

Middle East conflict - Lebanon. Security Council documents: Middle East con...

HS L 179:100



Dag Hammarskjöld's sawti

Middle East conflict [1958] - July 17

SECCO documents

Verbatim Record of the 831-Meeting

L 179: 100



UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



GENERAL
S/PV.831
17 July 1958
ENGLISH

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 17 July 1958, at 3 p.m.

<u>President:</u>	Mr. ARAUJO	Colombia
<u>Members:</u>	Canada	Mr. HOLMES
	China	Mr. TSIANG
	France	Mr. de VAUCELLES
	Iraq	Mr. ABBASS
	Japan	Mr. MATSUDAIRA
	Panama	Mr. ILLUECA
	Sweden	Mr. JARRING
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.	Mr. SOBOLEV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Pierson DIXON
	United States of America	Mr. LODGE

This record contains original speeches and interpretations. The final text, containing translations, will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in duplicate, within two working days, to the Chief, Meetings Service, Department of Conference Services, Room 1104, and also incorporated in mimeographed copies of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED AT 0930 HOURS ON 18 JULY 1958,
THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 0930 HOURS ON 22 JULY 1958.

Publication of the final printed records being subject to a rigid schedule, the co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The provisional agenda for today's meeting of the Security Council is to be found in document S/Agenda/831/Rev.1, and comprises three items. The first item is the adoption of the agenda. The second item is a letter dated 22 May 1958 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the President of the Security Council. The third item is a letter dated 17 July 1958 from the representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council, which reads as follows:

"Complaint by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan of interference in its domestic affairs by the United Arab Republic" (S/4053).

The Chair, respecting fully the public opinion of the world, which is most anxious to learn exactly what is happening on the Jordanian front, would like to take this opportunity of suggesting most respectfully to all the members of the Security Council that item 3 of the agenda should be taken up first. Thus, the representatives of Jordan and of the United Kingdom would have full opportunity -- this, naturally, also if the Council agrees -- to be heard in connexion with this item which is of vital interest to the public opinion of the world. If members of the Security Council have no objection I would ask them to agree to change the order of the agenda as I have suggested.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the provisional agenda an item has been included which is headed "Letter dated 17 July 1958 from the representative of Jordan". The text of the item is "Complaint by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, of interference in its domestic affairs by the United Arab Republic".

Unfortunately, it is very difficult to assess to what extent this issue merits being included on the agenda of this Council for this discussion, because the letter to which the agenda refers also consists of only one sentence and it reads as follows:

"Upon instructions from my Government, I have the honour to request the President of the Security Council to inscribe the following item on its agenda for urgent consideration: Complaint by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan of interference in its domestic affairs by the United Arab Republic. Signed, Ambassador Baha ud-Din Toukan, Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations."

As will be seen, there are no explanations, no facts and no material substantiation which would enable us to see to what extent this complaint against the United Arab Republic is justified or to what extent it merits consideration by the Council. It is very difficult for us, under these circumstances, to decide whether it does indeed warrant urgent consideration.

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

On the other hand, as far as the Soviet delegation is concerned, we do not object to the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the Council, but our acceptance of its inclusion should in no way be construed to mean that we to any extent endorse the contents of this item. This means that we cannot in any way recognize that the charges of Jordan against the United Arab Republic are valid. We will vote for the inclusion of this item in the agenda because this will enable the Security Council thoroughly to consider a question which has a direct bearing on the situation in the Near East, especially as regards Jordan -- that is, the question of the armed intervention of the United Kingdom in Jordan. That is, of course, directly within the competence of the Security Council. Therefore, while voting in favour of this item as it is now worded, we shall try to discuss it essentially from the point of view of the armed intervention of the United Kingdom in Jordan.

As far as the order of the discussion of this agenda is concerned, for three days now the Security Council has had before it the so-called Lebanese problem, which is in fact the problem of the armed intervention of the United States in the domestic affairs of Lebanon. The Council has not yet taken any steps even though the situation is becoming steadily more grave. There is no justification for the Security Council to defer the consideration of this issue. In so far as both issues are closely interrelated, the Council would act correctly if it discussed them simultaneously and took decisions in the order in which the various proposals were submitted. That is why I would suggest that we could follow any order; we could advance item 3 to item 2. I would propose, however -- and I do not think that we differ on this -- that the two questions be discussed concurrently by the Security Council. The situation in the Near East is so grave and it is deteriorating so rapidly that the Council must try to save its time. It must not waste too much time on procedural matters, but must act so that its decisions may contribute to the establishment of peace both in Lebanon and in Jordan.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I agree with the representative of the Soviet Union that we should proceed to a rapid decision on the Lebanese item.

I therefore suggest that the order of the agenda be left as it is.

In the interests of providing the Council with prompt information about Jordan, I suggest that we hear special statements on this point at the start of the meeting, then proceed with the agenda.

I assume that members of the Council would, as usual, be free to discuss the issues in their speeches with the same latitude that has prevailed heretofore.

Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): I should simply like to say that I agree with the procedure proposed by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Since the statements we have heard in connexion with the agenda are not in conflict in effect with the suggestion made by the President I shall, unless I hear any objection, declare the agenda adopted.

The agenda was adopted.

LETTER DATED 22 MAY 1958 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF LEBANON ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING:

"COMPLAINT BY LEBANON IN RESPECT OF A SITUATION ARISING FROM THE INTERVENTION OF THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF LEBANON, THE CONTINUANCE OF WHICH IS LIKELY TO ENDANGER THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY" (S/4007).

LETTER DATED 17 JULY 1958 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF JORDAN ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING:

"COMPLAINT BY THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN OF INTERFERENCE IN ITS DOMESTIC AFFAIRS BY THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC" (S/4053).

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Azkoul, representative of Lebanon, Mr. Loutfi, representative of the United Arab Republic, and Mr. Toukan, representative of Jordan, took their places at the Security Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I would like to call the attention of the members of the Security Council to the report that has been presented by the Observation Group of the United Nations now in Lebanon, which is to be found in document S/4052.

Mr. TOUKAN (Jordan): During the recent crisis through which the Arab world is passing, I sit with you here with a heavy heart for, in addition to all the unfortunate occurrences in the Middle East, the independence, safety and sovereignty of my country has been seriously threatened. It is serious enough to have any country's independence threatened, but it is more serious, even ironical, to have a country like Jordan face the threat of losing its independence and from a sister Arab State.

Jordan has always been a peaceful country and harboured every goodwill for her Arab sisters. But for over a year now, Jordan has been subjected to continuous attempts to overthrow its Government by subversive elements employed from outside. These attempts manifested themselves clearly in April, 1957, when a few officers instigated by Egypt tried to overthrow the regime. But thanks to the courage of His Majesty King Hussein, the loyalty of the Army and of the people, the attempted coup d'état failed to materialize.

These events which unfolded the plot by the United Arab Republic to subvert the whole machinery of Government in Jordan and reduce its existence as a free and democratic State are well known to you and to the honourable members of this Council.

(Mr. Toukan, Jordan)

The courage and alertness of His Majesty King Hussein have become almost legendary, and so was the loyalty of the Arab Army and the people of Jordan. They combined to frustrate and nip in the bud the plot by the United Arab Republic's agents and thus reasserted law and order. It might be well to remember at this point that some of the officers and their collaborators who attempted the coup d'Etat were given refuge in Egypt and Syria and have been allowed to carry on with their activities against the Jordan Government. It is a well known fact that the whole machinery of Egyptian subversion and propaganda is at their disposal.

However, the failure of that earlier attempt did not prevent the United Arab Republic from openly manifesting its hostility to Jordan. The smuggling of saboteurs and agents into the country, together with clandestine supplies of arms and ammunition and explosives, became common occurrences alongside the subversive elements mustered and bribed within Jordan with the intent to overthrow the existing regime. The poisonous broadcasts emanating from the United Arab Republic and the Press of the United Arab Republic were all directed to create confusion and subversion which was necessary to bring about the realization of that sinister plan. The Press and radio of the United Arab Republic always took cover under Arab nationalism. True Arab nationalism is derived from our traditions, our heritage and our religion. It does not recognize aggressive designs, nor the spilling of blood, nor subversion, nor the sowing of the seeds of discord and confusion among the ranks of a nation. It does not recognize the destruction of the framework of States that strove to attain their independence at great sacrifice and that now, with justification, jealously guard it and intend to preserve it and further develop it on solid foundations away from destructive principles. It is this nationalism that we believe in and whose goals we aspire to attain. It is this nationalism which runs in our veins and not the nationalism that is imported from outside and poisoned with destructive doctrines of totalitarianism.

Jordan continued to deal with all the varied forms of aggression coming from the United Arab Republic and to destroy the evil attempts in their cradle before their harmful effects spread, until it was recently faced with an imminent threat to its safety and integrity which was of such dimensions that

(Mr. Toukan, Jordan)

it could not cope with it with its own resources and methods, a method which threatened to be similar to the events in Lebanon and also those of Iraq, events whose horror has convulsed human feeling everywhere in the world, and among whose victims was the youthful King, the grandson of one of the leaders of the Arab renaissance and the founder of the Kingdom of Iraq. Among the victims of this horrifying aggression were also the Crown Prince of Iraq and a large number of leading Iraqi personalities.

The threat to Jordan lay also in the plot, recently discovered and nipped in the bud, to overthrow its existing regime and also in the movements of United Arab Republic troops from Syria along its northern borders. Last week a number of army officers were arrested, and investigation disclosed it had been the intention of the plotters to destroy Jordan's independence and integrity.

Faced with such a threat to its integrity and independence through imminent foreign armed aggression and an attempt by the United Arab Republic to create internal disorder and to overthrow the existing regime, the Jordan Government, with the approval of His Majesty the King, and basing itself upon the unanimous decision of the Jordan National Assembly, and in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, has requested the Governments of the United Kingdom and of the United States of America to come to its immediate aid.

British troops have begun landing on Jordan territory since early this morning in a generous response to that request.

May I, Mr. President, in concluding this short statement, beg your indulgence to request that I be heard again if the necessity arises.

Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): The Council has just heard the statement of the representative of Jordan on the threat to his country's independence that has developed. The pressure to which his Government has been subjected for some time past is well known, and my Government is in a position to confirm from its own sources the information which he has given to the Council on the most recent developments. We have no doubt whatever of the preparation of a fresh attempt to overthrow the regime and create internal disorder. In the light of this knowledge, the movement of Syrian forces, to which Mr. Toukan alluded, towards the northern frontier of Jordan were ominous developments.

(Sir Pierson Dixon, United Kingdom)

Indeed, the information at the disposal of the Government of Jordan and of the United Kingdom Government has been openly confirmed by the revolutionary regime in Baghdad. I should like to quote to the Council from a statement which has been repeated several times today over the Baghdad radio. This is how it runs:

"A revolution has started in Iraq and one in the Lebanon, and tomorrow another revolution will start in Jordan. Struggling Jordan tomorrow will rise in a great revolution to break their chains just as they were broken in Iraq and wipe out the rotten monarchy just as it was wiped out in Iraq."

In all these circumstances, what could be more natural than the appeal of His Majesty King Hussein and the Government of Jordan for assistance from friendly Governments in maintaining their country's independence? My Government was one of those to whom this appeal was made and we have responded to it. Here is an appeal from a Government which felt certain that the independence and integrity of its country was imperiled.

The representative of Jordan has told us why his Government took this view and why it appealed to its friends. It is my view that the Government of Jordan was in the circumstances entirely justified in making this appeal. We are also certain that they were entitled to make it under international law, just as Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom was entitled to respond. There is nothing either in the Charter or in the established rules in international law to inhibit a Government from asking a friendly Government for military assistance as a defensive measure when it considers itself to be in danger. Nor is there anything to inhibit the Government thus appealed to from responding.

(Sir Pierson Dixon, United Kingdom)

It was in these circumstances that Her Majesty's Government decided to accede to the request of the Jordan Government for military aid and are accordingly dispatching forces by air to Amman. As the Council will be aware, this movement has already started. These British forces are in Jordan for the purpose of helping the King and Government of that country to preserve its political independence and territorial integrity. We are not there for any military purpose of our own and our presence does not constitute a threat to any other country. If arrangements can be made by the Security Council to protect the lawful Government of Jordan from external threat and so maintain peace and security, the action which we have felt obliged to take will be brought to an end.

It will be clear from what I have already said that the appeal to my Government from King Hussein and the Government of Jordan was made in circumstances of extreme urgency and that if action was to be taken by my Government, it had to be taken without a moment's delay. On the instructions of my Government, I have taken the first possible opportunity of informing the Security Council.

In conclusion, I would simply say this. Aggression can take many forms. The method of indirect aggression, the method of subversion and the attempt to overthrow the constituted authority can be just as dangerous as the open variety. We all abhor the latter; we should equally abhor the former. This is the common factor linking the situations in Jordan and Lebanon, the factor of indirect aggression. Aggression by fomenting civil strife in the interest of a foreign Power is one of the gravest offences against peace and security. We are confident that the United Nations will continue to recognize these principles which they formulated and adopted in General Assembly resolution 380(V).

No doubt we shall hear from one member of the Council that our action in response to the appeal from Jordan is all part of some great colonialist imperialist plot. I do not believe the world will heed such libelous propaganda. Not for the first time in our long history we are activated in what we have done by a sense of responsibility and a desire to see truly peaceful and stable conditions in the world. My Government is particularly sensitive for historical reasons to any threat to the national independence of the Arab States

(Sir Pierson Dixon, United Kingdom)

of the Middle East. The major part which the United Kingdom played in establishing these States is sometimes forgotten. We are proud of our relationship with them and it has been a constant aim of our policy to assist in their national renaissance.

But if the peoples of the Arab world are to develop in political freedom and economic prosperity, they and their governments must be free from the constant threat of intervention, fomented from outside in the interests of other Powers seeking to dominate their policies and destroy their independence.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): The United States Government supports the action of the Government of the United Kingdom in responding affirmatively to the urgent appeal of Jordan for assistance in the defence of Jordan's independence and integrity. The United States believes that it is a justified exercise of the inherent right of nations to call for assistance when threatened.

We have just circulated the revised text of our draft resolution under the item of Lebanon. At the proper time the United States will move for priority in the voting for this revised draft resolution. We hope for a vote today for reasons which I shall explain. Let me first, however, review briefly the modifications which are contained in this revision. They represent suggestions made by several members of the Council to me informally.

In the second preambular paragraph the words "and the encouraging achievements reported by" are added. This language is inserted to reflect, among other things, the recent report of the Observer Group that it will in the future be able to function in areas previously closed to it.

Then the fifth preambular paragraph has undergone a technical revision to reflect more precisely the language employed by the representative of Lebanon in his statement to the Council. Primarily for the word "appeal" to the Security Council appearing in the first draft, the word "requested" has been substituted as well as the phrase "further assistance from the Security Council to uphold its integrity and independence."

Then the operative paragraphs have been rearranged and a drafting change has been made in new operative paragraph 1 to change the word "and" to the word "to".

A drafting change has also been made in the new paragraph 2 by deleting the words "such additional" and adding after the word "arrangements" the words "for additional measures".

We hope that this revised text, which takes into consideration the various suggestions which we have been given, will receive prompt and widespread support and that it will be adopted today.

We attach the greatest importance to the continuance and enhancement of the activities of the United Nations Observer Group and to the United Nations' assuming the functions set forth in this resolution. And, frankly, we regret

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

Then we should remember this. It was only yesterday that we were told that the Observation Group had finally reached agreement to enable it to get to the frontiers of Lebanon all the way around. That agreement was only received on the day, may I point out, that our forces landed, and with great respect I submit that our efforts may have already been helpful to the work of the United Nations. The fact that the day before yesterday the Observation Group got permission to reach the frontiers of Lebanon is a cause for gratification. But, obviously, it does not mean that the work of the Observation Group is finished. On the contrary, it means that they are now in a much better position than they have ever been to go ahead. It marks the end of the beginning -- the end of the beginning -- as far as the Observation Group is concerned, and the beginning of a phase which can be of even greater usefulness. So I think we ought to be clear about that.

Now to go to another but related aspect. There are those who would fasten on Arab nationalism the label of violence, of assassination, of mob rule and of subversion. The yearnings of all peoples for growing international stature, for economic growth, for increasing social justice, for full dignity, for closer regional understanding and independence, are all commendable. The United States is not only not opposed to these developments; it believes in them. The United States believes in change and constructive revolution, a path which it has followed itself, so much so that some people have said that the United States is in a perpetual state of revolution, so much so that millions upon millions of Americans have come up in their economic status. We believe in this kind of thing for ourselves; we believe in it for others; we want to help those who have not governed themselves to become self-governing. But we think that these things should be done peacefully and without causing an international convulsion. That need not be the price of progress. We do not believe in assassination, violence, mob rule or subversion, and we do not want to see this happen in one of the most democratic and politically free and independent countries of the Middle East, Lebanon.

(Mr. Lodge, United States of America)

The longings for progress and unity among the Arab peoples must not be thus subverted. The dynamic energies of Arab nationalism must not be abused to serve selfish ends. It must not depend for its advancement on assassinations, mob rule, subversion and infiltration.

Now I come to my conclusion with a rather heavy heart, because I am going to utter some words which are as serious and as fateful as any that the United States has ever spoken in the five and a half years that I have represented the United States in the Security Council. Sometimes, we in the United Nations get too close to the details to see what is really happening. If ever there was a time when we must see the big picture, this is the time. If ever there was a time when we must not allow ourselves to be diverted by technical administrative considerations, this is the time.

What is really happening is plain for all to see, if we but lift up our eyes. The overthrow of the lawful government of Iraq, beginning with the assassination of the Crown Prince, and which was followed by a wave of assassinations throughout that unhappy country, is one dreadful fact. Then, the attempt to subvert and overthrow Jordan, of which we have just heard, is another. And, of course, the effort directed from without, to subvert Lebanon, is familiar to everyone. One event which precipitated and increased the necessity of these sessions of the Security Council was the overthrow of the Government of Iraq. This is because it made it clear that there is, in the Middle East, a common purpose to take over everywhere, all at once. Clearly, there is a common purpose, master-minded from one source. You can read all about it in the Cairo newspapers, or listen to the incessant radio broadcasts from Cairo to other Arab countries.

In fact, a prominent Cairo newspaper is openly urging the assassination of President Chamoun. Furthermore, the United Arab Republic's ambassador stated Monday that United States aid to the Government of Lebanon would mean the assassination of the President and the Foreign Minister of Lebanon, who, he said, had been condemned to death by -- and I quote -- "Arab nationalists", with the sentence to be executed following Western intervention. What kind of behaviour is that? But that is the kind of thing that we face today.

(Mr. Lodge, United States of America)

The technical obstacles are not the main point. We face a great, rough, brutal fact; the fact is the fomenting of civil strife by assassins in plain clothes instead of by soldiers in uniform. Make no mistake about it, my colleagues, history will hold us responsible. We cannot avoid an answer to the question. Is the United Nations to condone subversion in plain clothes, controlled from outside a country? If the United Nations cannot deal with indirect aggression, the United Nations will break up. This could surely be the rock on which this Organization could founder.

Remember this too: if the United Nations does not meet this challenge, it will invite subversion all over the world. We cannot pass by on the other side of the street and salve our consciences by doing nothing. If United Nations inaction is interpreted as condoning indirect aggression, the imagination staggers at what the consequences of this could mean to world peace.

To no group of men has the opportunity ever been given to rise to a more fateful occasion. I hope, and I believe, that we will not fail humanity.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The situation in the Near and Middle East is becoming more complex by the hour. The United States has not only not taken steps to withdraw its armed forces from the territory of Lebanon, but further transfers of United States troops are being made to the area of the Near and Middle East. New contingents of American troops are landing in Lebanon. There is a communication to the effect that United States armed formations from Western Germany have been moved to Turkey and are taking up positions in the neighbourhood of the Syrian border.

Mobilization measures are being carried out by the United States forces. The Atlantic and Pacific fleets have been brought to a state of four-hour readiness. On 16 July, the Defense Department of the United States stated that all vessels which were to be "mothballed" or retired would be brought back to a state of preparedness, in other words, reactivated. According to the Headquarters of the United States Air Force in Europe, all formations under its command are in a state of readiness. Troops are being transferred from the United States to Western Europe. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McElroy, who has just returned from Eniwetok Island where the United States is conducting nuclear weapons tests, stated that all United States armed forces were in a state of readiness.

We can conclude from these facts that we have here not only the occupation of Lebanon but the preparation by the United States to strike also at other countries of the Arab East. The concentration of United States forces in the southwestern part of Turkey represents a direct threat of invasion by the United States armed forces in the Syrian area of the United Arab Republic. The world is witnessing not only a threat but a use of force by American imperialism against the freedom-loving peoples of the Near and Middle East.

Today, we have received a report, which was confirmed by the representative of the United Kingdom, to the effect that British air-borne troops had alighted in Jordan. As an excuse to justify this armed intervention in Jordan, the United Kingdom Government is using the very same manoeuvre which was resorted to by the Government of the United States. They are claiming that they have received an invitation from King Hussein of Jordan to do so. However, this camouflage net cannot conceal the genuine reasons that underlie British intervention in the domestic affairs of the peoples of the Near and Middle East.

Prime Minister Macmillan, speaking today in Parliament, stated that King Hussein of Jordan had requested British military assistance because he feared that an attempt might be made by the United Arab Republic to overthrow him according to the same pattern as was the case in Iraq. Prime Minister Macmillan added that reports of the British Intelligence showed that the fears of King Hussein were justified and that this attempt was to take place today. It is because of that, says Mr. Macmillan, that the United Kingdom Government decided to forthwith satisfy Jordan's request and to ship troops by air from Cyprus.

One must say that this sounds rather like a fairy tale from the "One Thousand and One Nights." There is a characteristic detail here. Mr. Macmillan reported to the British Parliament that the request of Jordan was received yesterday a few minutes after the debate in the British Parliament ended regarding the situation in the Middle East. As soon as Parliament adjourned, a few minutes later, this request of Jordan came in. What a fortunate coincidence. Parliament adjourns, a request is received, and the United Kingdom Government, in the absence of Parliament, can very easily and quickly take the decision to transfer its troops to Jordan. Thus, Prime Minister Macmillan was not able to consult Parliament. He did not have time to do so.

However, with Washington Prime Minister Macmillan not only had time to consult, but, as he reports to Parliament, he received the complete approval of the United States Government, and indeed Washington endorsed this shipment of British troops to Jordan.

As you see, this time the Government of the United Kingdom was more far-sighted. Whereas in 1956, when it attacked Suez, the British Government was not too prompt in concerting its actions with Washington and, therefore, faced a rather difficult situation as a result, this time everything was concerted and everything was endorsed by Washington. Furthermore, the United Kingdom and the United States at this time are acting jointly in the shameful and unenviable role of a joint aggressor, which has dealt a sore blow to peace in the Middle East and indeed throughout the world.

Mr. Macmillan says, and Sir Pierson Dixon confirms it here, that the British troops that were thrown into Jordan were there to help King Hussein repel the threat that allegedly hung suspended over Jordan. However, Sir Pierson, the propaganda of your machine, not the Baghdad radio, not the Moscow radio, your propaganda, your propaganda machine which is operating here, is informing the peoples of the world in the following manner: British air-borne troops landed in Jordan in order to support King Hussein's campaign, to overthrow the Iraqi rebels, and to bring back into line this very important country from the point of view of the West. I am speaking, of course, of Iraq.

First, Sir Pierson, it is not in order to help King Hussein, as Prime Minister Macmillan says, repel the alleged threat that hung suspended over Jordan, but in order to help Hussein overthrow the revolutionary movement in Iraq. That is why you have brought your troops to Jordan. And it is not I who am saying this, it is not I. You can find this written black on white in the information bulletins that are being circulated by your own propaganda machine.

In Washington, diplomatic circles hasten to confirm this specific purpose of not helping King Hussein but squashing the rebels, and I am again quoting from this communique. I will quote it in English at this time:

(continued in English)

"In Washington, diplomatic sources said the United States had rejected any idea of immediate United States or allied military intervention to restore pro-Western rule in Iraq".

(continued in Russian)

I am drawing your attention to the words "rejected any idea of immediate United States intervention to restore Western rule in Iraq," but then I read further:

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

(continued in English)

"The State Department did not rule out the possibility it might encourage King Hussein to march on Baghdad with loyal Jordanian and loyal Iraqi troops and try to restore a pro-Western Government in Iraq."

(continued in Russian)

That is what was being said in Washington and it is not an old woman who said this to another old woman as I said yesterday, but these are Western diplomatic sources in Washington, and we know that when the words "authoritative diplomatic circles" are used, they usually refer to official circles of the State Department.

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

It is therefore quite obvious that it is not for the purpose which was stated here in the Council that British troops have come to Lebanon; it is for something quite different. It is quite obvious, therefore, that the explanations of the United Kingdom Government regarding the purpose of the sending of British troops to Jordan is a lie that is designed to fool public opinion specifically, in the first place, in the United Kingdom. This lie can measure up only to the lie that was invoked in the autumn of 1956 when British and French troops attacked Egypt, when they committed aggression against the Egyptian people allegedly in order to help put an end to the Israel aggression on Egypt. However, we know full well what the situation was at that time.

Thus Jordan is not threatened by anyone and no one intends to attack Jordan. Thus any reference to measures of self-defence are merely a pretext in order to carry out intervention against the peoples of the Arab world. The point is that the invasion of British troops in Jordan which followed upon the American invasion of Lebanon shows that there is a conspiracy between the United Kingdom and the United States -- and apparently France is joining them according to certain reports -- to take joint action against the peace-loving peoples of the Near and Middle East.

There exists and there has been carried out an extensive plan of attack against the liberation movement of the Arab peoples. That this is the case can also be seen from the statement of Prime Minister MacMillan to the effect that the United Kingdom considers Arab nationalism as aggression. England, he said, is allegedly faced with a nationalism that feeds aggression. Mr. MacMillan did not hide the fact that the real reason for the sending of armed forces to the Near and Middle East was the desire to maintain the oil fields in British hands. The facts show that there is a conspiracy between the United Kingdom and the United States to extend the field of operations to involve further areas. This of course is a real threat to other Arab countries. It is for that reason that Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd has flown in to Washington. Apparently the United Kingdom Government is hastening to take advantage of the situation in order to protect its colonial interests in this part of the world.

The landing of British troops in Jordan is a desperate attempt of obsolete British imperialism to retain its positions in the Near and Middle East

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

As we know, the United Kingdom and France in 1956 attempted by force to re-establish colonial domination in Egypt. The shameful end of this adventure is of course still fresh in everyone's memory. However, this lesson was not wasted. The imperialistic circles in the West, which cannot forgo the old policy of colonial banditry, are trying to take revenge for the failure of their aggression against Egypt and also to take revenge for the adventure that was being planned against Syria. But experience has shown that these calculations are based on very shaky foundations. There is no doubt that this time too foreign intervention against the peoples of the Near and Middle East will also face disaster.

It is no secret, and I think it was mentioned here too in the Council, that the armed intervention of the United States and of the United Kingdom which was being planned for so long was speeded up by the events in Iraq where the regime has been overthrown, a regime which was betraying the Iraqi people and selling out its resources to the imperialists. The coup d'Etat in Iraq occurred on the eve of the planned Istanbul meeting of the Moslem countries which are participants in the Baghdad Pact, a meeting where the imperialists planned to organize their suppression of the troubles in Lebanon by the Arab members of the Baghdad Pact. It was then that Iraq overthrew its regime in order to embark, together with the other Arab countries, upon a course of national emancipation development. Those who cherish the feelings of any country which wishes to achieve independence cannot fail to welcome the events in Iraq. Only those who wish to profit from the resources of other peoples, who wish to enslave other peoples, could initiate armed intervention under the pretext of the events in Iraq, thus placing the world before the threat of a new world war.

Pitiable and pharisaical are the attempts of the United Kingdom and the United States to justify their completely unprovoked aggression against the peoples of the Arab East. They speak of intervention from without in Lebanon, but these slanderous inventions have been rejected and rebutted by the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon. They speak of upholding their own security, but are the Middle East Arab countries which are thousands of miles away from United States territory threatening the United States or the United Kingdom? They speak of protecting the lives of American and British citizens. But does international law allow foreign countries to send their armed forces to the territories of other countries for this purpose? The real reason for United States armed intervention

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

in Lebanon and of the United Kingdom intervention in Jordan are well known. It is an effort on the part of the oil monopolies to maintain their domination in the countries of the Near and Middle East, to maintain the exorbitant profits which they reaped there by plundering the natural resources of these countries.

It is not the aggressive Baghdad Pact nor the so-called notorious Eisenhower-Dulles doctrine which are able to ensure the protection of the interests of the oil monopolies in the United Kingdom and the United States. The Arab countries have rejected these weapons of imperialist policy.

Having realized the failure of the Baghdad Pact and of the Eisenhower-Dulles doctrine, the ruling circles of the United States mobilized another doctrine, the doctrine of the Rockefellers, the doctrine of the oil kings.

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

The main premises of this doctrine were formulated in a well known report of the Rockefeller group which was published early this year. In this report it is written, black on white, that the oil magnates were demanding a speeding up of the armaments race and the subordination of the strategy of the United States to the conduct of both total and small wars. They also propounded the establishment of troop units which will be able to suppress the emancipation movement in the countries of the East. Now we see this notorious and infamous doctrine being put into effect. The official statements that were made in Washington leave no doubt in our minds that the intervention of the American troops in Lebanon is merely a first step along this road, a first step in the colonial war against the Arab East. The next step, as the press shows, is armed intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom in the domestic affairs of Iraq.

I would like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to yet another fact which fills out this picture of the criminal actions of the United States military. In shipping their troops to suppress the national liberation movement of the peoples of the Arab East, the United States is trampling underfoot the sovereignty of other countries. We know that the Government of Austria, indignant at the flight of American planes over Austrian air space, addressed a protest to the Government of the United States in which it said that it could not allow such a blatant violation of its air sovereignty and that the Austrian Government was not in a position to authorize such flights. However, according to the Austrian authorities, notwithstanding this protest, American planes are continuing to violate the neutrality of neutral Austria.

The imperialist circles of the United States, supported by the other Western partners, have shed their mask and have embarked upon a course of open aggression against the peace-loving Arab peoples. If during the French and British aggression against Egypt in 1956 the United States showed or offered the interventionists only concealed support, hidden support, now they have decided openly to intervene in the affairs of the Arab countries. Perhaps certain Arabs had illusions about the genuine purposes of American policies in the Near and Middle East. Now, of course, these illusions have been dispelled because the people of the Arab East have now been able to judge for themselves.

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

The actions of the American imperialists and of their partners constitute a serious threat to peace and security throughout the world. That is why all peace-loving peoples of the world were so indignant at the news of the American intervention in Lebanon. This aggressive act has been unanimously condemned by the peoples of the Soviet Union, of the Chinese People's Republic, of all Socialist countries, by the peoples of India, Indonesia, Burma, Japan and other Asian countries, as well as by the peoples of Western Europe and Latin America. Anger and indignation is also rife in the Arab countries which consider that these actions are a gross violation of their sovereignty and independence.

This threat to the peace is growing hourly. The Security Council cannot remain a silent witness to the armed intervention that is being carried out in the affairs of the Arab countries on the part of the United States and the United Kingdom. The Security Council must act, and it must act forthwith and resolutely. The draft resolution (S/4047) moved by the Soviet Union points the way as to how the Security Council can effectively and decisively take steps to re-establish peace and prevent this new slipping into a third world war.

In connexion with the new events that have been reported, the Soviet delegation deems it necessary to revise its original draft resolution because we want to mention also the introduction of British armed forces in Jordan. For that reason, on behalf of the Soviet delegation, I move a revised draft resolution which will read as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Having heard the United States representative's announcement concerning the introduction of the United States armed forces within the confines of Lebanon, and also the communication of the representative of the United Kingdom regarding the transfer of British troops to Jordan,

"Recognizing that such actions constitute gross intervention in the domestic affairs of the peoples of the Arab countries and are consequently contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations as set forth in its Charter and, in particular, in Article 2 (7) which prohibits intervention in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State,

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

"Considering that the actions of the United States and the United Kingdom constitute a serious threat to international peace and security,

"Calls upon the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom to cease their armed intervention in the domestic affairs of the Arab States and to remove forthwith their troops from the territory of Lebanon and Jordan."

The Soviet delegation request that this draft resolution be considered and voted upon at today's meeting. If the Security Council is paralysed in its actions and if it will not be able to adopt the resolution which my delegation is moving, the Soviet Union will demand the immediate calling into session of an emergency session of the General Assembly in order to consider the question of the intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom in Lebanon and Jordan.

Mr. TSIANG (China): At the 828th meeting of the Security Council held on the morning of 15 July, the representative of the Soviet Union called the attention of the Council to what he considered to be discrepancies as found in the report of the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon and the case of Lebanon as presented to the Council by Dr. Charles Malik and Dr. Azkoul.

At the 829th meeting held on the afternoon of 15 July, the representative of the United Arab Republic did likewise.

I would like, first of all, to address myself to this point. My delegation voted for the Swedish resolution establishing the Observation Group. I have great respect for the men in the Group, and I know that the Secretary-General has laboured hard to make the work of the Group a success. Nevertheless, it seems to be obvious that the Observation Group of the United Nations in Lebanon did not and, of course, could not make any observation of developments in Lebanon before its arrival in Lebanon. It is also obvious that since its arrival, the work of the Group has been severely limited both in time and in space. The Group has not been able to go into the areas controlled by the rebels. For our purposes, these areas are the critical areas.

Furthermore, the Group has been able up to the present to visit less than one-tenth of the frontier between Lebanon and Syria. It is only natural, therefore, that the reports of the Group should, up to the present moment, be rather meagre in substance. These reports prove nothing one way or another.

It seems to my delegation that it is not justified to argue that what does not exist in the reports does not exist at all. The case of Lebanon as presented by Dr. Charles Malik, the Foreign Minister of Lebanon, on 6 July remains an impressive and substantially truthful document. Yesterday the representative of the United States produced to the Council some vital supplementary evidence collected independently by agencies of the Government of the United States. Furthermore, the tragic events in Iraq have thrown a flood of light on the developments in Lebanon.

The events in Lebanon and the events in Iraq are scenes of the same tragic drama. The Baghdad Radio, as reported a moment ago by our colleague from the United Kingdom, now under control of the conspirators, admits and proclaims the connexion between Lebanese and Iraqi events. It is proclaiming daily and

(Mr. Tsiang, China)

hourly that the victories in Lebanon and Iraq will soon be followed by victories in Jordan.

Today, considering the grave situation in the Near East, the Security Council would be irresponsible and unrealistic if it continued to view the crisis in Lebanon in isolation as if nothing had happened in Iraq or as if the tragic events in Iraq had no connexion with developments in Lebanon.

Viewing the Middle East scene as a whole, I believe that the Security Council should take additional measures for the protection of the independence and integrity of Lebanon. The Government of Lebanon appeals to us for additional aid. In an emergency as a temporary measure, the Government of Lebanon asked for military assistance from friendly States. The United States has granted some military assistance as a temporary measure and proposes now to the Council to create a United Nations Force to replace the forces of the United States.

The question before us is: Should we reject the appeal of Lebanon and, with it, the proposal of the United States? I believe the Council should not do that. The Council should not brush aside the judgement of the Government of Lebanon in regard to the dangers it faces. Lebanon is truly a country with malice towards none and charity to all.

Today, we can no longer limit our action to observation.

(Mr. Tsiang, China)

We have no right to gamble with the independence and the integrity of a country, even though it is a small country. Neither do we have the right to stake the prestige and the future of the United Nations on mere observation. If we did this, I am afraid that we would be making the Security Council the laughing stock of the world.

The representative of Sweden argued yesterday that Article 51 of the Charter could not be applied in Lebanon at this moment because, as he argued, of the absence of armed attack. In other words, he would limit the application of Article 51 to cases of direct aggression. My delegation does not share in that interpretation. We have always held the view that in the present period of world history indirect aggression is as dangerous as direct aggression. I should know being the representative, as I am, of a country which has suffered so much from indirect aggression by the Soviet Union. The organs of the United Nations in dealing with matters of this kind must keep in mind the Peace through Deeds resolution of 17 November 1950. My delegation will, therefore, vote for the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the United States.

Before I yield the floor, I wish to add that my delegation finds that the Jordanian appeal to the Government of the United Kingdom for military aid is a legitimate exercise of Jordan's inherent right of self-defence. We find further that the granting of such assistance by the United Kingdom is completely proper.

Mr. LOUTFI (United Arab Republic)(interpretation from French): I am faced today with the complaint that was submitted by the representative of Jordan. I find that this complaint is not sufficiently substantiated. It is not even accompanied by a memorandum that would explain its motivations. The facts are vague. They relate to events which transpired more than a year ago. Why is it now that this complaint has been filed? The answer is simple. You have to find pretexts for the British intervention in Jordan. You have to have pretexts for the sending of British troops to reoccupy Jordan. I cannot but fail to regret the decision of the Head of the Jordan State to request the return of British troops to his country.

There are no facts. The charges are vague. Nobody threatens Jordan. It is from Jordan, however, that the new authorities in Iraq are being threatened. The Government of the United Kingdom referred to the broadcasts of Baghdad Radio which are allegedly a threat to Jordan. But this intervention was decided upon long before these broadcasts of Radio Baghdad started, to which the representative of the United Kingdom referred.

If the Government of the United Kingdom sincerely believes that its intervention in Jordan was justified by virtue of international law and the Charter, the Government of the United Kingdom had no need to hide its head behind the usual charges that are being addressed to us now, that are customary against the United Arab Republic. The United Kingdom Government is very competent as regards aggressive interventions. We know something about it ourselves. We have had the recent experience of it. Last time it was allegedly in order to stop the hostilities between Israel and Egypt, and now it is in order to protect Jordan. But the truth is that one wishes to revert to colonial policies, to imperialist policies, which cannot be changed or which cannot be forgotten.

The international situation has become more serious. We are faced today with a new element which will certainly be a threat to the peace and international security. This British intervention which is not justified, particularly under the present circumstances, and bearing in mind the political tension in this part of the world, might unleash a situation which may very certainly threaten international peace.

(Mr. Loutfi, United Arab Republic)

I have already told the Council that in order to justify the American troop landings in Lebanon accusations were hurled against us, followed by a malicious propaganda campaign which was designed to show the world that it was the United Arab Republic which had caused the troubles that had occurred in Lebanon. These troubles were merely the consequence of internal differences that started with the desire of President Chamoun to become president for a second term, contrary to the Constitution.

We note that the State Department has published the American intelligence reports which appear today in the press. These reports are not very different from those which the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Lebanon submitted repeatedly to the Security Council. These are statements of the intelligence service, backed by no proof, and about which the Security Council can take no decision.

The Security Council, in its resolution of 11 June, clearly stated that it was far from being convinced by the statements of Mr. Malik and that it was not impressed by information which stemmed from such intelligence sources.

If I did not wish to save the time of the Security Council, and if we had not already bypassed that stage of our debate, I might have dwelt on these charges, which are usually not very significant, and I could have proven to the Council that they could hardly have established responsibility which would commit my Government. As regards what Mr. Lodge said today, I really do not know what he was talking about. But there are other broadcasts from other countries which are also inciting to assassination of the leading statesmen of the United Arab Republic, and if there is violence, I would add, in this part of the world, it is because of foreign intervention.

Propaganda, however well organized, cannot resist the impact of facts, and the facts are telling. But in the face of the international situation which has become so much more grave, I do not think that I have to dwell on this. The report of the Observation Group, which has just been circulated, will merely confirm the thesis which I advanced here, namely that there was no motive for the United States to land troops in Lebanon. It is quite obvious that the observers now have access to all areas in Lebanon. I have already explained that

(Mr. Loutfi, United Arab Republic)

Article 51 of the Charter would not apply in this case. The representative of Sweden, in his statement yesterday, reiterated this point of view and I would like to quote one of his statements. He said:

"One of the conditions for Article 51 to be applicable is that an armed attack has occurred against a Member State. The Swedish Government does not consider that this condition has been fulfilled..." (S/PV.830, pp. 22-25)

In my belief, this is a very accurate interpretation of the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. Loutfi, United Arab Republic)

The logical consequence from all I have said is that the United States had neither the right nor reason to intervene, and what I have just said applies as well to the intervention of the United Kingdom in Jordan. To justify this intervention of the United States, the protection of American citizens was invoked. This protection is also no justification for armed intervention. Diplomatic history teaches us that behind the alleged protection of the nationals of a State there is invariably a desire to intervene by armed force in the domestic affairs of other States. We consider that, with the establishment of the system that underlies the Charter, this practice -- which is a vestige of an obsolete colonial system -- should have come to an end too. The Lebanese crisis lasted sixty-five days, yet the lives and interests of Americans there were always respected. There has never been any information about the molestation of American citizens in Lebanon. Thus, neither the Charter, the principles of international law, nor the present situation in Lebanon, especially following the implementation of the resolution of the General Assembly, can justify this very grave decision which has been taken by the Government of the United States.

Furthermore, the situation in Iraq, which is strictly an internal affair of Iraq, has also become stabilized. According to the newspapers, The New York Times specifically, the troops were returned to their barracks and women were marketing in the streets as before.

The landing of British troops in Jordan has unfortunately made this international situation far more grave. It confirms a thesis which I advanced in the Council on many other occasions, namely, that the reason for this landing was not the situation that prevails in Lebanon and which could easily have been solved in Lebanon itself -- for instance, if the elections could have taken place on 24 July next -- but the issue is Iraq.

This decision taken by the United Kingdom Government seems to be a clear attempt to interfere in the domestic affairs of Iraq. There can hardly be any other possible explanation. And yet the situation, as I have just said, in Iraq has become stabilized and the union between Jordan and Iraq has come to an end. Therefore, the aggressive actions that were taken by the United Kingdom and the United States can only be a threat to peace and security in this part

(Mr. Loutfi, United Arab Republic)

of the world. Those who have assumed this responsibility have committed themselves and history will bear this in mind. These troop movements, these fleet movements, and these aircraft movements are a sinister augury of what may follow. World public opinion has been alerted. We see today in the Press of all countries, quoted by The New York Times this morning, for instance, that responsible statesmen and journalists have understood the danger to peace involved in these unjustified interventions. Even members of the Opposition in the British Parliament have expressed their disapproval. Many American Senators have expressed themselves. Senator Kennedy said that the (continued in English) "general feeling" is "that it was an unwise move to send troops into Lebanon." (Continued in French) Also, Senator Fulbright said (continued in English) "The implications of putting troops into the Middle East are tragic". (Continued in French) We see the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, saying (continued in English):

"If outside Powers intervene in internal affairs of Iraq and Lebanon, there is danger of total annihilation of humanity, because if one outside Power enters area, other Power is bound to jump in."

(continued in French)

I should not like to burden the Council with further quotations. Fortunately, there are still wise men in this world. The United Arab Republic, for its part, will pursue its policy of co-operation with the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, which we respect. In our belief it is the only way to maintain peace, which is the most precious of our treasures.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.