

Wednesday, 20 August 1958,
at 3 p.m.

New York

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



THIRD EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

C O N T E N T S

Page

Agenda item 5:	
Questions considered by the Security Council at its 838th meeting on 7 August 1958 (<i>continued</i>).....	127

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. Mr. RAHIM (Yemen): When I requested permission to intervene this morning [742nd meeting] to make a few remarks in answer to my colleague, Ambassador Abdoh of Iran, for whom I have great esteem, I had hoped to speak very briefly in order to dispel at once any doubts as to my esteem for him and as to the friendly relation of the Arab countries towards Iran. I wished to speak immediately after him because I did not want to leave these sentiments unclarified during the lunch hour. In your wisdom, Mr. President, and in your effort to save the precious time of the Assembly, which we all appreciate, you ruled otherwise. I am grateful that you have now given me this opportunity to speak.

2. Needless to say, I have read carefully the speech of the representative of Iran and do not intend to go into a detailed discussion of the text of this speech. I simply wish to say to him and to the Assembly that I am glad he intervened in order to explain the position of his delegation, and more than glad that he recognizes and favours the constructiveness of Arab nationalism. I recollect with pleasure and satisfaction his valuable work and fruitful co-operation when we worked together on the problems of the area and especially on the North African problem. I look forward to continuing this fruitful co-operation.

3. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The situation that has arisen in the Arab East has imposed upon the General Assembly at this emergency special session the grave and historic responsibility of removing the danger of war in that area. The Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom are on trial before world public opinion, since they have brought the world to the brink of catastrophe by their aggressive action in countries of the Near and Middle East. The peoples of the whole world expect the General Assembly to take urgent and effective steps at the emergency special session to ensure the immediate withdrawal of the United States and the United Kingdom forces, which have invaded countries of the Arab East against the will of their peoples.

4. Our delegation has carefully studied the programme submitted to the Assembly on 13 August 1958 [733rd meeting] by Mr. Eisenhower, the President of the United States, which he described as a "plan for peace". Our conclusion is that this plan is not new and that it does not include the main condition for ensuring peace in that region, namely, the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the occupation forces of the United States and the United Kingdom from Lebanon and Jordan. The new United States plan formally announced from this forum is proof of the failure of the "Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine", which was unanimously rejected by the Arab peoples. The purpose of this plan is to delude world public opinion, to hide behind the authority of the United Nations and to gain time, in order to consolidate domination over Lebanon and to isolate it from the rest of the Arab world. The impression is created that the United States plan is designed to obtain *ex post facto* sanction from the United Nations for the aggressive action in Lebanon and to camouflage it with the blue flag of the United Nations. The difference between the proposed plan and the United States' real policy reminds us of the well-known Russian saying: "Words sweet as honey, but deeds black as soot".

5. The United States has reserved the right to resort to similar occupation of other small countries. It is again raising the question of the establishment of a United Nations armed force to carry out the same functions as those which are now being performed by United States and United Kingdom forces in the Near East. It is known that the peoples of the Arab countries do not want either United States, United Kingdom or any other foreign troops in their territories.

6. The Government of the United States has submitted for the Assembly's attention a whole series of problems in connexion with the present situation in the Near and Middle East, in an attempt to cover up the main problem, that of aggression committed by the United States of America and the United Kingdom against Arab countries, which has caused a threat to peace throughout the world.

7. The United States plan gives some consideration to economic and financial aid to the Arab countries. It is unlikely that anyone present here will object to contributing to the development of the economy and culture of the countries of the Arab East.

8. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR has always been and will always be in favour of giving underdeveloped countries assistance on the most favourable terms, without any military or political conditions. In the opinion of our delegation, the economic problems of the Arab States should be considered by the economic organs of the United Nations and should not be hurriedly raised at an emergency special session of the General Assembly, convened to put an end to the

armed intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom against Lebanon and Jordan.

9. The President of the United States of America referred here to the so-called indirect aggression to which Lebanon and Jordan are supposed to have been subjected. We have witnessed how, under the pretext of combating non-existent, entirely unproved and uncorroborated "indirect aggression", very real aggression has been committed against the peoples of Lebanon and Jordan. The United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon twice stated that it had not discovered any interference in the domestic affairs of that country by the United Arab Republic, but the Government of the United States has disregarded this.

10. The whole world knows that the United States and the United Kingdom forces are now stationed not only in Lebanon and Jordan, but in Kuwait, Oman, Aden and the Bahrain Islands.

11. The ruling circles of the United States are trying to represent themselves as friends of the Arab people, and to present the new Eisenhower plan as an act of benevolence towards the Arab countries. The well-known Russian playwright and diplomat A. S. Griboyedov wrote in his comedy *The Mischief of Being Clever*, "Above all other woes, let us avoid both the master's anger and the master's favour". The Arab peoples want only one thing, that the United States and the United Kingdom should spare them both the master's anger and the master's favour, should not interfere in the domestic affairs of the Arab countries, should respect their neutrality, and should refrain from setting up military bases in their territory and from dividing those countries into spheres of influence.

12. In actual fact, the ruling circles of the United States have taken the course of suppressing the national liberation movements of the Arab peoples by blatantly violating their legitimate rights to freedom and independence by imposing upon them effete, reactionary and anti-popular régimes and re-establishing the old colonialist order, which is contrary to the spirit and trend of development of human history.

13. When he spoke here [734th meeting], Mr. Lloyd, the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, did so from the standpoint of nineteenth century colonialism, refusing, as he did, to reckon with the fact that colonialism is now largely a thing of the past and is being replaced by a new world of awakened peoples, who are taking the future into their own hands. He appealed to the General Assembly to approve the aggressive action taken by the United States and the United Kingdom against the Arab peoples. To this end, Mr. Lloyd would like to set aside the question of Anglo-American aggression in the Near East and to concern himself with the so-called indirect aggression invented by the interventionists.

14. In an attempt to justify his country's aggressive action in the Near East, the United Kingdom representative referred to King Hussein's invitation as a lawful pretext for the introduction of United Kingdom forces into Jordan. It is well known how this invitation was fabricated. In a report from London the correspondent Drew Middleton wrote to *The New York Times* on 16 July 1958 that "qualified military sources predicted late tonight that the most probable area of British military operations would be in Jordan". On the following day the purported invitation from King Hussein arrived and United Kingdom forces landed in

Jordan on 17 July 1958. The facts quite clearly show the falsity of statements about the so-called invitation of United States and United Kingdom troops to Lebanon and Jordan.

15. In his statement, the United Kingdom representative tried to play the part of a zealous champion of the interests of small States. Apparently he has "always been doubtful about the wisdom of the great Powers trying to prescribe remedies for the problems of small countries in particular areas". Mr. Lloyd does not conceal the fact that he is referring here to a meeting between the great Powers, which is not to his liking. But when it is a question of a secret agreement between two great Powers, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, with a view to committing armed intervention against small countries in the Near East, Mr. Lloyd takes part in such an agreement and can see nothing reprehensible in it. However, this is not the point of view held by wide circles of world public opinion, which, as is known, actively supported the proposal of the USSR Government to call a meeting of the Heads of the Governments of the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and India, with the participation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in order to put out the conflagration that has broken out in the Near East. There can be no doubt that given a genuine desire for peace and co-operation on the part of all the participants, such a meeting would facilitate a solution which would meet the interests of the peoples of the Near and Middle East, would ensure respect for their sovereign rights and, at the same time, would take into account the interests of all States connected with the countries of the region.

16. A few words should be said about the help given to the interventionists by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is well known that some States members of NATO were drawn into the aggressive action against the countries of the Arab East. For example, the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany was used by the United States military command as one of the bases for armed intervention against the Arab countries. It has become clearly apparent once again that the North Atlantic bloc headed by the United States has also been created as an instrument for defending the interests of the colonialists and for suppressing the struggles of peoples aspiring towards national independence. The aggressive action of the United States and the United Kingdom against the Arab countries is being concealed behind demagogic statements about the so-called defence of the independence of small countries.

17. Mr. A. A. Gromyko, the head of the Soviet Union delegation, has already given an exhaustive reply on this matter in his statements of 13 August [733rd meeting], and I shall not go over the same ground. The real purpose of the landing of United States and United Kingdom forces is to suppress the national liberation movement of the peoples of the East, to re-establish and strengthen their own influence in that region, to split up the Arab countries, to foment discord among them and to continue the intensive plundering of the peoples of these countries in accordance with the old colonialist slogan of "divide and rule". Such activities are well described in the book by the Belgian writer de Coster, *The Legend of Thyl Ulen-spiegel*, which contains the following statement: "Having donned the mask of love for all mankind, and having

chosen his moment, he quietly comes and smothers an individual or a nation”.

18. The organizers of armed intervention in Lebanon and Jordan are lavish with their promises to withdraw their forces from these countries, but at the same time stipulate various conditions and try to avoid committing themselves by fixing any specific time limits for this withdrawal. In my country we liken such promises to feeding a nightingale with fables. Indeed, Mr. Fawzi, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic, reminded us here of what such promises are worth. It is a fact that the occupation of Egypt by United Kingdom forces continued for seventy-three years, and during all that time there was no lack of solemn promises of an early withdrawal of troops from the country. We cannot help wondering whether the United States of America and the United Kingdom are not planning to repeat this manoeuvre. But times have changed in the past hundred or even the past fifty years. The powerful popular forces which have arisen throughout the world will not allow this to happen. The peoples are asking: “When, when will you withdraw your troops from Lebanon and Jordan?” They do not want to wait a single day for this withdrawal, much less for several years.

19. During the discussion of the question before us, we have heard many other statements, which differed in their character and in the aims pursued by the speakers. Some gave a sober appraisal of the situation in the Near East and showed a sincere concern to seek ways and means of bringing about a real improvement in the situation which would meet the vital interests of the Arab countries and the desire for peace of the peoples of the whole world. Others tried in every way to defend the organizers of armed intervention against Lebanon and Jordan and even to substantiate the theory that certain great Powers have the right to take such aggressive action in the future.

20. In this connexion the statement by Mr. Walker [735th meeting], the Australian representative, is worthy of special mention. On behalf of the Australian Government, Mr. Walker welcomed the intention of the United States to dispatch troops on future occasions ostensibly for the purpose of defending small nations, but in reality for the purpose of establishing outright military occupation and suppressing national liberation movements wherever they may arise. It is evident that some of the representatives attending this session would like to replace international law by the law of the jungle and to convert the United Nations into a world police force. The proposals made by the representative of Australia are further evidence of his biased and unobjective approach to the essential nature of events in the Near East.

21. In their statements yesterday [741st meeting], the sponsors of the draft resolution [A/3878], Mr. Engen, the representative of Norway, and Mr. Smith, the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, particularly emphasized that the document they had drawn up represented a compromise. In the opinion of our delegation, this draft resolution contains no compromise whatever. In point of fact, it provides exactly what the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom want and are striving for. We consider that there is a vast difference between the measures proposed in the draft resolution and the demand made by many delegations for the withdrawal of the United Kingdom and United States troops by fixed deadlines. The measures provided for in the

resolution may take months, and possibly years, to carry out, to say nothing of the fact that their nature has not been precisely defined. It is well known that the peoples of the whole world, and first and foremost the Arab peoples, are demanding the immediate withdrawal of the United Kingdom and United States forces from Lebanon and Jordan. The immediate withdrawal of the United States and United Kingdom forces from Lebanon and Jordan is the primary condition for the settlement of the problem before the General Assembly. The draft resolution to which I have just referred can serve merely as a screen to conceal United Kingdom and United States interference in the domestic affairs of the Arab countries.

22. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that this draft resolution is unacceptable and will vote against it.

23. Discussion of this question in the emergency special session is now in its second week, but the situation in the Near and Middle East is still dangerous. At the present time, land forces of 70,000 men are concentrated in that area. In all, there are some 1,000 aircraft of various types, on United States and United Kingdom air bases in the area as well as on aircraft carriers. The naval strength of the aggressors comprises approximately 120 warships and landing craft. It is clear to anybody that so large a concentration of troops and military equipment in this area has not been made for the purpose of carrying out irrigation work or combating disease in the Arab East.

24. A war which starts in one place may easily spread and turn into a universal conflagration instantly enveloping the whole world. The horrors of the Second World War are still fresh in the memory of the peoples of the entire world, and especially of the peoples of Europe. The Byelorussian delegation understands the concern and alarm at the threat of a new world war voiced by the representatives of a number of countries in their statements. The Byelorussian people, who suffered grievously during the Second World War, cannot remain indifferent to the fact that the threat of war again hangs over mankind.

25. The attempts to deny or to minimize the danger of the outbreak of war which was seen in the statements of certain representatives are merely a manoeuvre designed to conceal the planning and execution of new adventures against the peoples of the Arab countries.

26. We are fully resolved not to allow history to repeat itself. We do not wish to see the cities and villages which have risen from the charred ruins of the last war become the targets of atomic or hydrogen bombing.

27. We have come to this special emergency session from different countries of the world for the purpose of taking urgent measures to halt aggression and to defend the national independence of the Arab States, to put a stop to armed intervention in their domestic affairs, and to demand the immediate withdrawal of the United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan. We must do everything in our power to give the countries of the Arab East an opportunity to shape their lives according to their own wishes in the interests of the welfare and peace of their peoples. We must—and we will—remove the sword of Damocles hanging over the Arab peoples.

28. The ruling circles of the United States and the United Kingdom are attempting to maintain their colonial positions in the Near and Middle East by means of sub-machine-guns and cannons. As Mr. Khrushchev, the Head of the Soviet Government, has said in this connexion, the peoples are throwing off and tearing

asunder the chains of colonialism. Those who try to arrest the struggle for freedom of the peoples who have risen up against age-old colonialist oppression will find that their efforts are in vain. The course of events confirms the soundness of those words.

29. More than a month has now passed since the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom began their armed intervention in Lebanon and Jordan. It is natural and legitimate for the man in the street to ask why the ruling circles of the United States and the United Kingdom embarked on armed aggression against these countries and what goals they are pursuing.

30. The whole world knows that the aggressive policy of the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near and Middle East is governed by the interests of the huge United States and United Kingdom oil monopolies. These powerful monopolies prescribe and direct the policy of the ruling circles of the United States and the United Kingdom. Evidence of this is provided by the report of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc., which was published in the United States Press on 6 January 1958 and immediately became known as "the Rockefeller doctrine". The authors of this document openly stated that the United States should organize special military units capable of rapid and effective intervention with a view to preventing the development in any part of the world of "situations" regarded as "undesirable" by the United States monopolies.

31. In giving an interpretation of the Rockefeller doctrine, the United States newspaper, *The Wall Street Journal*, wrote as follows early in January 1958: ". . . the strategic concepts of this committee—if adopted—might have the U. S. starting wars with smaller countries." From this statement by a well-known and influential United States newspaper it can be seen that the aggressive policy of the United States in the Middle and Near East is inspired by the United States oil monopolies.

32. It is a known fact that two-thirds of the world's oil reserves are concentrated in the Near and Middle East. In 1957, 177 million tons of oil were extracted in this area. At the present time, 60 per cent of the oil output is controlled by United States' companies. According to a report published by the newspaper *New York Journal-American* on 7 August 1958, the profits earned last year by foreign oil companies in the Near and Middle East are estimated at \$2,500 million. According to United Nations statistics, net investments in the oil industry of the countries of the Near and Middle East during the decade between 1946 and 1955 amounted to \$1,100 million. This means that, in a single year, the foreign companies recoup the capital which they have invested over an entire ten-year period.

33. It should be emphasized that the oil reserves in Iraq are estimated at 2,650 million tons. This accounts for the extreme sensitivity of the United Kingdom and United States monopolies to events in Iraq, where the people have decided to use their own national resources without reference to others and to pursue an independent policy in keeping with the country's interests.

34. The firm determination of the peace-loving countries and, above all, of the Soviet Union, to put a stop to aggression in the Arab East and the wave of popular protest which has swept all the countries of the world have spoiled the game and upset the plans of the organizers of armed intervention. Contrary to their original plans, the United States and the United King-

dom have been compelled to refrain from carrying out their aggressive designs against the Republic of Iraq and the United Arab Republic. However, the threat of war has not been eliminated and it will continue as long as the troops of the interventionists remain on Arab soil.

35. The order given by the United States military command for the withdrawal of 1,700 officers and men from Lebanon and their transfer to United States warships is a manoeuvre designed to divert the attention of the General Assembly from the main problem, which is the speedy withdrawal of all foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan.

36. We are living at a time when the fate of mankind and world civilization is largely dependent on the direction in which international events develop—towards war or towards peace. In these circumstances, only peaceful coexistence holds out any prospect of a bright future for the peoples of all countries.

37. The Byelorussian delegation will, for its part, continue its unremitting struggle to avert the threat of a new war and to safeguard peace and peaceful coexistence for all States, regardless of their social and political system.

38. The Byelorussian people, like all peace-loving peoples, earnestly desire that the peoples of this area should be free and independent, that they should settle their domestic problems themselves in accordance with their national interests, that their territories which are close to the borders of the Soviet Union should not be transformed into military bases and that peace and tranquillity should prevail in the Near and Middle East.

39. The United Nations must put an end to interference by the United States and the United Kingdom in the domestic affairs of the countries of this area and must guarantee the right of the Arab peoples to settle their domestic affairs themselves. By taking a decision along those lines, the United Nations would be making a major contribution to the maintenance of general peace and security. It would enhance the prestige of the United Nations in the eyes of all the peoples of the world.

40. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR warmly supports the draft resolution of the Soviet Union recommending the immediate withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan. Only the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of the Arab countries can guarantee peace in the Near and Middle East, avert the outbreak of a new world war and guarantee the inalienable right of the countries of the Arab East to shape their destiny as they themselves see fit.

41. It is the duty of the General Assembly at this emergency special session to do everything possible to promote the achievement of the noble purposes which, according to the Charter, constitute the principle tasks of the United Nations.

42. We hope that the delegations present here will appreciate the serious responsibility confronting the General Assembly, that they will promote the success of its work in every possible way and thus make their contribution to the cause of consolidating peace throughout the world.

43. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) (*translated from Spanish*): In the view of my delegation the question which this emergency session is considering, and which is described in general terms as the Middle

East question, is in reality the world-wide question of preserving peace, a question that has again forced itself upon us at this time when serious danger threatens not only principles which are dear to mankind but also the very survival of the world.

44. Until this Assembly was actually convened, many countries had been unable to do more than act as mere spectators of a serious crisis with world-wide repercussions in which they found themselves involved and on which their destiny depended. The convening of the world parliament, in which all, be they great or small, have the right to be heard, now gives us the opportunity to make our views known and to make some contribution to whatever settlement may be agreed upon. My Government is convinced that the question now before us should, in view of its manifold implications, be kept within the framework of the United Nations, where every Member State has an opportunity to participate.

45. As far as my country is concerned, both its Government and its people are following the situation now evolving in the Middle East with the keenest interest, not only because it will have world-wide consequences and repercussions in many fields, or because of the very special ties which link the Arab world and the countries of Spanish origin, but also because the peoples of the Middle East are defending the same principles of independence and self-determination for which the people of Venezuela have shed their blood on many occasions. Now in particular do these aspirations evoke a sympathetic response from the Venezuelan people at a time when they are hailing representative democratic rule as the best guarantee of respect for human dignity, the improvement of living conditions and the preservation of national autonomy.

46. Viewing in this spirit the question which has brought us here, my delegation clearly sees, as have many others which have already taken part in the debate, that beyond the immediate and visible causes of the present crisis there are others, both regional and world-wide, of a more profound and complex nature which make it particularly difficult to find a solution in this case.

47. Among the purely regional causes, one of the most important, in our opinion, is the difference in approach to a historical phenomenon which neither can nor should be checked. I refer to the existence in the Arab world of an increasingly deep and active nationalist sentiment, which is leading the Arabs to take the reins of their destiny in their own hands with growing firmness.

48. Although, in our opinion, it is wrong to ignore this fact or to attribute it to causes other than the true ones, it would be equally wrong to allow that sentiment to become uncontrollably deflected by doctrines which are absolutely foreign to it, particularly at a time when the precarious balance on which peace rests could easily be destroyed in such a way as to bring about the extinction of the human race.

49. It is therefore essential not only that the full significance and import of the aspirations of the Arab world should be understood and heeded by the international community but also that the Arab world in turn, aware of the decisive role which it is playing in history and of the close interdependence between its fate and that of the rest of the world, should move forward to achieve its aims in a way that will not destroy that balance on which the fate of all depends.

50. We are all aware that the geographical situation of the region and its wealth in petroleum are also factors in the present crisis.

51. My delegation realizes how difficult it will be for the General Assembly at this emergency special session to consider all the implications and deep-rooted causes of the problem, some of the most important of which I have touched upon briefly. This of course would be the only really constructive approach to the situation and therefore the only approach which could lead, not to a temporary and illusory solution, but to the permanent removal of the real danger.

52. It is fortunate that, side by side with the new parliamentary diplomacy, the old-fashioned diplomacy of direct negotiation, in which fundamental questions can be faced more frankly and directly, is still making progress. In this field, the Secretary-General, who has displayed such great ability as an intelligent and energetic negotiator, should be able, by making use of the tools which the United Nations places at his disposal, to go on giving decisive assistance by continuing to study the background of the situation, by working to maintain a balance between the conflicting elements and by seeking permanent solutions.

53. I do not wish what I have said to be taken as implying that, in the view of my delegation, the Assembly should state that it is unable to find a solution and should confine itself to passing the problems over to the Secretary-General. On the contrary, and in line with what I said at the beginning of my statement, I believe that it is essential for every country to participate in the consideration of this question, not only in order to maintain the prestige of the United Nations but also because of the undeniable interest which each and all have in a question of universal import.

54. We are faced with a complex situation which must be settled by taking into account the principles of law and the circumstances of fact.

55. As regards the principles of law, my delegation's position is unambiguous and definitive: whatever the solution resorted to, it must be based on respect for the two principles of non-intervention, direct or indirect, in the internal affairs of any country and of the inalienable right of nations to decide for themselves what kind of government they wish to have.

56. As regards the circumstances of fact, the situation must be approached in the light of political realities, and an effort must be made to avoid a hasty decision that might further endanger the peace of the region and, in consequence, the peace of the world.

57. The existing unstable balance in Lebanon and Jordan cannot be suddenly disrupted; therefore, we are bound to admit that before the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from these countries, steps must be taken, with the participation of the United Nations, to create a situation which will make their prompt withdrawal easier.

58. To some, the presence of United States and United Kingdom troops in Lebanon and Jordan may seem justifiable, and to others not. In any case this is a fact, and it is likewise a fact which to some may seem justifiable and to others not—that propaganda and foreign incitement have been a factor in this conflict.

59. In these circumstances we must find a solution which will take into account the realities of the situation, without discrediting the principles and rights to

which I made reference earlier or establishing precedents which will damage or weaken them.

60. Following the lines of my earlier arguments, my delegation believes that the action to be taken should be based on the following general principles. First, the question should be considered and solved solely within the framework of the United Nations. Secondly, the Secretary-General should be allowed sufficient scope and flexibility in his activities to enable him, in agreement with the countries directly and immediately concerned, to carry on, through the United Nations Observation Group or the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization or in any other way that seems suitable, with the plan which has already been started. Thirdly, any measures proposed should have as their aim the solution not only of the specific problem which led to the convening of this Assembly but also of the long-term economic and social problems of the area. In this connexion, my delegation warmly welcomes the very valuable proposals made by the President of the United States in his address to this Assembly, in which he described in detail a vast plan for aid to the countries of the Middle East. Fourthly, any action undertaken for the benefit of the Middle East should take into account and, far from repressing, should stimulate and encourage the legitimate aspirations of the area. Fifthly, any action proposed should not, either directly or by implication, undermine any of the principles expressly enshrined in the Charter and in particular the principles of non-intervention and self-determination.

61. In supporting the adoption of these courses and defending the integrity of principles which my country is unable to renounce, my delegation is giving expression to the feelings of the Venezuelan nation, which, by its history, culture, geographical position and, above all, the will of its people and Government, forms an integral part—ideologically, politically and economically—of that part of the world in which flourishes the Christian civilization, which loves peace and has real faith in the future of democracy.

Sir Claude Corea (Ceylon), Vice-President, took the Chair.

62. Mr. ISMAIL (Federation of Malaya): In many ways, my Government welcomes the calling of this emergency special session of the General Assembly to consider the grave situation that has arisen in the Middle East and to take upon itself the heavy responsibility of resolving the crisis. We feel that it is fitting that each one of us assembled here in this great forum, representing all the eighty-one Members of the United Nations, should have a direct share in the consideration of the Middle East crisis and a direct responsibility with regard to any acceptable solution to the crisis. It is fitting that the General Assembly should sit, as it did two years ago, to deal with a situation which my Government considers would endanger international peace and security if it were permitted to develop. It is our hope and prayer that we in this Assembly will be able to find a solution, as the General Assembly did in the Suez crisis, which would remove the threat to world peace and security. As on that previous occasion, the effectiveness of the United Nations as a moral force for peace is again subjected to a grave test, a test which it must go through equally successfully.

63. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to re-affirm the faith which the Government and the people of Malaya, in common with the peace-loving peoples the world over, have in the United Nations

as the expression of our united endeavour for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is also fitting that we should, on this occasion, renew our pledge to uphold the Charter and recall its aim that States should "practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours." We should also recall General Assembly resolution 1236 (XII) on "Peaceful and neighbourly relations among States", adopted only eight months ago. We should jointly pledge that in our policies, both towards and within the area, our respective Governments will act strictly in accordance with the principles of mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, of non-aggression, of non-interference in each other's internal affairs, and of equal and mutual benefit, and that they will ensure that our conduct by word and deed conforms to these principles.

64. As a token of the high esteem with which we regard him and the confidence we have in the Secretary-General, my delegation will support any action which will empower the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Governments of the Arab States, to make such practical arrangements within the framework of the Charter and in accordance with its purposes and principles, as may facilitate the peaceful solution of the crisis in the Middle East on the basis of the principles I mentioned earlier.

65. My delegation is gratified at the recognition in this United Nations Assembly of the existence and growing force of nationalism in the Arab fatherland. President Eisenhower, in his address to us here on 13 August [733rd meeting], referred to it, and rightly so, as the "great surge of Arab nationalism". Nationalism, whether it be in the Middle East, in South-East Asia, or anywhere else in the world, is not inherently a destructive force. On the contrary, by its very nature it is a powerful influence towards strength and unity in a people. It can bring forth all that is good within a nation, as the history of many nations has proved. It is only when the forces of nationalism, in their growth and in their attempts to find expression, are impeded and frustrated, whether by internal or external influences, that they are forced to assume a destructive character.

66. My delegation believes that this is the position in the Middle East today. The upsurge of nationalism in the Arab world can no longer be contained, whether by internal or external forces. The rest of the world must allow it to find its own expression and to reach its own goals unimpeded, in its own way. There is a nationalistic restlessness in the whole of the Middle East today, and this state has been aggravated, rather than relieved, by the introduction of foreign troops into the area. This restlessness will become a threat to international peace and security only through intervention, in any form whatsoever, from any external source. It is my delegation's view, therefore, that if this emergency special session of the General Assembly is to achieve its object of removing the threat to international peace and security caused by the present crisis in the Middle East, it must render, to use a medical term, immediate symptomatic relief to the grave crisis.

67. The symptomatic relief to which I refer is the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan. It is clear to my delegation that there is a general agreement on the desirability of this withdrawal. It is clear also that there is a difference of view on when and in what cir-

circumstances this withdrawal of foreign troops should be undertaken. The Government of the Federation of Malaya feels that it would be proper, in the situation that faces this General Assembly concerning the Middle East, that full use should be made of United Nations machinery to assist and accelerate the rendering of the symptomatic relief. The United Nations already has an Observation Group in Lebanon, the usefulness of whose work has been already acknowledged. It seems to my delegation that the United Nations Observation Group should be enlarged and its area of operations extended in order to include Jordan as well. My delegation would therefore urge that as an immediate solution to the crisis in the Middle East, foreign troops should be withdrawn and United Nations activities extended in the area in consultation with the Governments of the Arab States.

68. My Government welcomes the initial action of the United States in withdrawing some of its forces from Lebanon, and hopes that United States forces will be completely withdrawn at an early date. My Government would like also to see the complete withdrawal of United Kingdom forces from Jordan at an early date.

69. My delegation recognizes that there are longer-term problems affecting the Middle East which also require solution, problems of a serious and complex nature. Because of the nature of these problems, the General Assembly, sitting in this short emergency special session, cannot even begin to consider them. There is inevitably a political aspect to these problems since, as I have pointed out earlier, the growing force of Arab nationalism is a factor of the greatest importance in the affairs of the Middle East. There must obviously be a political settlement of these long-term problems, since they affect the national aspirations of the people of the area. And equally obviously, the solution of these political problems must necessarily lie in the hands of the Arab people themselves. They could never be readily solved—and indeed serious complications with grave consequences would result—by the intervention of external influences.

70. There is, of course, the economic aspect of the long-term problems of the Middle East, on which great emphasis has been laid in the statements made in this Assembly. The economic problems as attributed to the Middle East are not peculiar to the area; these are the very same problems which resurgent nationalism would encounter whether it be in the Middle East, South-East Asia or anywhere else in the world. And it is in the solution of these economic problems that the true constructive character of nationalism anywhere would show itself and be afforded its natural outlet. There is, of course, a danger that the forces of nationalism, in attempting to find solutions to the economic problems which beset the nation, might be subjected to influences that are entirely foreign to its character. Communism as an alien influence offers such a danger. It could destroy the constructive character of nationalism needed to face the economic problems which require solution if the true ultimate goals of nationalism are to be achieved, and we are convinced that the Arab people are themselves fully aware of such dangers in finding expression for their nationalist aspirations.

71. My delegation agrees, of course, that the solution of the economic problems in the Middle East, as elsewhere, requires the assistance of all countries which

are in a position to offer assistance. But such assistance, in whatever form, must only be given in order to reinforce and sustain the true, constructive character of nationalism in these countries. It cannot supplant it in any way, however subtle.

72. As far as the Arab people are concerned, it is the deep-rooted faith of the Government of the Federation of Malaya that they have a great contribution to make to the international good. As you know, my country has very close cultural links with the Arab nation, links which have been forged over many centuries. The religion that the Arabs brought to our land many centuries ago is a potent factor in the life of my people. It has taught us the ideals of peace and the brotherhood of man; it has taught my people the virtues of tolerance and understanding. I would say that our own nationalism, which has brought independence for our country, has been tempered by the virtues which Islam has taught the Malay people. I would repeat that my own people owe a great cultural debt to the Arab people, and we are convinced that the Arab people will continue to contribute towards the spiritual and material progress of mankind. It is for the Arab people themselves to decide the measure of such a contribution.

73. Mr. DUKULY (Liberia): It is the privilege of the Liberian delegation to co-sponsor, with the delegations of Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Norway, Panama and Paraguay, the draft resolution initiated by the Norwegian delegation [A/3878].

74. Grave events in the Near East, carrying with them the threat of a clash of arms whose end no man could foresee, brought us together in this emergency special session of the General Assembly. We are here to consider how best we can, by joint action, contribute to the solution of the ever more formidable and challenging problems that have accumulated in an area which some of us may think has been too long neglected, without proper help and sympathy from the outside world. One of the lessons we have learned from recent history is that when we hesitate to apply, to social maladies which are apparent to all, economic remedies which might effect a cure, we are often driven instead to seek military relief, which is likely to kill the patient as well as the disease. In the Near East our chief task, I suggest, is to remove the basic causes of the fever which now rages there by the use of a milder therapy than that afforded by the surgeon's knife.

75. There has been much talk in the past few days of finding a formula on which we can all agree. Certainly we shall have failed if the search for such a formula proves fruitless. But we shall also have failed if we content ourselves with the approval of a formula which will later be shown to have no practical utility. The whole world is listening intently to this debate, not for the sake of the able speeches which are made, but in the desperate hope that these speeches will result in bold, imaginative and, above all, sincerely motivated action.

76. It would be a tragedy for many nations which belong to, or have legitimate interests in, the Near East if we were to reach the end of this session with virtually nothing accomplished. It would also be a tragedy for this Organization, which came to birth amid so many bright omens in 1945 and which since then has retained, and I believe deserved, the respect and support of the vast majority of mankind. All of us must be soberly aware of the wave of disappointment, and perhaps of disillusionment, which must inevitably sweep

throughout our anguished world if at this time, when the issue of peace or war hangs so precariously in the balance, we are misled by prejudice or anger or expediency into courses which promise not an end to tension but, at best, glowering truce fraught with the danger of even greater catastrophe.

77. No one is happy when there are headlines in the newspapers about the movement of troops, by air and by sea, into countries where feelings are already running high and where so much inflammable material is lying around waiting to be ignited. President Eisenhower, in his admirable address, made it clear that no one would be better pleased than he if tomorrow the Lebanese situation had improved to such an extent that the presence of American forces was no longer needed. This view is also shared by the United Kingdom in regard to Jordan. But my delegation doubts very much whether, as some speakers have claimed, the mere withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan should be the sole, immediate goal of our endeavours. The incursion of these troops, at the invitation of the Lebanese and Jordanian Governments, is like the small part of an iceberg that shows above the surface of the water. The greater part of the iceberg, which poses the real threat to peaceful navigation, lies below the surface. Even if we could detach the visible part, the obstruction and the menace would still remain. We are faced with a simple choice between half measures and full measures, between tackling what is superficial and what is basic.

78. The eminent representative of New Zealand referred in his speech [737th meeting] to the several problems, other than that of troop withdrawal, which are still unsettled in the Near East. The Liberian delegation shares his views and is convinced that no plan, however plausible and however well intended, will dissipate this crisis if it does not provide in some manner for the political, social and economic rehabilitation of the whole area between the Nile Valley and the Persian Gulf.

79. Who can deny that there are developing in this region tendencies which imperil the sovereignty of independent countries whose right to have control of their own affairs is surely not lessened by the fact that they happen to be small in land area and in population? As a Member of the United Nations and a nation of African origin, Liberia is disturbed, is uneasy, when a small country is faced with a challenge to its right to exist as a separate and distinct entity and to work out its own destiny in a manner suitable to its own purposes. I say this without in the slightest degree questioning the *bona fides* of those who uphold the cause of nationalism, in the Near East or elsewhere. It is a cause to which Liberia has given succour in the past and will continue to give succour in the future. But nationalism, if it is to be true to itself, must concede to others the freedom and the dignity which it rightly claims to be the birthright of all peoples.

80. It was in defence of this political philosophy that Liberia, although geographically remote from Korea, answered in a measure the appeal of that country when its right to an independent and unmolested existence was threatened.

81. A few months ago eight independent countries of Africa held a conference at Accra with the main object of exchanging views on ways and means of promoting the closest possible co-operation among themselves in all matters affecting their common welfare. Because

of the many points at which the interests of the eight States touched those of the world in general and of the African Continent in particular, the President of Liberia attended the conference. The eight States unanimously adopted a resolution in which they declared their determination to safeguard the "hard-won independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of their members" and to give all possible assistance to the dependent peoples in their struggle to achieve their freedom also. In this debate, as in all similar proceedings in the Assembly, the Liberian delegation seeks to remain loyal to the spirit of that resolution, and of the resolutions passed at Bandung in 1955.

82. The nations of the Near East together constitute a valuable link in the chain of our world community. Each of them possesses the inherent right of sovereignty, the right to have its people live in a society free from fear, the right to be master of its own fate, the right to be shielded from interference, whether by close neighbours or by distant outsiders, in its internal affairs. This, in the opinion of the Liberian delegation, is the sacred principle by which we must be guided in seeking peace in the Near East and indeed peace throughout the world.

83. It is, I trust, a commonplace, not open to serious dispute, that the resort to violence in the solution of problems, be they national or international, is repugnant to the lofty ideals enshrined in the Charter, to which all the countries represented in this great Organization have pledged solemn allegiance.

84. I speak for a small nation. It is not within our competence to lift the burden of fear that weighs so heavily today upon the souls of men. The safety of the whole of the human race can be assured only by the great Powers. Theirs must be the "yea" or the "nay". How quickly would the atmosphere in this chamber be cleansed of dissidence and suspicion if they—the great Powers—could abandon their exhausting and perennial feud, and establish a relationship based on genuine trust and friendship. In this connexion the President of Liberia, in a recent Independence Day address, made the following statement:

"The present international situation is critical and dangerous, but I think it can be solved if international statesmanship is tempered by a return to more spiritual and moral principles: God and reason. It is essential that the great Powers desist from retaining a monopoly of the world."

85. In the draft resolution which my Government is co-sponsoring, the Secretary-General, in whom we all repose unqualified confidence, is requested to make such arrangements as would ensure the independence and sovereignty of the States of Lebanon and Jordan, having in mind the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom forces from these areas.

86. No one, I am sure, will claim that his proposal offers a perfect solution, but in a world inhabited by fallible human beings, and plagued by misunderstandings of increasing complexity, we may aspire to perfection, but must be content if we fall short of attaining it. "If at first you don't succeed, try, try, again." The Liberian delegation co-sponsors the draft resolution in the belief that at least it gives us a start along the right path. Knowing the Secretary-General as we do, and bearing in mind his past tireless activity in the cause of peace, we may hope that if all Members of this Assembly—and especially those which have played a

leading part hitherto in the Near Eastern drama—will make a sincere and concerted effort to sustain him in his arduous and vital task, he will bring it to a shining and redemptive consummation.

87. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The emergency special session of the General Assembly which was called to discuss the dangerous situation in the Near and Middle East resulting from the United States and United Kingdom aggression against Lebanon and Jordan, and to discuss the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from those countries, has been under way for almost two weeks. The delegation of many countries have stated their Governments' position on this matter.

88. What general conclusion suggests itself as a result of the debate that has taken place? The conclusion is, I think, obvious. A majority of the States represented in the United Nations condemn the invasion of the Near East by United States and United Kingdom troops; it has created a tense situation in this area which for several years has been the object of almost ceaseless imperialist intrigues and acts of military provocation. If any further evidence was needed of the condemnation of the United States' and the United Kingdom's actions towards these two Arab States, the debate at this session has provided cogent evidence of it. However much the United States and United Kingdom Governments may try to check the development of such sentiments, the majority of Members of the United Nations are definitely in favour of the rapid removal of United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan. Rarely in the past has the United Nations witnessed anything comparable to what is happening now in the debate on the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from the Near East.

89. No one but the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom themselves, and of several other States which are bound hand and foot by military and other obligations to those two Powers, has defended the military intervention in Lebanon and Jordan. Particularly noticeable is the fact that the most zealous defenders of the occupation of those countries have been the delegations of States like Australia and New Zealand which are situated thousands of kilometres from the Arab East and therefore have but a very remote connexion with the vital problems of that area, with the needs and concerns of its peoples.

90. It is also significant that even the Governments directly responsible for the aggressive actions in the Near East, those of the United States and the United Kingdom, were forced to come before the Assembly with soothing assurances. The pity of it is, however, that these assurances were given in such a vague form that they in fact commit those two Governments to nothing, and the urgent matter that we are considering here—the withdrawal of the troops—is actually being postponed for an indefinite period. An attempt is being made to obscure the main issue by discussion of whether the appeals in response to which the United States and the United Kingdom invaded Lebanon and Jordan were legal or illegal, and other similar matters. An attempt was made to convince us that the introduction of those nations' troops into the Near East was virtually a normal occurrence, and the General Assembly is practically being asked to thank the United States and the United Kingdom for this action.

91. An attempt was even made to justify the invasion of Lebanon and Jordan by United States and United Kingdom troops by citing various provisions of the United Nations Charter. However, since the actions of the United States and the United Kingdom are in reality grossly at variance with the Charter, which categorically and unequivocally prohibits interference by one State in the domestic affairs of another, particularly by the use of armed force, these attempts led to nothing but embarrassment. It is no accident that only the representatives of those countries which are the most active members of the NATO bloc continue to invoke the Charter and its principles.

92. It was not a desire to comply with the United Nations Charter or concern for the sovereignty of Lebanon and Jordan that dictated the action of the United States and the United Kingdom in regard to those countries. It was the general policy pursued by the United States and the United Kingdom throughout the post-war period—a policy which has created dangerous tension in international relations and which at times literally leads the world to the brink of war. These are the fruits of the "positions of strength" policy, which is the basic tenet of present-day United States foreign policy.

93. We recently listened to the statement which the President of the United States made [733rd meeting] in the United Nations. We were told that the United States by no means intended to confine itself to Lebanon and Jordan but intended to "reserve the right"—that is what the President said: "reserve the right"—to send its armed forces into other small countries as well. At whose discretion—that of the United Nations, perchance? Not at all, at the discretion of the United States. There is an example for you of respect for the United Nations, respect for its principles and purposes, respect for its Charter. If this sort of attitude towards the United Nations constitutes respect for its lofty principles and purposes, then I cannot imagine what disrespect for the United Nations or contempt and defiance of its principles would be.

94. It is easy to see what would remain of the United Nations if the fate of its principles and purposes were decided in accordance with the tastes of certain States, or rather of their ruling circles, which approve only of those countries which submissively follow the policy of establishing military blocs, make their territory available for United States military bases, and follow in the wake of the NATO leaders' aggressive policy. Perhaps some members of the General Assembly will say that we are being too harsh and painting the situation in too gloomy colours! We agree that that picture is not a rosy one, but it is unquestionably correct. How else can one speak of events like those which we have all repeatedly witnessed during the last two or three years alone in the Near and Middle East, where, as a result of the expansionist and aggressive policy of certain States, the world has more than once been on the verge of an outbreak which might have had grave consequences for the cause of international peace?

95. Look at the map of the Near and Middle East and you will see why the Soviet Union and its people cannot remain impassive spectators while the area of the Near and Middle East is transformed into an increasingly dangerous centre of provocation and intrigue, into a focus of war. That this is happening is further confirmed by the fact that an attempt has recently been

made to turn the region into a regular military staging area for the leading Powers of the aggressive NATO bloc—a fact which speaks for itself.

96. The Soviet Government has stated more than once, and it states now, that the Soviet Union cannot be a detached observer of such a situation, which, in view of the closeness of the area concerned to the Soviet frontiers, is contrary to the vital security interests of the USSR.

97. Needless to say, it is contrary to the interests of upholding peace in general and to the vital interests of the peoples of this area. The overwhelming majority of the Near and Middle Eastern countries, which are vigorously demanding the cessation of foreign interference in their domestic affairs and respect for their independence, have said so on more than one occasion. The voices of a few isolated statesmen in those countries, who have lost the confidence of their peoples and are reaching out to Washington and London with a plea for protection by foreign troops, cannot alter the situation.

98. Take another look at the same map, where the areas of deployment of United States and United Kingdom forces in the Near and Middle East are indicated, and you will see that tens of thousands of United States and United Kingdom troops, armed with modern military equipment and backed by a concentration of naval and air forces, have levelled their sights at the United Arab Republic and the Republic of Iraq—and not at those Arab States alone. For what purpose? Have these troops perhaps brought sovereignty for Lebanon and Jordan on the points of their bayonets? One would have to be hopelessly lacking in any understanding of the situation in this area, or else simply a hypocrite, in order to answer that question in the affirmative.

99. It is easy to see what would happen if States based their course of action in international affairs on the arguments used here by the organizers of the intervention in Lebanon and Jordan, who cited appeals from the former President of Lebanon and the King of Jordan. Every great Power—and, for that matter, every strong nation—would feel entitled to move its armed forces, on one or another formal pretext, into another State in which it wished to establish itself. Today there are foreign troops in Lebanon and Jordan, tomorrow someone will find it advantageous to send marines and paratroopers into one of the Latin American countries, and the day after tomorrow it may be the turn of a State in South-East Asia or some other region. If that happened, all the standards of peaceful intercourse between States and of mutual respect for sovereign rights would be thrown overboard. Utter chaos would reign in international affairs, except that the word "chaos" does not convey the full peril of such a situation in our times, when a military conflict, and especially an outbreak in which the great Powers become involved, is capable of having the gravest consequences for mankind. Can events be permitted to take this course? I think everyone will agree that this is out of the question. But, if that is so, let us use our joint efforts to see that the United States and the United Kingdom withdraw their troops from the Near East without delay—I repeat: without delay—and, at the same time, let us tell them that henceforth they must not play with fire and bring the situation in this area to a white heat.

100. Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, has expressed displeasure in this

Assembly at the fact that the invasion of Jordan by United Kingdom troops and of Lebanon by United States troops was characterized by the Soviet delegation as an act of aggression. We understand, of course, that the United Kingdom Government finds this description disagreeable. But what is one to do if those are the facts? We are merely calling a spade a spade. Let others select anodyne and tactful expressions which do not convey the danger of the situation. If we followed their example, we would be doing a disservice to the cause of peace, for then the United Nations would have to discuss not the question of withdrawing United States and United Kingdom troops from the Near East but, perhaps, the question of building barracks for those troops at United Nations expense and, in general, helping them to settle down there for a long stay.

101. If the United Kingdom Government does not want to be the subject of such unfavourable comment, it should refrain from action which gives every reason for describing it in such terms; above all, the continuing United Kingdom intervention in Jordan and United States intervention in Lebanon should be halted and the troops should be removed from the Near and Middle East.

102. I cannot but refer to one matter which for some reason has not received due attention in our debate, particularly in the statements by those delegations which are attempting to justify the action of the United States and the United Kingdom. I am speaking of the Observation Group which was sent to Lebanon in accordance with a Security Council resolution¹ and which has submitted its views to the United Nations in a report—in fact, in several reports. It looks as if those who at one time urged the need to send observers to Lebanon have now lost much of their interest in those observers, or at least in their reports. Nevertheless, it would be advisable for the General Assembly to give this matter close study.

103. The Observation Group has submitted several reports to the Security Council, but each time they have been virtually ignored in Washington and London. Only a few days ago, during the present emergency special session of the General Assembly, the Group's third report² was circulated to us, and the same old story is being repeated again: the United States and the United Kingdom are acting as if there were no United Nations Observers in Lebanon. Why is this? The explanation is simple. The Observation Group has stated in all its reports, on the basis of thorough study of the situation in Lebanon, that there neither has been nor is any interference by neighbouring States in the domestic affairs of Lebanon.

104. Incidentally, due attention should be given to the conclusion expressed in the Group's third report that the landing of United States armed forces in Lebanon had caused a set-back to the work of the United Nations Observers and resulted in a sharp reaction among the Lebanese population. Such conclusions by the United Nations Observers, whose impartiality no one here has questioned, obviously cannot please those who carried out the invasion of Lebanon and Jordan and are now hunting for excuses to prolong the occupation of those countries.

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1958*, document S/4023.

² *Ibid.*, Supplement for July, August and September 1958, document S/4085.

105. What is one to say about the so-called indirect aggression which is allegedly being employed against Lebanon and Jordan and which the representatives of certain countries have attempted to bring into the discussion of the question that is before the General Assembly? I think we have all noticed that the myth of indirect aggression has been exploded before our very eyes. It can convince nobody now. Indeed, what was, in the final analysis, the main charge levelled by the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and the countries which defended their position? Essentially, it amounted to voicing an objection to radio broadcasts from certain countries, the contents of which do not suit some politicians in Lebanon and Jordan and, of course, do not suit Washington and London.

106. But who is going to believe that the reasons for the present tension in the Near and Middle East should be sought not in the presence of foreign troops on the soil of Arab countries, not in the flights of United States bombers over the cities of Lebanon and Jordan, not in the ships of the United States Sixth Fleet cruising along the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, and not in the policy of imperialist expansion with regard to the countries of the Arab East, but in the critical remarks by Arab radio commentators about various politicians in Beirut and Amman who are protected by the United States and United Kingdom Governments?

107. Why have these radio broadcasts suddenly begun to attract so much attention from the United States and the United Kingdom? What is the reason for all this interest? It does not require much perspicacity to see that the reason lies in the need to find some basis for justifying the armed invasion of the Arab East, some excuse for armed aggression. There can be no other explanation for the statements we have heard concerning the danger which these radio broadcasts represent or for the efforts to depict them as some sort of indirect aggression.

108. If the leaders of the United States and the United Kingdom were seriously interested in preventing the abuse of radio broadcasts and in ensuring that those who are in fact using them to disseminate tendentious information and foment enmity between peoples should no longer be permitted to do so, they should first of all take steps to put an end to the inflammatory propaganda systematically turned out day after day against many countries of Eastern Europe and the Near East, as well as several other countries, by the numerous propaganda centres supported by United States funds, including those in Europe. The statements about indirect aggression made here by representatives of countries which defend the action of the United States and the United Kingdom have about as much truth in them as the broadcasts of Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America.

109. If the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have really begun to be so concerned over the effect of certain broadcasts on the security of entire States, then what prevents them from accepting the Soviet Union's proposal to put a stop to the propaganda of war, enmity and hatred between peoples? It is now some years since the Soviet Union first made this proposal.

110. Furthermore, we know very well that mankind has not yet invented a barrier that can stop the spread of an ideology. As we know, there are customs barriers

and immigration barriers. In the post-war period we have witnessed the establishment of quite extensive barriers in international trade, barriers which of late, however, have steadily been weakening under the pressure of events. Yet there are not and never will be barriers that can prevent the dissemination of truth among peoples.

111. We fully realize that even reports consisting merely of factual information on such topics as the successes of the Soviet Union in developing the national economy, upturning virgin soil, building huge power-stations and so forth, may cause displeasure and even annoyance to certain circles. If so, we cannot help it; all we can do is advise them to compete with us in carrying out such measures. Competition of that sort would be far better and far more profitable than competition in producing atomic and hydrogen weapons, building military bases on foreign soil, increasing war budgets and, in general, an armaments race which has already gone so far that only the blind can fail to see all the dangers it holds for the destiny of the world.

112. If, however, we are to consider who, in fact, are involved in indirect aggression and have made such aggression an integral part of their foreign policies, we must recognize that those who are guilty of it are the States which have also resorted to direct aggression against the countries of the Near East. Many examples to prove this point could be found in the activities of both the United States and the United Kingdom. The statements made here by some delegations merely scratched the surface of what could be said on the subject.

113. If we were to confine ourselves merely to enumerating the plots uncovered time and again in one Arab country after another, organized from abroad for the purpose of overthrowing legal governments in the countries of the Arab East, if we were to confine ourselves to listing the statesmen of those countries who have been liquidated because they did not please those who wanted to control the destiny of the Arab peoples, that alone would suffice to demolish the myth that the introduction of United States and United Kingdom troops was dictated by the desire to protect Lebanon and Jordan from some "indirect aggression" from abroad.

114. We must also draw attention to another tactic which is resorted to by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom not only openly but also behind the scenes. I have in mind the frequent and mysterious hints which have been dropped to the effect that the United Kingdom is allegedly prevented from carrying out an early withdrawal of its troops from Jordan by the threat of an attack on Jordan by Israel. It is being said outright that the United Kingdom would withdraw its troops from Jordan but cannot possibly do so because, supposedly, there is a danger that Israel would then attack Jordan and war would result. Can this attempt at intimidation by raising the spectre of a campaign by Israel against Jordan be interpreted otherwise than as part of a preconceived plan?

115. While all this is going on, the representatives of Israel are occupying their places among us, listening to all our statements and, of course keeping themselves fully informed of what is going on behind the scenes. The Israel delegation listens to all this, has so far remained enigmatically silent and neither refutes nor confirms what is attributed to Israel. In short, it is hedging in order to sell itself dear.

116. If we are to speak plainly about what may or may not happen in the event of United Kingdom troops being withdrawn from Jordan, we must frankly state that unless Israel has the support of other countries, there can be no danger that it will attack Jordan. If, on the other hand, it is anticipated that Israel will nevertheless do so, then obviously someone has laid plans along those lines in advance. If that is so, let us openly admit that such plans exist. If there are no such plans, there is no need to arouse fear of Israel among Arabs. In that case the delegation of Israel should make a statement to that effect and put an end to speculation on the matter. If it does not, it will only strengthen our conviction that the General Assembly is witnessing a stage performance in which roles have been assigned in advance.

117. Several representatives speaking in support of the position of the United States and the United Kingdom have predicted other disasters and calamities if foreign troops withdraw from Jordan. What will happen, they say, if Jordan is freed from foreign occupation? Yet it is highly unlikely that any disaster will ensue if we simply show genuine rather than feigned concern for the people of Jordan, if we take the stand that they have the same right as any other people to manage their domestic affairs. We are deeply convinced that the Jordanian people are capable of settling their domestic problems without internal interference and there is no reason to believe that they are not sufficiently mature to do so.

118. Was it so long ago that India, Burma, Indonesia and many other States, today worthily represented in the United Nations, were also considered incapable of managing their domestic affairs and governing themselves? Yet experience has shown that they are able to make as good use of their national freedom and independence as any other State. It may well be that the Jordanians will settle their domestic problems as London and Washington would like, but that is another matter. The question is, why should they take orders from those two capitals? What significance could be attached to statements recognizing the principles of the United Nations and the equality of peoples, if in practice the peoples of the Arab East, including the people of Jordan, were denied their fundamental right to an independent existence free from foreign tutelage? Such statements would indeed have little significance.

119. The Soviet delegation has already drawn attention to the efforts made by the Governments of certain Western Powers, particularly the Government of the United States of America, to put forward various economic proposals as a means of steering our debate away from the primary purpose for which this emergency special session of the General Assembly was urgently convened, on the initiative of the Soviet Union. That primary purpose is to ease the present tension in the Near and Middle East, to put an end to the dangerous situation which has arisen there as a result of the introduction of United States and United Kingdom forces into the territory of two Arab States, and to bring about the withdrawal of those forces; if we allow the Assembly to be diverted from the search for a settlement of that problem, the authority of our organization will be dealt a new and serious blow, especially in the eyes of the peoples of the Arab countries, who will then be justified in saying that the United Nations has not performed its duty.

120. We have no doubt that the Government of the United States is quite well aware that the present session is not the proper occasion for considering questions relating to the economic development of one country or another. If it has nevertheless seen fit to raise questions concerning the economy of the Arab countries, the only explanation can be that it is seeking to substitute one question for another, regardless of the fact, which is now quite plain, that not a single Arab State has authorized the United States Government to submit plans for the economic development of the countries of the Arab East.

121. Let no one interpret these words of the Soviet delegation as evidence of any lack of interest in the problem of economic aid for the development of the countries of the Near and Middle East. The Soviet Union is an ardent advocate of granting assistance to the young States of the East in their economic development and of strengthening their independence, assistance rendered without any political or other conditions attached. The experience of the Soviet Union's economic relations with those countries speaks for itself. We have reason to express our deepest satisfaction that the relationship established between the Soviet Union and many of those countries has helped them to stand on their own feet, helped to strengthen their independence. Is this what the sponsors of the United States proposal also wants? No, for if it were, they would long since have accepted the Soviet Government's proposal concerning economic assistance to the countries of the Arab East in a form which would fully respect the independence of those countries. The proposal to set up some sort of special agency acceptable to Washington—an agency which would in effect take charge of the economic development of the countries concerned—does not change this situation. It is not a matter of a special agency but of a policy. If we consider the policy of the United States in its relations with the Arab East, we may say, "He who pays the piper calls the tune".

122. Speaking from this rostrum, the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, as well as those of a few other countries which support the United States-United Kingdom intervention in the Near East, have tried to convince the Assembly of their warm feelings towards the national liberation movement of the Arabs or, as they call it, Arab nationalism. Today they enthusiastically recall the history of the Arab nation and its contribution to the development of world civilization.

123. Allow me to ask all those who have suddenly come to appreciate the great contribution of the Arabs to world history and culture: if you sincerely recognize this contribution and respect Arab nationalism, why, then, are your troops occupying two Arab countries? Why are you unwilling to leave Lebanon and Jordan and why do you assume that the Arabs in Lebanon and Jordan cannot do without your tanks, guns, bombers, and warships? Somehow your protestations that you respect nationalism do not accord with what you are actually doing in Lebanon and Jordan, and not in those countries alone.

124. Those who are defending the policy of the United Kingdom, in particular, have paid moving tributes from this rostrum to the great historic role of that country in relation to the peoples of the colonial countries. To hear them, one would imagine that the United Kingdom had for at least a hundred years

been exclusively concerned with the liberation of the Asian and African peoples. Yet you all know very well that is far from true, that the stern facts of history are quite different.

125. During the General Assembly debate, the delegations of many countries have put forward a number of valuable thoughts and ideas with a view to the establishment of lasting peace and tranquillity in the Near and Middle East. In this we see proof that great importance is attached to the problem under discussion during the current session and that the Members of the United Nations sincerely wish to find a solution which would lead to the reduction of international tension and the strengthening of peace. The Soviet delegation, for its part, is doing everything possible to promote the search for such a solution.

126. We are glad to note that the overwhelming majority of members of the Assembly have shown a desire to co-operate with all, including the Soviet delegation, in that search. This is true particularly of the majority of the States of the Arab East and the overwhelming majority of Asian and African States, which clearly realize what the foreign occupation of Lebanon and Jordan means for themselves and for the cause of peace. We must, however, unfortunately state that we met with no response when we tried to reach agreement with the United States and the United Kingdom delegations on taking joint action and on securing the adoption by the General Assembly of a concerted decision providing for the immediate withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from the Near East and for simultaneous—I repeat: the simultaneous—appropriate action by the United Nations.

127. Our proposal for the immediate withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan and for appropriate United Nations action has been countered by the proposal which, although known as Norwegian, is in reality a United States and United Kingdom draft resolution.

128. What is there to be said about this proposal? It is mainly intended to mislead the members of the Assembly and to create the impression that the United States and the United Kingdom also wish to withdraw their forces. One requires great—I might even say: very great—experience in the analysis of casuistic texts to determine whether this draft resolution has any connexion whatsoever with the question of the withdrawal of foreign armies from Lebanon and Jordan. If we discard the casuistry and consider the true purport of this draft resolution, we find that its sponsors have simply left the question of the withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan suspended in mid-air. In effect they propose that the Assembly should not express any views on the central question before this emergency special session and should completely rely on the good will and the fine promises of the United States and United Kingdom Governments.

129. In addition, the draft resolution is literally stuffed with proposals intended to divert the Assembly's attention from the essence of the question under review. There is reference to plans for the establishment of a United Nations police force, which the President of the United States light-heartedly described as a "peace force" in his statement to the Assembly in order to present this project in the most favourable light. There is clearly a psychological motive behind this. In the light of present events it is not difficult to understand

what this United States plan for the establishment of a so-called peace force holds in store for small countries. The experience of Lebanon and Jordan has shown that open armed intervention in the internal life of the Arab States has in our time become politically embarrassing, and a way is therefore being sought to cloak any future armed intervention in other forms, to engage in it under cover of the United Nations flag. As I see it, it is gratifying that the overwhelming majority of States have duly appreciated the danger inherent in such a plan and have left its authors in no doubt that they have seriously miscalculated if they expected to see it endorsed and adopted.

130. If we try to analyse and give a general appraisal of this draft resolution, we must frankly state that had the task been assigned to the Rockefeller Standard Oil Company, it could not have produced any other plan than the one set out in the draft resolution.

131. Some representatives may possibly point out in reply that the draft resolution nevertheless requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to take some action in the sphere of negotiations with the Arab States and that, in general, this action may contribute to a positive settlement of the problem of the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom forces.

132. This, however, leads to the counter-question: how and with whom the Secretary-General is to negotiate, if the Arab States immediately concerned are resolutely opposed to the draft resolution, as it in no way promotes a solution of the question of the withdrawal of forces. Is it not clear that the adoption of such a resolution would place the Secretary-General and the States supporting the proposal in a worse than false position?

133. All this must be taken into account if we are to show our concern about the situation in the Near East not only in words, but in deeds. It is surprising, not that this draft resolution finds no support among the States which are consistently urging the need for the immediate withdrawal of foreign forces from the Near East, for the regularization of conditions in that area, and for the removal of the threat to peace, but that there should be any Governments supporting it.

134. The Soviet delegation thought it necessary to state its attitude to the Norwegian draft resolution, now sponsored by seven countries, in unequivocal terms.

135. Those who are behind this draft resolution are boosting their own morale and that of their sympathizers by making out that everything will be for the best, that it will be possible to get together the necessary majority of votes and that a draft resolution convenient to themselves will be adopted. Permit me, however, to ask this question: What would the adoption of such a resolution by the Assembly mean? What kind of text would this be, adopted against the wishes and legitimate interests of the Arab States, with which it is primarily concerned? What value would it have? It may be said in advance that this would be a feeble, lifeless document, of which there are already many in the archives of the United Nations, because they have been adopted against the wishes and legitimate interests of the States immediately concerned.

136. It may be asked whether we want to bring about such a situation. The answer is indisputably no, in so far as the vast majority of the members of this Assembly are concerned. We think that this is clearly evident from the whole of our discussion, during which

the overwhelming majority of the members of the General Assembly have consistently placed strong emphasis on the need to find a settlement which would be in accordance with the vital interests of the Arab peoples and with the interests of security in the Near and Middle East.

137. Yet those who have submitted and are supporting this draft resolution pretend that all this is of no importance or at least not of serious importance. They apparently act on the assumption that the draft resolution only needs to be approved by Washington to be regarded as appropriate. Can such an attitude be described as respect for Arab nationalism, Arab culture and the vital interests of the Arab peoples? Hardly. If this is respect for the interests of the Arab people, then what, it may be asked, would constitute disregard of their interests?

138. Some argue more or less as follows: the United States and the United Kingdom are in a difficult position, having become involved in a military adventure in the Near East. They should therefore be helped to extricate themselves, and the draft resolution under review is, they say, an attempt to find a way out of the maze of difficulties in which they have become entangled as a result of their policy. The answer to this argument is that the best method of disengagement is the immediate withdrawal of United States troops from Lebanon and of United Kingdom troops from Jordan, without recourse to any form of evasion. I think most members of the Assembly will agree that this would be the speediest and most reliable means and would be duly appreciated by all peoples, including the Soviet people.

139. As we have already pointed out, such action by the United States and the United Kingdom could only benefit their prestige, which has suffered seriously and is badly in need of bolstering.

140. If the Assembly wishes to justify the hopes of the peoples, if we all wish worthily to fulfil our duty to strengthen peace in the Near and Middle East and remove the threat to peace which has arisen in that area, we must take steps to secure the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan.

141. This is the purpose of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [*A/3870 and Corr.1*]. Its adoption by the General Assembly would, we are convinced, contribute to a relaxation of international tension in the Near and Middle East and thus to a strengthening of peace throughout the world.

142. As long as foreign forces remain in Lebanon and Jordan, the situation in the Near and Middle East cannot be described as normal, and will continue to be extremely dangerous.

143. We should like to reiterate our hope that the members of the General Assembly will show that they are conscious of their great responsibility for the outcome of this session, on which the great cause of the maintenance of peace and the strengthening of friendship among peoples will largely depend.

144. Mr. DE FREITAS-VALLE (Brazil): It was with satisfaction that my delegation noted the unanimous decision of the Security Council to call for an emergency special session of the General Assembly. Although we regret that the lack of unanimity among the permanent members has prevented the Security Council from taking effective and immediate action both in Lebanon and Jordan, we welcome the oppor-

tunity to hear the opinions of the various nations here represented and to express our own opinion.

145. We live in a world that has been integrated by technology and by the devices of modern science to such an extent that no nation can remain indifferent to events of a political and military character that threaten international peace and security even when they take place in areas that, according to geographical concepts, could be called remote. My country, and I think I may say the whole of Latin America, is greatly interested in and deeply concerned about the development of the situation in the Middle East. We are determined to take an active part, not only in the discussions that are now taking place in this international forum, but also in the decisions and actions that may issue from our deliberations.

146. With your permission, Mr. President, I will recall to this General Assembly one phrase that the President of my country wrote to the President of the United States concerning our attitude in relation to world problems:

"This substantial part of our continent—that is to say, Latin America—must be freed from the featureless rearguard position which it has held heretofore on the international scene, and its voice be heeded whenever the destinies of the peoples are at stake."

It is in this spirit that I venture to put before the Assembly the views of my Government on the situation prevailing in the Middle East.

147. It is somewhat unrealistic, if not artificial, to confine our discussions and restrict our action to the two countries of the Middle East which are paramount in our minds. Although the situation in Lebanon and Jordan gives rise to considerable concern, it is but the ominous sign of complex and entangled problems in which powerful forces, both legitimate and otherwise, interplay freely. It should, therefore, be viewed in its broader context.

148. There are in the Middle East, as I see it, four different and equally powerful factors involved. The first is nationalism. Only the blind can fail to discern the awakening of a new spirit, assertive of national values, in areas which seemed until so recently to be dormant and apathetic. Nationalism is not a phenomenon which is peculiar to the Middle East. It is rather a political attitude which finds enthusiastic support in all regions of the world and especially in those which are now taking their full share of responsibility in the international scene. No amount of military force can quench the national spirit which is making itself so acutely felt in the Middle and Near East. Only wisdom and foresight can channel these irresistible forces into an orderly process of evolution. It is, therefore, with satisfaction that we have noted, both in the proposals of the President of the United States and in those outlined by the Secretary-General, a clear understanding of the realities of the situation.

149. The second factor is subversion. It seems superfluous and out of place to discuss here academic definitions of the various forms in which aggression may take place. Indirect aggression resists definition, but this fact does not prove that it may be any less effective than other types of violent action which are easily detected. I submit that the craving for world domination which seems to dictate the policies of certain countries is taking advantage by insidious means of the nationalistic movements now afoot the world over.

The problem that confronts the United Nations today, and baffles the most powerful nations in the world, is how to discern between the legitimate aspirations of the peoples and the selfish interests of certain Governments.

150. The third element is the presence of the State of Israel. The General Assembly is familiar with the intransigent attitude which seems to be the only common denominator between Israel and the Arab nations. The fact remains, however, that no lasting solution can be found to the problems of that region if some form of coexistence between Israel and her Arab neighbours is not devised.

151. I have stated on previous occasions and on behalf of my Government that the Arab States should cordially discuss with Israel their common problems. The question of the Palestine refugees and the plans for economic expansion of the region, so vital for the settlement of the present Middle Eastern crisis, afford a unique opportunity for such an exchange of views. May these friendly words not go unheeded.

152. The fourth and last element is the presence in the area of some of the richest deposits of oil in the world and the influence that this fact has on the economy, not only of the region itself, but of the Western world as a whole.

153. This is how the situation in the Middle East presents itself to us. We rather doubt that any action that may be taken now by the United Nations could solve, to the general satisfaction, all the problems which have been touched upon. We are, however, convinced that now is the moment to make a start.

154. The first move could be to ascertain what measures the countries of the Middle East themselves think could be usefully applied. For that purpose, I respectfully suggest that the General Assembly make use once again of the services of its Secretary-General. It seems to us that an urgent visit of Mr. Hammarskjold to the Middle East might clarify the situation and place the General Assembly in a better position to proceed with its deliberations. I recall the success that the Secretary-General had in other but not dissimilar circumstances, and I am convinced that a series of consultations carried out in different countries of the Middle East would enable Mr. Hammarskjold to elaborate on the proposals he put before the General Assembly at its first meeting.

155. The action in the political field must, however, be coupled with a strong determination to assist and participate in the process of economic growth which is the main cause of international unrest in the Middle

East and elsewhere. Never has the gap between developed and under-developed regions been so wide—and let us make no mistake, it is getting wider every day. This fact has not yet been fully realized. No major step will have been taken towards solving the world's problems until the elimination of this chasm becomes the paramount concern of the great Powers.

156. The Middle East crisis is a striking example of the political repercussions of underlying economic causes. In that respect, the problems of the Middle East are akin to those of other areas of the world, where economic facts, if ignored, will lead inevitably to political and social unrest and prepare the ground for subversive activities.

157. We therefore welcome the proposal that a regional Arab development institution be set up to accelerate progress in such fields as industry, agriculture, water supply, health and education. We are particularly pleased by the fact that similar arrangements are being contemplated for other areas. It seems to us especially significant that the President of the United States has referred to the consultations now being carried out with Latin American countries to strengthen the role of the Western hemisphere in economic development. May I be allowed, in that connexion, to quote once again from a recent statement of my country's President:

"The struggle against under-development is an indispensable strategic move of capital importance. The democratic forces can hardly present to the world a formula to settle its ills when the most important bastion of democratic resistance shows such impressive instances of under-development."

158. The situation in the Middle East, as it stands, affords the United Nations a great opportunity for effective assistance. The work of the Observation Group in Lebanon deserves our unreserved support. We commend the decision of the Secretary-General to strengthen the Group and enlarge its scope. We are confident that the United Nations provides the best if not the only channel for the solution of the present crisis in the Middle East, a solution based upon respect for the independence of the countries concerned and framed within the principles of justice.

159. We are convinced that the hopes we hold and the views we have are adequately expressed in the draft resolution submitted by Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Liberia, Norway, Panama and Paraguay [A/3878]. We will therefore vote in favour of that draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.