

# Middle East conflict - Lebanon. Third Emergency Special Session: Middle Eas...

*HS L 179:102*



National Library  
of Sweden

Dag Hammarskjölds saml.

Third Emergency Special Session [1958] - Aug. 13

(verbatim record)

- Dwight D. Eisenhower (USA)
- Gromyko (USSR)

L 179: 102



NACIONES UNIDAS

ASAMBLEA  
GENERAL



PROVISIONAL

A/PV.733

13 August 1958

ENGLISH

Third Emergency Special Session

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 13 August 1958, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

Sir Leslie MUNRO

(New Zealand)

Questions considered by the Security Council at its 838th meeting on  
7 August 1958

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

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the three working  
languages (English, French, Spanish), preferably in the same language as the text  
to which they refer. Corrections should be sent in triplicate within three  
working days to the Chief, Meeting Services, Department of Conference Services,  
Room 1104, and also incorporated in mimeographed copies of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED AT 0930 HOURS ON 14 AUGUST 1958,  
THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 0930 HOURS ON 19 AUGUST 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.

QUESTIONS CONSIDERED BY THE SECURITY COUNCIL AT ITS 838TH MEETING ON  
7 AUGUST 1958

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

ADDRESS BY MR. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

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

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

That is a danger.

That danger in turn gives rise to another danger -- the danger that nations under aggressive leadership will seek to exploit man's horror of war by confronting the nations, particularly small nations, with an apparent choice between supine surrender, or war.

This tactic reappeared during the recent Near East crisis.

Some might call it "ballistic blackmail".

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

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

The immediate reason is two small countries -- Lebanon and Jordan.

The cause is one of universal concern.

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

On the basis of that response an effort has been made to create a war hysteria. The impression is sought to be created that if small nations are assisted in their desire to survive, that endangers the peace.

This is truly an "upside down" portrayal. If it is made an international crime to help a small nation maintain its independence, then indeed the possibilities of conquest are unlimited. We will have nullified the provision of our Charter which recognizes the inherent right of collective self-defence. We will have let loose forces that could generate great disasters.

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

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

I recall the moments of clear danger we have faced since the end of the Second World War -- Iran, Greece and Turkey, the Berlin blockade, Korea, the Straits of Taiwan.

A common principle guided the position of the United States on all of these occasions. That principle was that aggression, direct or indirect, must be checked before it gathered sufficient momentum to destroy us all -- aggressor and defender alike.

It is this principle that was applied once again when the urgent appeals of the Governments of Lebanon and Jordan were answered.

I would be less than candid if I did not tell you that the United States reserves, within the spirit of the Charter, the right to answer the legitimate appeal of any nation, particularly small nations.

(The President of the  
United States)

I doubt that a single free government in all the world would willingly forgo the right to ask for help if its sovereignty were imperiled.

But I must again emphasize that the United States seeks always to keep within the spirit of the Charter.

Thus when President Truman responded in 1947 to the urgent plea of Greece, the United States stipulated that our assistance would be withdrawn whenever the United Nations felt that its action could take the place of ours.

Similarly, when the United States responded to the urgent plea of Lebanon, we went at once to the Security Council and sought United Nations assistance for Lebanon so as to permit the withdrawal of United States forces.

United Nations action would have been taken and United States forces already withdrawn, had it not been that two resolutions, one proposed by the United States, the other proposed by the Government of Japan, failed to pass because of one negative vote -- a veto.

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

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

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

Let me turn now specifically to the problem of Lebanon.

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

(The President of the  
United States)

I repeat to you the solemn pledge I then made. Our assistance to Lebanon has but one single purpose -- that is the purpose of the Charter and of such historic resolutions of the United Nations as the "Essentials for Peace" Resolution of 1949 and the "Peace through Deeds" Resolution of 1950. These denounce, as a form of aggression and as an international crime, the fomenting of civil strife in the interest of a foreign Power.

We want to prevent that crime -- or at least prevent its having fatal consequences. We have no other purpose whatsoever.

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

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

The United States delegation will support measures to this end.

Another urgent problem is Jordan.

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

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

I hope that this Assembly will be able to give expression to the interest of the United Nations in preserving the peace in Jordan.

There is another matter which this Assembly should face in seeking to promote stability in the Near East. That is the question of inflammatory propaganda. The United Nations Assembly has on three occasions -- in 1947, 1949 and 1950 -- passed resolutions designed to stop the projecting of irresponsible

(The President of the  
United States)

broadcasts from one nation into the homes of citizens of other nations, thereby "fomenting civil strife and subverting the will of the people in any State". That is stated in the language of the resolution. We all know that these resolutions have recently been violated in many directions in the Near East.

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

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

(The President of the  
United States)

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

Therefore, I believe that this Assembly should take action looking towards the creation of a standby United Nations Peace Force. The need for such a Force in being is clearly demonstrated by recent events involving imminent danger to the integrity of two of our Members.

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

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

This clearly applies to the great surge of Arab nationalism.

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

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

This is a real challenge to the Arab people and to all of us.

To help the Arab countries fulfil these aspirations, here is what I propose:

First, that consultations be immediately undertaken by the Secretary-General with the Arab nations of the Near East to ascertain whether an agreement can be reached to establish an Arab development institution on a regional basis.

Second, that these consultations consider the composition and the possible functions of a regional Arab development institution, whose task would be to accelerate progress in such fields as industry, agriculture, water supply, health and education, among others.

Third, other nations and private organizations which might be prepared to support this institution should also be consulted at an appropriate time.

Should the Arab States agree on the usefulness of such a soundly organized regional institution, and should they be prepared to support it with their own resources, the United States would also be prepared to support it.

The institution would be set up to provide loans to the Arab States as well as the technical assistance required in the formulation of development projects.

The institution should be governed by the Arab States themselves.

This proposal for a regional Arab development institution can, I believe, be realized on a basis which would attract international capital, both public and private.

I also believe that the best and quickest way to achieve the most desirable result would be for the Secretary-General to make two parallel approaches: first,

to consult with the Arab States of the Near East to determine an area of agreement; then to invite the International Bank for Reconstruction and

Development, which has vast experience in this field, to make available its facilities for the planning of the organizational and operational techniques

needed to establish the institution on its progressive course.

I hope it is clear that I am not suggesting a position of leadership for my

own country in the work of creating such an institution. If this institution is to be a success, the function of leadership must belong to the Arab States

themselves.

I would hope that high on the agenda of this institution would be an action

to meet one of the major challenges of the Near East, the great common shortage -- water.

Much scientific and engineering work is already under way in the field of

water development. For instance, atomic isotopes now permit us to chart the

courses of the great underground rivers. And new horizons are opening in the

desalting of water. The ancient problem of water is on the threshold of solution. Energy, determination and science will carry it over that threshold.

(The President of the  
United States)

A/PV.733  
12

AC/ma

(The President of the  
United States)

Another great challenge that faces the area is disease.

Already there is substantial effort among the peoples and Governments of the Near East to conquer disease and disability. But much more remains to be done.

The United States is prepared to join with other Governments and the World Health Organization in an all-out, joint attack on preventable disease in the Near East.

But to see the desert blossom again and preventable disease conquered is only a first step. As I look into the future I see the emergence of modern Arab States that would bring to this century contributions surpassing those we cannot forget from the past. We remember that Western arithmetic and algebra owe much to Arabic mathematicians and that much of the foundation of the world's medical science and astronomy was laid by Arab scholars. Above all, we remember that three of the world's great religions were born in the Near East.

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

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

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

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

(The President of the United States)

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

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

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

- (1) United Nations concern for Lebanon.
- (2) United Nations measures to preserve peace in Jordan.
- (3) An end to the fomenting from without of civil strife.
- (4) A United Nations Peace Force.
- (5) A regional economic development plan to assist and accelerate improvement in the living standards of the people in these Arab nations.
- (6) Steps to avoid a new arms race spiral in the area.

To have solidity, the different elements of this plan for peace and progress should be considered and acted on together, as integral elements of a single concerted effort.

Therefore, I hope that this Assembly will seek simultaneously to set in motion measures that would create a climate of security in the Near East consonant with the principles of the United Nations Charter, and at the same time create the framework for a common effort to raise the standard of living of the Arab peoples.

(The President of the United States)

But the peoples of the Near East are not alone in their ambition for independence and development. We are living in a time when the whole world has become alive to the possibilities for modernizing their societies.

The American Government has been steadily enlarging its allocations to foreign economic development in response to these worldwide hopes. We have joined in partnership with such groupings as the Organization of American States and the Colombo Plan; and we are working on methods to strengthen these regional arrangements. For example, in the case of the Organization of American States, we are consulting with our sister republics of this hemisphere to strengthen its role in economic development. And the Government of the United States has not been alone in supporting development efforts. The British Commonwealth, the countries of Western Europe, and Japan have all made significant contributions.

But in many parts of the world both geography and wise economic planning favour national rather than regional development programmes. The United States will, of course, continue its firm support of such national programmes. Only where the desire for a regional approach is clearly manifested and where the advantage of regional over national is evident will the United States change to regional methods.

The United States is proud of the scope and variety of its development activities throughout the world. Those who know our history will realize that this is no sudden, new policy of our Government. Ever since its birth, the United States has gladly shared its wealth with others. This it has done without thought of conquest or economic domination. After victory in two world wars and the expenditure of vast treasure there is no world map, either geographic or economic, on which anyone can find that the force of American arms or the power of the American Treasury has absorbed any foreign land or political or economic system. As we cherish our freedom, we believe in freedom for others.

The things I have talked about today are real and await our grasp. Within the Near East and within this Assembly are the forces of good sense, of restraint, and of wisdom to make, with time and patience, a framework of political order and of peace in that region.

(The President of the United States)

But we also know that all these possibilities are shadowed, all our hopes are dimmed, by the fact of the arms race in nuclear weapons -- a contest which drains off our best talents and vast resources, straining the nerves of all our peoples.

As I look out on this Assembly, with so many of you representing new nations, one thought above all impresses me.

The world that is being remade on our planet is going to be a world of many mature nations. As one after another of these new nations moves through the difficult transition to modernization and learns the methods of growth, from this travail new levels of prosperity and productivity will emerge.

This world of individual nations is not going to be controlled by any one Power or group of Powers. This world is not going to be committed to any one ideology.

Please believe me when I say that the dream of world domination by one Power or of world conformity is an impossible dream.

The nature of today's weapons, the nature of modern communications, and the widening circle of new nations make it plain that we must, in the end, be a world community of open societies.

And the concept of the open society is the ultimate key to a system of arms control we can all trust.

We must, then, seek with new vigour, new initiative, the path to a peace based on the effective control of armaments, on economic advancement and on the freedom of all peoples to be ruled by governments of their choice. Only thus can we exercise the full capacity God has given us to enrich the lives of the individual human beings who are our ultimate concern, our responsibility and our strength.

In this memorable task there lies enough work and enough reward to satisfy the energies and ambitions of all leaders, everywhere.

The PRESIDENT: I am certain that I speak for the representatives in this hall when I express appreciation to the President of the United States for the address he has delivered on the important issues that confront us today and for the consideration of which an emergency special session of the General Assembly was summoned at the request of the Security Council. I am glad that

(The President)

the President can remain seated with us while I outline a few of the things which we have to do.

As I stated at the opening of the meeting and following the decision taken on Friday last, the Assembly begins today the substantive debate on the item before it. In order that this debate may develop efficiently and for the convenience of all delegations, I respectfully request the representatives that they inform the Secretariat when they wish to be inscribed on the list of speakers, and plenary meetings can then be arranged accordingly. I again express appreciation to the President of the United States for having joined with us today.

The meeting will now be suspended for ten minutes while I escort the President of the United States from the hall.

The meeting was suspended at 11.30 a.m. and resumed at 11.40 a.m.

Mr. CROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The calling of the present emergency special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations became necessary as a result of the armed intervention undertaken by the United States of America against Lebanon and by the United Kingdom against Jordan. Two great Powers, permanent members of the Security Council, which, together with other States that are permanent members of the Council, bear special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace, acted as violators of this peace. The basic foundations of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations were trampled underfoot.

The landing of United States and British troops in Lebanon and in Jordan respectively created a dangerous situation. The leaders of the United States and the United Kingdom, who have so often and so gladly voiced their alleged faithfulness to the purposes of the United Nations, in fact showed complete contempt for this Organization and its Charter and undertook behind the back of the United Nations an armed intervention in the Middle East with a view to consolidating their domination in this area, maintaining a hold over its natural resources and compelling the peoples of the Arab countries to dwell under a colonial regime, peoples who for centuries had already dwelt under such rule.

Of course the leading statesmen of the United States and the United Kingdom responsible for such a policy realized full well that military intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries cannot fail to provoke nowadays a decisive reaction on the part of the mighty Powers to whom the cause of peace is dear. That is why the organizers of the intervention against Lebanon and Jordan are making a considerable effort to cover up their activities in a superficially plausible manner. We have heard so many excuses on the part of both parties in justification of their action. It was claimed, for instance, that the United States and British occupation of Lebanon and Jordan was required in order to protect and uphold the independence of those countries against alleged intrigues on the part of the United Arab Republic. Reference was made to domestic events in Iraq as a result of which Iraq was proclaimed a Republic and denounced its Union with Jordan which was a product of imperialistic intrigues in the Near East directed against the independence of the Arab countries and peoples.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

The landing of United States and British troops was also allegedly justified by the fact that it was invited by the President of Lebanon and the King of Jordan. Of course, it was also said that the sending of troops, guns, tanks, warships and aircraft was required in order to protect the citizens of the United States and the United Kingdom, even though it is quite well known that not a single citizen of the United States in Lebanon or of the United Kingdom in Jordan was so much as scratched or even threatened. This was merely a pretext which had been invoked for decades by various colonialists in order to cover up acts of violence against the peoples of the East.

What can one say of all these excuses that were invoked in order to justify intervention in Lebanon and Jordan? Just as the military action undertaken by the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near East constitutes a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of other generally accepted norms of international law, to the same extent the arguments which are now being belatedly invoked to uphold this action are absolutely unfounded and in blatant contradiction with the facts.

Indeed, in raising a noise around the alleged intervention by the United Arab Republic in the domestic affairs of Lebanon and Jordan, neither Washington nor London was able to adduce any concrete facts of such intervention. We know full well that the authoritative Observation Group of the United Nations which was sent to Lebanon by the Security Council under its resolution, which was also voted for by the United States and the United Kingdom, refuted in two of its reports the allegations of intervention on the part of the United Arab Republic. The same conclusion was arrived at also, as we know, by Mr. Hammarskjold, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who visited Lebanon. But the Government of the United States did not choose to take into account the conclusions of the representatives of the United Nations as these conclusions did not suit those who prepared and carried out intervention in the Near East.

As regards the reference to the events in Iraq as one of the reasons which allegedly motivated the sending of American and British troops to the Near East, if any special need existed for demonstrating the absurdity of these allegations, this evidence was produced by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom, for just a few days after the representative of the United States spoke about alleged mob rule -- and I will repeat these words, "alleged mob rule" -- that prevailed in Iraq in the domestic affairs of this country, which was taken advantage of as the main pretext for the introduction of foreign troops in Jordan and Lebanon, the United States and the United Kingdom proclaimed their recognition of the Government of the Iraq Republic.

Equally clear is the complete absurdity of the attempts made to cover up the activities of the British and Americans in the Near East with the allegations that these troops were requested by President Chamoun and King Hussein. These requests of President Chamoun and King Hussein were made, as we know, in violation of the constitutions of Lebanon and Jordan as was already pointed out by many statesmen of these countries, including the President of the Lebanese Parliament, Mr. Osseiran, who emphatically condemned the actions of President Chamoun in a letter which was circulated among all Members of the United Nations.

Incidentally, many statesmen of the Western countries admit openly that the so-called requests of Chamoun and Hussein to the United States and the United Kingdom were directly inspired by the American and British Governments.

In connexion with the present attempts of the Government of the United States to picture the intrusion of the American troops in Lebanon as being a completely legitimate measure and as being virtually a blessing for the Lebanese people, I would like to refer here to an international document which carries the signature of the Government of the United States. Article 17 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, dated 30 April 1948, reads:

"The territory of a State is inviolate and cannot even temporarily become the object of military occupation or other violent acts that directly or indirectly are undertaken by other States irrespective of the motive."

In Washington it is considered possible to assail the military occupation of States at the very time when the United States is building up blocs of States under its aegis. In fact, this occupation in regard to the countries of Asia and Africa is regarded as completely legitimate, and special doctrines are being drafted which provide for the intrusion of troops in these territories.

To fill out the picture, it is necessary to point out that the Government of the United States does not adhere to the principles of the condemnation of military occupation which were proclaimed by it in regard to the countries of the Western Hemisphere as can be seen from the actions that were undertaken last month when American troops were sent into one of the countries of Latin America.

No matter how much the statesmen of the United States and the United Kingdom attempt to delude public opinion regarding the genuine intentions behind the military intervention in Lebanon and Jordan, none of the shrouds that are made up of false pretexts can cover up the shameful fact of the unprovoked armed intervention on the part of the United States and the United Kingdom against the Arab peoples.

In order to justify the introduction of foreign troops on the territories of two sovereign Arab States, the attempt is also made to take advantage of Article 51 of the Charter which speaks of the right of self-defence of peoples. To what extent this reference to the Charter is artificial and spurious can be seen from the fact that Article 51, which speaks of the right of self-defence, can be invoked only if there is an armed attack on a Member State of the United Nations -- only if there is an armed attack, that is, if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations. But even the Governments of the United States and the

United Kingdom cannot claim there was an armed attack by any other country against Jordan or Lebanon. If Article 51 is to be invoked at all, its application would be justified in order to repel the armed intervention that was undertaken by the United Kingdom and the United States against Jordan and Lebanon.

Finally, in order to justify this armed intervention, a legend was launched regarding indirect aggression which allegedly threatens Jordan and Lebanon from all sides -- from the east, from the south, from the north, from everywhere except the west, that is to say, from where the armed force of the aggressors, in fact, came to Lebanon and Jordan.

This allegation of indirect aggression is merely a propaganda slogan by which the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom would like to cover up the direct aggression which they themselves undertook in the Near East.

The import of the statements of the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States regarding the need to repel indirect aggression can be evaluated from the fact that the representatives of the Governments of these two countries have for years pigeon-holed in the United Nations, starting with the negotiations in Dumbarton Oaks -- if there are any participants of these negotiations here, they will certainly confirm my words -- every effort of the Soviet Union and of other countries to draw up a clear definition of aggression, including indirect aggression. The absence of such a definition is to the advantage only of those who are planning aggressive action. Those who have such plans, of course, are not interested in defining aggression.

In the light of the recent actions of the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near East, it becomes very clear why they persistently refuse to arrive at an agreed definition of aggression, and, therefore, it is no accident that at the end of last month the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, stated that he deemed it undesirable to define aggression. How can there be any place for the definition of aggression when aggression has been, in fact, committed?

The Government of the United States has been searching recently for arguments which would justify American intervention in Lebanon. This can be clearly seen during the last few days in connexion with the calling of this special emergency session of the General Assembly. Thus, there appeared the thesis to the effect that the actions of the United States were prompted by some alleged indirect aggression against Lebanon by other States. This whole version of the existence

of some indirect aggression against Lebanon is, of course, completely unfounded. Those who launched this thesis based themselves on the premise apparently that they would be able to delude certain gullible persons. The propaganda machine was launched full speed in order to make the slogan popular.

If you base yourself on these facts, then you must recognize that it is the clear intention to attribute to others those actions which United States circles -- especially those responsible for the foreign policy of the United States -- have for a long period of time been committing, the action of indirect aggression against other States.

If we take only the period of time after the end of the Second World War, we see that the world repeatedly witnessed such acts of aggression against other States. Furthermore, one can quite definitely state that indirect aggression became a constituent part of United States policy.

The armed intrusion into Lebanon and Jordan undertaken by the United States and the United Kingdom, which was conceived as the start of a campaign against other Arab countries, is a typical example of the colonists whose main motive was the garnering of profits by enslaving peoples. It was in 1956-1957, according to the data that has been published, that the oil monopolies of the United States pumped two and half billion dollars in profits from the countries of the Near East. Oil, oil, and oil again -- that was the thing that was tempting the monopolies of the United States and the United Kingdom in the Arab East, and that is what prompts them to undertake continuous military adventures in this area.

One can say that the military occupation of Lebanon is an example of the implementation of the Eisenhower doctrine, and if anybody in the East or elsewhere still has any illusions regarding the alleged anti-colonialism of the United States, these illusions have certainly been dispelled. During the course of the conflict in the Suez Canal, the United States preferred to remain in the background and to leave its NATO allies to carry out aggression, but this time the United States has grasped the hand of the United Kingdom and is acting in close co-operation with it. Thus it is quite clear that the United States and the United Kingdom are acting as conspirators in order to repress the national liberation movement of the Near and Middle East; the United States is picking up the reins of the old and decrepit wagon of the colonizers. The leaders of the United States and the United Kingdom are united by the common interest of the exploitation of the Near East as well as by strategic interests that are directed against the aspirations of the socialist countries and the countries which have been liberated very recently from the colonial yoke.

It is to these ends that the United States and the United Kingdom, during the years which followed the Second World War, tried to transform the Near and Middle East, which are adjacent to the southern frontiers of the Soviet Union, into an arsenal of military aggression. However, their efforts were opposed by the resistance of the Arab peoples. The Arab countries, one after the other, have shown that they are unwilling to be the pawns of the military plans of the Western Powers. Today, when the last bastion of imperialism is crumbling -- I speak of the Baghdad Pact, a name which today sounds like an anachronism -- the leaders of the United Kingdom and the United States have embarked upon the course of dangerous military adventures.

Soldiers, tanks, bombers -- these are the means by which they wish to settle the situation in the Near and Middle East. We must also add the atomic weapon with which the Secretary of Defense has publicly threatened the Arab States.

One cannot fail to stress the danger of this game of playing with fire in one of the most sensitive parts of the world and what threat this constitutes for the maintenance of the peace of the world. The neighbouring States of this region are compelled to take the necessary steps to assure their own defence.

As the Government of the Soviet Union has publicly declared on many occasions, the Soviet Union cannot remain indifferent to the fact that in the immediate neighbourhood of its frontier there is a focal point of military danger. Notwithstanding the reassuring statements which we frequently hear, the situation in the Near and Middle East continues to remain tense. There are many underwater shoals against which the ship of peace can smash itself in this area. Even though the intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom has aroused the indignation of all the countries which are the victims of this intervention and of many other States, the United Kingdom and the United States continue to reinforce their military forces in the Arab East. To convince yourself of this you only have to read any American newspaper. If the resistance of the Arab peoples and the resolute attitude of other peace-loving countries have led for the moment to the checking of the elaborate plans against the United Arab Republic and other Arab States, it does not follow at all that the danger of a military eruption has diminished.

It would be a grave mistake if Member States of the United Nations would allow themselves to be lulled to sleep by statements to the effect that the military intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom is limited to two small countries, Lebanon and Jordan, and that it was not going further for the time being. As long as there are United States soldiers on Lebanese soil and British soldiers on Jordanian soil, the danger of the aggravation of the military conflict remains.

In certain countries we may see statesmen who argue more or less as follows: All these events in Lebanon and Jordan are taking place far from our country and do not interest us; there is no reason to be alarmed at them. The Soviet delegation would like to stress with great force that such reasoning is very erroneous because the threat which hangs over the peace of the world caused by the armed intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom affects all countries. If the countries which have landed their forces in Lebanon and in Jordan were able to consolidate their positions there, the problem would no longer be limited to the Near and Middle East. The policy of the fait accompli which the United States and the United Kingdom are following at the present time threatens to plunge humanity into the abyss of a new war with all its horrible consequences.

To the optimists and the sceptics who deny the danger created by the actions of the United States and the United Kingdom -- and unfortunately there are such optimists and sceptics -- I will only say this: You strangely resemble those statesmen of Western Europe on the eve of the Second World War who, even when the smell of powder was in the air, reassured themselves and calmed others by saying: There is no reason to be alarmed; the worst cannot happen. However, the worst did happen. A few days before the war began, it seemed to these men that the tragedy could be averted, that the sun would continue to shine. However, the storm broke and, as a result of the fires of war, many millions of people died and incalculable riches were destroyed.

Perhaps you will tell me that these events were unforeseen, unexpected. But how can the optimists who wish to lull the world to sleep claim that the foreign intervention in the Near East is not a danger and that the accumulation of atomic weapons and hydrogen weapons is not dangerous? How can these optimists now honestly say that the world will not be the victim of or witness to events that historians of the future will regard as unexpected and unforeseen?

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

The situation which obtains in the Near and Middle East as a result of the invasion carried out by American and British troops has one other very dangerous aspect which should not be overlooked. In carrying out their aggressive actions in this region, the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom seek to drag into them in one form or another a number of other States, especially the members of the North Atlantic Treaty, thus turning them into their accomplices. The territories of the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and Turkey are being used in order to transport American troops to Lebanon. The island of Cyprus, the population of which has for years been engaged in a struggle for liberation from foreign domination, is being used as a base for armed forces being shipped to Jordan. The air space of Israel was used on a large scale for the transport of British troops.

It must be noted that as a result of these actions by the United States and United Kingdom, the North Atlantic Treaty has manifestly been revealed as a military bloc, one of whose main purposes is the suppression of the national emancipation movements of colonial and slave peoples. It is clear that playing the role of porters for the colonial ventures of the United States and the United Kingdom cannot be regarded as being in accord with the national interests of either Western Germany, Italy or Turkey. In this connexion I should like to dwell on the role which unfortunately was played by the Soviet Union's neighbour, Turkey, in present events in the Near and Middle East. We are convinced that this role is entirely at variance with the interests of Turkey, since any complication of the situation in the Near East and any disturbance in this region can only drag Turkey into the holocaust of war and can only bring trouble and misfortune to her. The Soviet Union sincerely wishes to maintain good relations with Turkey, and this is the consideration from which the Soviet Union proceeds when it warns the Government of Turkey of the dangers which are implicit in Turkey's present support of the current actions of the United States and United Kingdom in the Near and Middle East.

From the Western Powers, especially from the United Kingdom, one can often hear voices stating that their actions in the Near and Middle East are determined by their interest in Near Eastern oil. In this connexion I should like to remind you that when in 1956, in the course of the Soviet-British negotiations in

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

London, the then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Sir Anthony Eden, declared that the United Kingdom was prepared to go to war for the sake of Near Eastern oil, taking into account, as he put it, the importance of oil for the economy of the United Kingdom, Nikita Sergeivich Khrushchev warned the leaders of the United Kingdom that the policy of colonial domination and plunder was inconceivable now and was doomed to failure. The statesmen of the United Kingdom were given a good piece of advice not to launch war against the Arabs, since this would inevitably lead to sad consequences for the United Kingdom in the first place. All those who were not blind could see that even at that time, but they would not hearken to this good piece of advice, they did launch aggression against Egypt, and, as is well known, they suffered shameful failure.

The events of 1956 confirmed the sinister and doomed nature of the policy of military adventures for those who engaged in such military operations, and this is what we again witness, in the kind of actions that occurred in the Near and Middle East. Armed American and British intervention in Lebanon and Jordan was undertaken at a time when preparations for a summit meeting, proposed by the Soviet Union, were underway for the purpose of putting an end to the cold war and the armaments race, and just when the Soviet Union had adopted a historic decision to discontinue the testing of hydrogen and atom weapons.

The question arises whether the leaders of the United Kingdom and the United States did not calculate that one of the results of their actions in respect of Lebanon and Jordan would be to frustrate that turnabout in the direction of improving the international situation which had become marked and which displeased them. Now when the armed incursion of the United States and United Kingdom in the Middle East has placed the United States in a parlous and dangerous situation, it is particularly clear how necessary it is to put an end to the doomed and sinister policy of positions of strength and to approach the solution of international problems rather from positions of reason.

A big step forward along this path would be to achieve an agreement among the great Powers for non-intervention in the internal affairs of the countries of the Near and Middle East and strict respect for their sovereignty and territorial integrity. Such a special agreement has long been advocated by the Soviet Union.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

Not only would it meet the needs of the maintenance of universal peace -- which, of course, is the most important consideration -- but in addition it seems to us it would be useful from the point of view of the interests of the Western Powers, since it would constitute one of the essential elements for the creation of stable political and economic relationships between the Western Powers on the one hand and the countries of that region on the other.

May I venture to remind the Assembly of the proposals which the Soviet Government placed before the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France as early as February 1957. As you know, the Soviet Government proposed an agreement pursuant to which the Governments of the great Powers would assume specific obligations in respect of the securing of a lasting peace in the Near and Middle East. A prominent part among these would be the demand for the settlement of controversial questions exclusively by peaceful means on the basis of negotiation, non-intervention -- I repeat, non-intervention -- in the internal affairs of the countries of the Near and Middle East, respect for the sovereignty and independence of these countries, and likewise the withdrawal of foreign troops from their territories.

Can anyone deny, in the light of the events that have occurred and which are occurring in the Near and Middle East, that these proposals have acquired even greater timeliness and significance?

An agreement among the great Powers on non-intervention in the affairs of the countries of the Near and Middle East constitutes an entirely essential precondition for the settlement of the problems of this region in the interests of the peoples thereof and in the interests of peace alike. But in order to bring this about, of course, it is necessary to forego all attempts to solve questions and problems by force. It is essential to put an end to aggressive actions, and it is essential, first of all, to withdraw foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan. If peace is to be strengthened, one's attachment to peace must be confirmed by deeds rather than merely proclaimed by declarations.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

What are the American and British troops in Lebanon and Jordan for? Why are the effectives of these troops being increased? Why are additional contingents and armaments being shipped there? How can all this be made compatible or be harmonized with the peace-loving assurances and declarations of the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom? Even those who previously were inclined to take the position of minimizing the danger implicit in the armed intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near East have now had their eyes opened to the real state of affairs by the actions of the British and Americans themselves.

The peoples of the Arab countries are demanding indignantly that foreign troops be withdrawn, as is also indicated by the recently elected President of Lebanon, who announced that the withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon is the main task in the national policy of his country. It must be observed that peace in the Near and Middle East can be restored on condition that the troops of the foreign interventionists be withdrawn from the Arab East fully, unreservedly, and not slowly. This must be borne in mind in particular, since there is a certain tendency afoot now to keep foreign troops in Lebanon and Jordan in one way or another. Needless to say, this would be tantamount to making a mockery of the principles of the United Nations; it would be a body-blow to its authority.

We have heard talk to the effect that foreign troops must be kept in the Near and Middle East until, as some put it, "order has been restored there, until the situation has been stabilized". There is hardly any need to speak in detail of the dangers implicit in the policy to which some are trying to push the United Nations, for if any State or group of States arrogates unto itself the right to impose such order as it pleases in other countries, then in international affairs no place would be left for law or right, nor would there be any place for the United Nations, and in relations between States the law of the jungle and the law of the fist would prevail in international affairs.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

I am not even referring to the well known intention of the Government of the United States as a token gesture to withdraw one battalion of its occupation troops from Lebanon. Is there any need to argue that these theatrical stratagems have nothing in common with actual measures designed to maintain peace in the Near and Middle East and to restore the independence of Arab countries which have been subjected to occupation? They ship into the territories of other countries dozens of battalions in order then to withdraw one battalion with pomp and circumstance, and then they strive to argue that this is a reassuring development in international relations.

One cannot ignore one other tactic which has been frequently resorted to recently. Seeking to divert the attention of public opinion from the fact of the concentration of armed forces of the United States and United Kingdom in the territories of the States of the Near and Middle East, the official spokesmen of these two Powers make increasingly frequent resort to statements to the effect that they are eager to contribute to the economic development of the countries of the Near and Middle East. This is what we heard, for example, in today's speech of the President of the United States of America, Mr. Eisenhower, who addressed you from the rostrum of this Assembly.

Extending assistance to the economic development of the countries of the Near and Middle East is surely something that is good. The Soviet Union has always favoured the extending of such assistance without any political or military strings attached, and it actually builds its relations with other countries, including the countries of the Near and Middle East, on the foundation of the full equality of the rights of all parties in mutual benefit.

The considerations on questions of economic assistance to the States of the Near and Middle East set forth here by the President of the United States in his address require careful and suitable consideration; but I submit that, first of all, the chief question must be solved, and that is the question of the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan. It is quite inadmissible, surely, that talk of economic assistance should be utilized in order to divert the General Assembly's attention from the solution of this paramount issue. That is why the Soviet Union resolutely presses the point that the question of the withdrawal of American and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan should be solved without delay and initially.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

Immediately after the United States and then the United Kingdom had undertaken armed intervention into the Arab East, the Soviet Union demanded that the Security Council of the United Nations take the most urgent measures in order to put an end to aggression and safeguard the national independence of the Arab countries which had been subjected to unprovoked attack; but the Security Council, the majority of whose members consists of States which are members of military blocs headed by the Powers precisely which committed aggression in the Near East, found itself unable to fulfil its duty. In view of this the Soviet Government proposed a convening of a conference of the Heads of Government of the Soviet Union, the United States, Great Britain, France, and India, with the participation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld. However, the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom made it impossible to carry out such a conference.

In these circumstances the Soviet Government deemed it its duty to present the question of the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from the Arab East and the restoration of peace in this region to the General Assembly for its consideration in the emergency session.

In pressing for the withdrawal of American and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan, the Soviet Union is guided by its solicitude for the maintenance of international peace and the safeguarding of the security of peoples. The Soviet Union has no selfish purposes or hidden, ulterior motives in the Near and Middle East. The Soviet Union has no military bases there; it has no oil concessions, no capital investments. The Soviet Union has not invested one dollar in the economies of these countries. There is not one Soviet soldier in these countries. The only way in which the Soviet Union is interested in the Near and Middle East -- the only way, I say -- is in the maintenance of lasting peace and tranquillity in this area and making it possible for the inhabitants of this region to develop their lives and their economies in peace and tranquillity.

One more point: the Soviet Union has called for a special session of the General Assembly and it has demanded in it the immediate withdrawal of British and American troops from Lebanon and Jordan. It is doing that, however, not for the purpose of worsening relations between our country and the United States and the United Kingdom or doing any harm to the prestige of the United States and the United Kingdom. It is not our intention in any way to worsen relations between

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

these two Powers and the countries of the Arab East either. We would be very happy if these relations were to develop in the best possible way on the basis of peaceful co-operation, in full respect for the national sovereignty and independence of the Arab countries.

The Soviet Government, as is well known, seeks to establish good relations based on full trust with the United States and the United Kingdom. It is not our fault that such relations have not as yet materialized. We do not close our eyes to the fact that in the United States and United Kingdom there are people who consider that the Governments in Washington and London have gone too far in their actions in the Near and Middle East and that they cannot withdraw their troops from Lebanon and Jordan on the appeal of the United Nations without seeing their prestige harmed. This point of view could perhaps be understandable but it surely cannot be agreed to.

If the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom were in reality interested in helping bring about or finding a correct way out of the acute situation in which we find ourselves in order to strengthen the peace, then, comprehensively and thoroughly weighing the pro and con, they would nevertheless understand the necessity of withdrawing their troops from the Near and Middle East; and so far from harming their prestige, this would in effect strengthen and cement it in the eyes of world public opinion.

The question for the consideration of which the present emergency special session of the General Assembly was convened is of tremendous importance. As never before, our Organization now finds it possible to make an important contribution to the maintenance of international peace.

On instructions of the Government of the USSR, the Soviet delegation has submitted to the emergency special session of the General Assembly the following draft resolution on the immediate withdrawal of the troops of the United States from Lebanon and the United Kingdom troops from Jordan. The text is as follows:

"The General Assembly,

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

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

"Recommends the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom to withdraw their troops from the territory of Lebanon and Jordan without delay;

"Instructs the Secretary-General to strengthen the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon in accordance with the plan presented by the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon in its second report, and to send an observation group to Jordan with a view to the supervision of the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan, and of the situation along the frontiers of those countries."

In submitting this draft resolution, the Soviet delegation wishes to express confidence that the General Assembly of the United Nations will examine it with suitable attention and with a proper sense of responsibility. I think we are not far from wrong if we say that the overwhelming majority of States represented in the United Nations are in favour of the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Near and Middle East.

Things are not changed materially by the fact that some announced this aloud, so everyone could hear them; others say so with some diffidence; while a third group say nothing and remain silent.

It is well known that many of those who participate in the session of the General Assembly are engaged in the search for a suitable formula through which the demands for the withdrawal of American and British troops could be clothed. Of course, if there is a genuine desire to contribute to the adoption of such a decision, which will be the only correct one, then the formula is not difficult to find. It seems to us that a suitable formula is contained in the draft resolution of the Soviet Union. This does not mean that we refuse to help in the search for a mutually acceptable formula worked out with due consideration of the views of other delegations, if it meets the main purpose -- the withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan. Even today, if you please -- I repeat, even today -- we are prepared to enter into official or unofficial consultations, any sort of consultations, with any delegations, including the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom, concerning the preparation of such a constructive decision which could be adopted by the General Assembly in the interests of peace.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

The Soviet Government trusts that the emergency special session of the General Assembly will carry out the task which faces it: the restoration of peace in the Near and Middle East in a worthy manner. The Soviet Union, like other peace-loving States, will continue to do everything in its power in order consistently to champion and to defend the cause of peace. This resolute decision found clear expression in the recent Soviet-Chinese communiqué concerning the meeting between the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Nikita Khrushchev, and the Chairman of the Chinese People's Republic, Mao Tse-Tung. This is what guides the delegation of the Soviet Union in the current session of the General Assembly. This session can serve the cause of peace well if we are filled with the feeling of profound responsibility for the outcome of its work.

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

In appearing before this Assembly, the Jordan delegation comes to present a case -- a serious case -- and to ask for an answer -- a satisfactory answer. My country is undertaking a bold struggle against indirect aggression and external plots threatening its independence and integrity. We should like to feel that in resisting this pressure and in defending the common cause of peace, we are not alone.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Fawzi, United Arab Republic)

adventure in 1956, should be hiding their faces, and the steady and the fair could rejoice.

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

(Mr. Fawzi, United Arab Republic)

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

As for the return of the prodigal sons of Britain not to their homes in the north but to Jordan and as for the ominous reticence of the Government of the United Kingdom in relation to the withdrawal of those arms-carrying boys, we find that no amount of resentful words can express our feelings and our views. Yet words or no words the armed forces of the United Kingdom shall have to withdraw, and the sooner the better for all concerned.

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

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

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

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.