with which the United States and United Kingdom Governments would like to mask the direct aggression which they have committed in the Near East.

78. The utter baselessness of the present statements by official spokesmen of the United States and the United Kingdom concerning the need to avert the alleged threat of "indirect aggression" in the Near East may be seen from the fact that in the United Nations, the Governments of these two Powers have for a number of years, from the conversations on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals onwards—and if there are any participants in these conversations here they cannot but confirm what I am saying—tried to shelve all efforts by the Soviet Union and other States to secure the adoption of a definition of aggression, including "indirect aggression". The absence of such a definition is convenient only to those who are planning aggressive action. It is obvious that anyone who has such plans is not interested in defining aggression.

79. In the light of the action recently taken by the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near East, the unwillingness of these countries to reach agreement on the definition of aggression becomes particularly understandable. In this connexion, we can hardly regard as accidental the statement made at the end of July 1958, by Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State of the United States, to the effect that he considers a definition of aggression to be undesirable. Would you be likely to

want to define aggression when you are engaged in committing it in practice?

80. The United States Government has recently been redoubling its efforts to find arguments to justify its intervention in Lebanon. This has been particularly noticeable during the last few days in connexion with the emergency special session of the General Assembly. Thus, as we have already noted, the theory has emerged that United States action was necessitated by the existence of some sort of "indirect aggression" against Lebanon on the part of certain States.

81. This whole story of "indirect aggression" against Lebanon is of course completely unfounded, but those who have circulated it apparently calculated that it would none the less mislead a few gullible people. As always happens in such cases, the propaganda machine worked at full speed in order to popularize the story.

82. If we base ourselves on the facts, we must admit that we are in the presence of a blatant attempt to ascribe to others the activities in which the United States or, more correctly, the groups responsible for its foreign policy, are engaged. It is precisely these groups that have for some time themselves been committing indirect aggression against other States. If we merely consider the interval since the end of the Second World War, we see that the world has more than once witnessed such aggression by the United States against other States. What is more, it may definitely be asserted that indirect aggression has become, as it were, part and parcel of United States foreign policy.

83. The armed intervention in Lebanon and Jordan by the United States and the United Kingdom has undoubtedly been planned as the starting point of a campaign against other Arab countries. It is a typical example of colonial policy, which has always had as its mainspring the desire to make profits from the exploitation of dependent, enslaved peoples. According to the published figures, United States oil monopolies extracted profits of \$2,500 million from the countries of the Near East in 1956 and 1957 alone. It is oil, oil, always oil, that lures United States and United Kingdom monopolies to the Arab East and inspires their incessant military gambles in that area.

84. The United States military occupation of Lebanon may be said to represent the "Eisenhower Doctrine" in action. If, until recently, there were still people anywhere in the East or in other regions of the world who retained some illusion regarding the alleged "anti-colonialism" of the United States, such illusions have now been dispelled. Whereas at the time of the Suez war, the United States preferred to remain in the background, leaving the actual commission of aggression to its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], on this occasion Washington decided to associate itself more closely with the United Kingdom and to act in concert with it. Thus, the United States and the United Kingdom are clearly acting in collusion in order to suppress the national liberation movement in the countries of the Near and Middle East and, to an increasing extent, the United States is taking over the leadership of decrepit colonialism.

85. Those who direct United States and United Kingdom policy are bound together by their common interest in exploiting the peoples of the East and by their joint military and strategic plans against the socialist States and against countries recently liberated from colonial and semi-colonial dependence.

86. It is no secret that for many years after the Second World War, the United States and the United Kingdom have, in accordance with the general purposes of their policy, been attempting to convert the area of the Near and Middle East which adjoins the southern frontiers of the Soviet Union into a military base. These efforts have been resolutely opposed by the peoples of the Arab countries, which have given, one after another, convincing proof of their unwillingness to serve as pawns in the military plans of the Western Powers. Now that the last prop of foreign imperialism in that area, the Baghdad Pact—whose very title today sounds like an anachronism—has begun to collapse, those who direct United States and United Kingdom foreign policy have plunged into dangerous military adventures. Soldiers, tanks, bombers and even atomic weapons, which the United States Secretary of Defense has publicly threatened to use against the Arab countries—these are the means which they are attempting to “regularize” the situation in the Near and Middle East to their own advantage. I need hardly point out how dangerous it is to play with fire in one of the most sensitive areas of the world and how grave a threat it creates to the maintenance of peace throughout the world.

87. In the circumstances, the States bordering on the Near and Middle East must, of course, take the necessary steps to safeguard their own security. As the Soviet Government has repeatedly and publicly stated, the USSR cannot be indifferent to the emergence of a serious source of military danger in the immediate vicinity of its frontiers.

88. Despite the reassuring statements frequently heard, the situation in the Near and Middle East remains tense. Now, as before, there are still many hidden rocks on which the ship of peace may founder in this area.

89. Although the intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom has aroused indignation among the peoples both of the countries subjected to the invasion and of all other States, the build-up of foreign forces in the Arab East is still continuing before the eyes of the world. One only needs to read any United States newspaper to find confirmation of this.

90. Although the resolute opposition of the Arab peoples and the firm stand of other peace-loving States foiled the aggressive designs against the Republic of Iraq and other Arab States at this stage, this in no way means that the danger of a conflagration in the Near East has passed.

91. The States Members of the United Nations would be making a serious and costly mistake if they allowed themselves to be reassured by the assertion that United States and United Kingdom military intervention in the Near East is at present confined to the territory of two small countries, Lebanon and Jordan, and is not for the moment spreading any further. As long as armed forces of the United States and the United Kingdom remain on Lebanese and Jordanian soil, there is still a danger of the aggravation and extension of the military conflict.

92. In some countries the thinking of statesmen is approximately as follows: all these events in Lebanon and Jordan are taking place far away; they do not concern us, and there is consequently no particular reason for anxiety.

93. The Soviet delegation would like to emphasize as strongly as possible that such thinking is profoundly mistaken. The threat to peace resulting from the military intervention in the Near East by the United States

and the United Kingdom concerns all States. If the countries which have invaded Lebanon and Jordan with their forces succeed in consolidating their position in those countries and in reaping the fruits of their action, the repercussions would undoubtedly not be confined to the Near and Middle East. The policy of the *fait accompli* which United States and United Kingdom leaders are now trying to practise threatens to push mankind into the abyss of a new war with all its grievous consequences.

94. We should like to say to the sceptics and optimists who deny that the action of the United States and the United Kingdom is dangerous to peace—and there are such sceptics and optimists: you are not very different from those Western politicians who, on the eve of the Second World War, when there was already a smell of powder in the air, continued to reassure themselves and others by saying that there was no reason for alarm, that the worst would not happen.

95. However, the worst, as we know, did happen. For several days and even weeks, these people thought that the tragedy could be averted, that the sun was shining in the heavens just as before. But the storm broke, and, as a result of the conflagration of war, many millions of men and women perished and untold material wealth was destroyed. It may be said that events occurred at that time which were unexpected and unforeseen. But can the optimists who, while attempting to lull the fears of gullible people with assertions that the foreign intervention in the Near East and the increasing accumulation of atomic and hydrogen weapons do not pose a danger, honestly say that the world will not once again witness events which future historians will describe as unexpected and unforeseen?

96. The situation which has arisen in the Near and Middle East as a result of the invasion by United States and United Kingdom troops has another highly dangerous aspect which should not be overlooked. While carrying out their aggressive activities in this area, the United States and United Kingdom Governments are trying to involve a number of other States in one way or another, particularly the members of the North Atlantic alliance, and are thus making them their accomplices. The territory of the Federal Republic of Germany, of Italy and of Turkey is being used in connexion with the dispatch of United States troops to Lebanon. The island of Cyprus, whose population has been struggling for many years for liberation from foreign domination, is being used as a base for the armed forces which are being sent to Jordan. The air space of Israel has been used very extensively in connexion with the transport of United Kingdom troops.

97. It should be pointed out that, as a result of these actions by the United States and the United Kingdom, the North Atlantic Alliance has emerged very clearly as a military bloc one of whose chief tasks is to crush the national liberation movement and subject nations to colonial enslavement. Needless to say, the role of accomplices in the colonial adventures of the United States and the United Kingdom cannot be regarded as being in the national interest of West Germany, Italy or Turkey.

98. In this connexion, I should like to say a word about the role which the Soviet Union's neighbour Turkey is unfortunately playing in the events now occurring in the Near and Middle East. We are convinced that this role is completely contrary to Turkey's interest, since any aggravation of the situation in the Near East, any upheaval in that area can only drag

Turkey into the maelstrom of war and will bring it nothing but disaster. The Soviet Union sincerely desires good relations with Turkey, and that is precisely what prompts the Soviet Government to warn the Turkish Government of the dangers implicit in the support it is giving to the current activities of the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near East.

99. One often hears it said by the Western Powers, particularly the United Kingdom, that their actions in the Near and Middle East are governed by their interest in Near Eastern oil. In that connexion, I should like to recall that in 1956, Sir Anthony Eden, who was then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, declared during the British-Soviet talks in London that, in view of the importance of Near Eastern oil to the British economy, the United Kingdom would be prepared to go to war for the sake of that oil. Mr. N. S. Khrushchev at that time warned the statesmen of the United Kingdom that at the present time the policy of colonial oppression and plunder was unthinkable and doomed to failure. The statesmen of the United Kingdom were given some good advice: not to unleash a war against the Arabs, since it would inevitably have the most grievous consequences, particularly for the United Kingdom. But they did not heed this advice, committed aggression against Egypt and, as we know, suffered an ignominious defeat.

100. The events of 1956 demonstrated how disastrous military adventures are for those who engage in them. Now we are again witnessing activities of this nature in the Near East.

101. The United States and the United Kingdom undertook their armed intervention in Lebanon and Jordan at a time when preparations were under way for the summit conference proposed by the Soviet Union for the purpose of halting the "cold war" and the arms race, when the Soviet Union had made the historic decision to suspend unilaterally its tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons. The question arises whether it was not a factor in the calculations of the leaders of the United States and the United Kingdom that one result of their action in regard to Lebanon and Jordan would be to check the trend towards an improvement in the international situation, which did not suit their purposes.

102. Now that the United States' and United Kingdom's armed intervention in the Near East has placed the world in a dangerous situation, the need becomes particularly apparent to put an end to the pernicious "positions-of-strength" policy and proceed to the settlement of international problems from a position of reason. An agreement among the great Powers on non-interference in the domestic affairs of the Near and Middle Eastern countries and on strict respect for their sovereignty and territorial integrity would be a major advance in this direction. Such an agreement, which was proposed by the Soviet Union a long time ago, not only would serve the cause of preserving world peace—which, of course, is what matters most—but would also, it seems to us, be advantageous from the standpoint of the interests of the Western Powers, since it would be one of the essential factors in establishing stable political and economic relations between the Western Powers and the countries of this area.

103. I should like to remind the Assembly of the proposals which the Soviet Union Government addressed to the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France as early as February 1957. As we know, the Government of the USSR proposed

that an agreement should be reached whereby the Governments of the great Powers would assume certain obligations with regard to ensuring a lasting peace in the Near and Middle East. The most important of these obligations are the settlement of controversial issues exclusively by peaceful means through negotiation, non-interference—I repeat: non-interference—in the domestic affairs of the Near and Middle Eastern countries, respect for the sovereignty and independence of those countries, and withdrawal of foreign troops from their territory.

104. Can anyone deny that, in the light of the events now occurring in the Near and Middle East, these proposals have acquired even greater timeliness and importance?

105. Agreement among the great Powers on non-interference in the affairs of the Near and Middle Eastern countries is an absolute prerequisite for the settlement of the problems of that region in the interest of its peoples and in the interest of peace. In order to attain these objectives, however, it is of course necessary to renounce any attempt to solve problems by force; it is necessary to desist from aggressive acts and, above all, to withdraw foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan. If peace is to be strengthened, the desire for it must be demonstrated in practice and must not be confined to declarations.

106. Why are there United States and United Kingdom troops in Lebanon and Jordan? Why is the build-up of these troops continuing and why are more and more new contingents and arms being dispatched? And how is all this to be reconciled with the peace-loving pronouncements of the United States and United Kingdom Governments?

107. Even those who were previously somewhat inclined to minimize the danger of the military intervention by the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near East are having their eyes opened to the true state of affairs by the present actions of the Americans and the British. The peoples of the Arab countries are indignantly demanding the withdrawal of the interventionists' troops. An indication of this is the recent statement by the newly elected President of Lebanon, who declared that the withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon was the chief aim of his country's national policy. And it must be stated bluntly that peace can be restored in the Near and Middle East only if the troops of the foreign interventionists are totally, unconditionally and immediately withdrawn from the Arab East. It is particularly necessary to bear this in mind inasmuch as some idea of keeping the foreign troops in Lebanon and Jordan by one means or another is now in evidence. This would unquestionably constitute a mockery of the principles of the United Nations and a severe blow to its authority.

108. We now hear it said that foreign troops must remain in the Near and Middle East until, as some people put it, "order has been established" and "the situation has been stabilized". It is scarcely necessary to dwell on the dangers of the course into which an attempt is being made to impel the United Nations. After all, if every State or group of States starts arrogating to itself the right to establish the kind of order it likes in other countries and setting itself up as an arbiter in this matter, there will no longer be any place in international affairs for law or for the United Nations, and the law of the jungle, the law of the mailed fist, will prevail in relations among States.

109. I have not yet mentioned the reported intention of the United States Government to make a token withdrawal of one battalion of its occupation troops from Lebanon. Is any proof needed that such theatrical manoeuvres have nothing in common with genuine measures designed to preserve peace in the Near and Middle East and to restore the independence of the occupied Arab countries? Dozens of battalions of troops are moved into the territory of a foreign country so that one battalion can later be withdrawn with pomp and ceremony; an attempt is even being made to reassure the peoples on the basis of the United States Government's plans.

110. Mention should be made of another technique which has been put to frequent use of late. In an obvious attempt to divert the attention of world public opinion from the concentration of United States and United Kingdom armed forces in the territory of Near Eastern States, the official representatives of those two Powers are making increasingly frequent statements about their desire to promote the economic development of the Near and Middle Eastern countries. We heard this very thing in today's address to the Assembly by Mr. Eisenhower, the President of the United States.

111. Assistance in the economic development of the Near and Middle Eastern countries is undeniably a fine thing. The Soviet Union has always favoured extending such assistance without imposing political or military conditions of any kind and in actual fact bases its relations with other States, including the countries of the Near and Middle East, on complete equality of rights and mutual benefit.

112. The remarks which the President of the United States has made here concerning economic assistance to the States of the Near and Middle East naturally call for appropriate study. But the very first thing to be settled is the crucial question of the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan. We cannot for one moment allow talks about economic assistance to be used to distract the General Assembly's attention from the settlement of this vital issue. That is why the Soviet Union resolutely insists that the question of the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan should be settled without delay and as a matter of priority.

113. Immediately after the United States and then the United Kingdom, too, undertook armed intervention in the Arab East, the Soviet Union demanded that the United Nations Security Council should take the most urgent measures to put an end to this aggression and safeguard the national independence of the Arab countries which had suffered an unprovoked attack. But the Security Council, the majority of whose members are associated with military blocs headed by those very Powers which perpetrated the aggression in the Near East, was unable to do its duty. That being so, the Soviet Government proposed that a meeting should be called of the Heads of the Governments of the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and India, with the participation of Mr. Hammarskjöld, the Secretary-General of the United Nations. But the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom made it impossible to convene such a meeting.

114. In those conditions the Soviet Government considered it its duty to bring the question of the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from the Arab East and the restoration of peace in that area before the General Assembly for consideration at an emergency session.

115. In pressing for the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan, the Soviet Union is guided by its concern for the preservation of world peace and for the security of the peoples. The Soviet Union has no selfish purposes or concealed interests in the Near and Middle East. It has not a single soldier, not a single military base, no oil concessions and no capital investments there. The Soviet Union's sole concern in the Near and Middle East is to maintain a firm and lasting peace in this area and to ensure that the peoples living there are allowed to develop freely and independently.

116. And here I should like to stress one more point. The USSR proposed the calling of this emergency session of the General Assembly and is now, in the course of it, demanding the immediate withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan. It is not doing so with the idea of aggravating relations between our country and the United States and the United Kingdom, or in order to diminish the prestige of these States. Nor is it in any way our intention to bring about a deterioration of relations between these two Powers and the countries of the Arab East. We should be only too glad if these relations prospered on a basis of peaceful co-operation and full respect for the national sovereignty and independence of the Arab countries. The Soviet Government, as you know, is itself striving to establish with the United States and the United Kingdom good relations marked by complete confidence, and we are not to blame for the fact that such relations have not yet been realized.

117. We are not blind to the fact that both in the United States and in the United Kingdom there are people who consider that the Governments in Washington and London have gone too far in their actions in the Middle East to be able to withdraw their troops from Lebanon and Jordan in response to the United Nations appeal without harm to their prestige. Such an attitude is perhaps to some extent understandable, but it cannot for one moment be accepted. If the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom were truly interested in helping to find the right way out of the difficult situation which has arisen, and to strengthen peace, then, after carefully weighing all the pros and cons, they would realize the need to withdraw their troops from the Near and Middle East; so far from harming their prestige, this would, on the contrary, considerably enhance it in the eyes of the world at large.

118. The question this emergency session of the General Assembly has been convened to consider is one of immense importance. Our Organization has now, perhaps, a greater opportunity than ever before of making a valuable contribution to the preservation of world peace.

119. On behalf of the Government of the USSR the Soviet delegation has submitted for consideration at the emergency session of the General Assembly the following draft resolution on the immediate withdrawal of United States troops from Lebanon and United Kingdom troops from Jordan:

"The General Assembly,

"Recognizing the necessity of adopting urgent measures for the relaxation of tension in the area of the Near and Middle East in the interests of preserving universal peace,

"1. Recommends the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom to with-

draw their troops from the territories of Lebanon and Jordan without delay;

"2. *Instructs* the Secretary-General to strengthen the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon in accordance with the plan presented by the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon in its second interim report (S/4052), and to send an observation group to Jordan with a view to the supervision of the withdrawal of the United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan, and of the situation along the frontiers of those countries." [A/3870.]

120. In submitting this draft resolution, the Soviet delegation expresses its confidence that the General Assembly will study it with the requisite attention and a due sense of responsibility.

121. I do not think that we should be wrong in saying that the overwhelming majority of States represented in the United Nations is in favour of the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Near and Middle East. The situation is not altered by the fact that some are saying this aloud so that all can hear, others are saying it timidly, while others again are saying almost nothing.

122. It is well known that many of those taking part in this session of the General Assembly are engaged in a search for an appropriate formula in which to couch the demand for the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops. Of course if there is a real desire to facilitate the adoption of such a course, which is the only correct one, then it should not be difficult to find a formula. A suitable formula, it seems to us, is offered in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation. This does not mean that we refuse to look for a mutually acceptable formula which would take into account the views of other delegations, if it serves the main purpose—the prompt withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan. We are ready today, if you wish—I repeat, today, if you wish—to enter into official or unofficial consultations with any delegation, including the United States and United Kingdom delegations, on the question of working out a constructive decision which the General Assembly might adopt for the sake of preserving peace.

123. The Soviet Government hopes that the emergency session of the General Assembly will worthily fulfil its task of restoring peace in the Near and Middle East.

124. The Soviet Union, like other peace-loving States, will continue to do all that is required for the consistent defence and maintenance of peace. This determination was clearly expressed in the recent Soviet-Chinese communiqué after the meeting between Mr. Khrushchev, Prime Minister of the USSR, and Mr. Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the People's Republic of China.

125. These are the considerations guiding the Soviet Union delegation at the present session of the General Assembly. This session can serve the cause of peace well if we are all imbued with a sense of high responsibility for the outcome of its work.

126. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan): At the opening of the general debate of this emergency special session of the General Assembly on the Middle East, I wish, on behalf of the Jordan delegation, to express our hope that the present debate under your chairmanship, Mr. President, will lead to successful and constructive achievements.

127. In appearing before this Assembly, the Jordan delegation comes to present a case—a serious case—and to ask for an answer—a satisfactory answer. My country

is undertaking a bold struggle against indirect aggression and external plots threatening its independence and integrity. We should like to feel that, in resisting this pressure and in defending the common cause of peace, we are not alone.

128. The guiding principles expressed at this meeting in the words of the President of the United States, in this General Assembly, filled the hearts of small nations with hope and satisfaction. We trust that, through the joint efforts of Member States of the United Nations, steps will be taken to curb the type of aggression prevailing in our region and to help our people to live in peace.

129. My delegation will, therefore, very soon present its case and express its views on the present alarming situation in the Near East.

130. Mr. FAWZI (United Arab Republic): It is my distinct privilege to bring you the greetings and the good wishes of the Government and the people of the United Arab Republic.

131. You will recall that this Republic was established in response to the persistent and unanimous wishes of the people of Egypt and Syria—wishes which were confirmed by a plebiscite held in February of this year. Likewise, you will recall the crisis relating to Syria in 1957 which was gravely endangering world peace and which is now superseded by a promising outlook for positive and earnest peaceful endeavours; thus, this marks the difference between yesterday's forebodings and today's hopefulness.

132. At the same time, it is gratifying to note that the United Nations and the General Assembly are welcoming the new Iraq, which has been widely recognized and acclaimed throughout the world and which has given abundant proof of its constructiveness, its devotion to the purposes and principles of the United Nations and its determination to uphold the norms of fair play in the best traditions of international life. We are confident that Iraq will copiously contribute to the work of this Organization and to the welfare, peace and security of the world.

133. Another source of gratification which has taken place since the twelfth session of the Assembly, relating to the area from which I come, is the conclusion of a final agreement on compensation—the text of which I have communicated to the Secretary-General—between the Government of the United Arab Republic and the stockholders of what is now called the Compagnie financière de Suez. The heads of an agreement which had been reached previously in this connexion were in time duly communicated to the Secretary-General and distributed as a document of the United Nations [A/3827]. The conclusion of the final agreement bears out the declarations which have been made by my Government from the very outset that adequate compensation would be paid to the shareholders of the former Universal Suez Maritime Canal Company, which has been nationalized. With the glowing, growing and unprecedented record of efficiency and of traffic through the canal under the present national management, which has already begun an ambitious and carefully studied work of improvement on the canal in order to make it still more adequate for the requirements of modern navigation, the prophets of gloom and the monsters of war who took nationalization as a pretext for their miserable adventure in 1956, should be hiding their faces, and the steady and the fair can rejoice.

134. My Government has previously stated its views on the action which was taken by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom as an occasion for stationing their armed forces in Lebanon and in Jordan. Therefore, I shall not repeat our thoughts in this regard. What we are all facing now, is the immediate withdrawal of these armed forces. We welcome the announcement by the Government of the United States of its intention to withdraw its armed forces from Lebanon, and of the actual beginning of this withdrawal. But we are deeply perturbed by the failure of the United States to indicate, until now, the time during which that withdrawal will be completed, and we are anxiously waiting to hear such an indication.

135. Ours is a country in which the United Kingdom had stationed its armed forces in the year 1882 and to which the United Kingdom, since then, gave frequent and so-called solemn assurances of imminent withdrawal. It is common knowledge that it took no less than seventy-three years for the United Kingdom to honour those assurances and to effect that "imminent" withdrawal. Yet I am happy to be able to state here that we have more than one reason to believe that the withdrawal of United States forces from Lebanon will soon be completed, although, I repeat, an indication of the time space for withdrawal, which we hope will be very brief, would be both wise and extremely important.

136. As for the return of the prodigal sons of Great Britain, not to their homes in the north, but to Jordan, and as for the ominous reticence of the Government of the United Kingdom in relation to the withdrawal of those arms-carrying boys, we find that no amount of resentful words can express our feelings and our views.

Yet words or no words, the armed forces of the United Kingdom shall have to withdraw, and the sooner the better for all concerned.

137. If it is peace we want in the Middle East, if it is the common intention to inaugurate an era of lawfulness and of constructiveness in and in connexion with the Middle East, then surely those who have forgotten it must remember and practise again the rule of the Charter of the United Nations that we should not use force for the settlement of international differences, that we should all relinquish the use of force for such a purpose. For our part, we shall scrupulously maintain our faithfulness to this great rule. We shall, at the same time, continue to feel dismayed and threatened—together with world peace—as long as the British armed forces in Jordan do not go.

138. The Assembly has before it a clear and an extremely moderate draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union [A/3870] recommending the withdrawal from Lebanon and Jordan respectively of the United States and the United Kingdom armed forces which are stationed there. It is the view of my delegation that this draft resolution completely deserves our full, serious and sympathetic consideration.

139. A hand was raised before us today over the heads of many people. It occasionally marked and punctuated words of blessing and, in its own way, offered good cheer. We have not been able yet to ponder and appraise the real portent of those words. But until we do, we earnestly hope that we shall all continue to exert our efforts to the utmost in behalf of human brotherhood and world peace.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.