

**Middle East - Suez story No  
7-14: Middle East - Suez  
story No 7-14 - 18**

*HS L 179:110*



National Library  
of Sweden

Dag Hammarskjöld's saml.

Middle East / Suez story - 8

26 Aug. 55

- Meeting of the Council on Foreign Relations in honor of J. F. Dulles at H. Pratt House.
- Address by J. F. Dulles before the Council
- Comment by D.H. on address by J. F. Dulles

Council on Foreign Relations, Inc.  
58 East 68th Street  
New York City

For release after 5:30 p.m., E.D.T.  
Friday, August 26, 1955

Meeting of the Council on Foreign Relations  
in honor of John Foster Dulles  
Secretary of State  
The Harold Pratt House, New York

The Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, was the guest of honor at a meeting of the Council on Foreign Relations at the Harold Pratt House on Friday afternoon, August 26, at 5:30 p.m., at which he delivered a major address on United States foreign policy. Approximately 150 members of the Council were present.

The Council on Foreign Relations is a non-profit, non-partisan organization established to study important problems of American foreign policy. It conducts an extensive research program, organizes study and discussion groups for men experienced in foreign affairs, and produces publications on international affairs, including the quarterly review, FOREIGN AFFAIRS. One of the study groups conducted under Council auspices was that on Aid to Europe under the chairmanship of President Eisenhower during the two years before he assumed command of the NATO forces.

The Council also administers a program of fellowships and arranges off-the-record meetings for its members with leading foreign and American statesmen. Among the participants in these meetings during the past year have been Premier Pierre Mendès-France of France, Premier Mario Scelba of Italy, Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida of Japan, Prime

Minister U Nu of Burma, Admiral Arthur W. Radford, Ambassador Arthur H. Dean, Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson, and General Matthew B. Ridgway. Affiliated with the Council are Committees on Foreign Relations composed of community leaders in twenty-seven cities throughout the United States.

The present officers and directors of the Council are as follows: John J. McCloy, Chairman of the Board; Henry M. Wriston, President; Frank Altschul, Vice-President and Secretary; David Rockefeller, Vice-President; Elliott V. Bell, Treasurer; Walter H. Mallory, Executive Director; George S. Franklin, Jr., Executive Director; and Hamilton Fish Armstrong, William A.M. Burden, Lewis W. Douglas, Allen W. Dulles, Thomas K. Finletter, W. Averell Harriman, Joseph E. Johnson, Devereux C. Josephs, Grayson L. Kirk, Russell C. Leffingwell, Philip D. Reed, Whitney H. Shepardson, Myron C. Taylor, and John H. Williams, directors.

# DEPARTMENT OF STATE

AUGUST 26, 1955

FOR THE PRESS

NO. 517

## CAUTION - FUTURE RELEASE

FOR RELEASE AT 5:30 P.M., E.D.T., FRIDAY, AUGUST 26, 1955.  
NOT TO BE PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED, QUOTED FROM OR USED IN  
ANY WAY.

ADDRESS BY

THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
BEFORE THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS  
COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS BUILDING  
NEW YORK CITY

FRIDAY, AUGUST 26, 1955

(The Secretary's Address will be broadcast by the radio networks of the Mutual Broadcasting System at 6:30 p.m., e.d.t., the National Broadcasting Company at 7:45 p.m., e.d.t., the American Broadcasting Company at 8:00 p.m., e.d.t., and the Columbia Broadcasting System at 10:30 p.m., e.d.t.)

### THE MIDDLE EAST

One of the first things I did as Secretary of State was to go to the Middle East. I wanted to see for myself that area so rich in culture and religious tradition, yet now so torn by strife and bitterness. So, in the spring of 1953, I visited Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia. Upon my return I spoke of the impressions gathered on that trip and of the hopes which I held as a result of talks with leaders and people there.

Some of those hopes have become realities. At that time the Suez Base was a center of controversy and of potential strife. Now, as a result of patient effort, in a spirit of conciliation, the problem of the Suez Base has been successfully resolved.

Another problem which was then concerning many of the leaders in the Middle East was that of the security of the area. It was clear that effective defense depended upon collective measures and that such measures, to be dependable, needed to be a natural drawing together of those who felt a sense of common destiny in the face of what could be a common danger. Here, too, there has been some encouraging progress.

A third problem which called for attention was the need for water to irrigate land. I mentioned in my report the possibility that the rivers flowing through the Jordan Valley might be used to make this valley a source of livelihood

rather

rather than dispute. Since then Ambassador Eric Johnston has held talks with the governments of countries through which the River Jordan runs. They have shown an encouraging willingness to accept the principle of coordinated arrangements for the use of the waters. Plans for the development of the Valley are well advanced. Ambassador Johnston is now on his fourth visit to the countries concerned in an effort to eliminate the small margins of difference which still exist.

A beginning has been made, as you see, in doing away with the obstacles that stand in the way of the aspirations of the Middle Eastern peoples. It is my hope -- and that is the hope of which I would now speak -- that the time has come when it is useful to think in terms of further steps toward stability, tranquillity and progress in the Middle East.

### The Arab-Israel Problem

What are the principal remaining problems? They are those which were unresolved by the armistices of 1949 which ended the fighting between Israelis and Arabs. Before taking up these problems specifically, I would first pay high tribute to what the United Nations has done to preserve tranquillity and to serve humanity in the area. Despite these indispensable efforts, three problems remain that conspicuously require to be solved.

The first is the tragic plight of the 900,000 refugees who formerly lived in the territory that is now occupied by Israel.

The second is the pall of fear that hangs over the Arab and Israel people alike. The Arab countries fear that Israel will seek by violent means to expand at their expense. The Israelis fear that the Arabs will gradually marshal superior forces to be used to drive them into the sea, and they suffer from the economic measures now taken against them.

The third is the lack of fixed permanent boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

There are other important problems. But if these three principal problems could be dealt with, then the way would be paved for the solution of others.

These three problems seem capable of solution, and surely there is need.

Border clashes take an almost weekly toll of human lives and inflame an already dangerous mood of hatred. The sufferings of the Arab refugees are drawn out almost beyond the point of endurance. The fears which are at work, on each side, lead to a heavy burden of armament, which constitutes a serious drag on economic and social progress. Responsible leaders are finding it hard to turn their full attention and energies to the positive task of creating conditions of healthy growth.

Serious

Serious as the present situation is, there is a danger that unless it improves, it will get worse. One ill leads to another, and cause and effect are hard to sort out. The atmosphere, if it worsens, could becloud clear judgments, making appear attractive what would in fact be reckless.

Both sides suffer greatly from the present situation, and both are anxious for what they would regard as a just and equitable solution. But neither has been able to find that way.

This may be a situation where mutual friends could serve the common good. This is particularly true since the area may not, itself, possess all of the ingredients needed for the full and early building of a condition of security and well-being.

The United States, as a friend of both Israelis and Arabs, has given the situation deep and anxious thought and has come to certain conclusions, the expression of which may help men of good will within the area to fresh constructive efforts. I speak in this matter with the authority of President Eisenhower.

### I.

To end the plight of the 900,000 refugees requires that these uprooted people should, through resettlement and, to such an extent as may be feasible, repatriation, be enabled to resume a life of dignity and self-respect. To this end, there is need to create more arable land where refugees can find permanent homes and gain their own livelihood through their own work. Fortunately, there are practical projects for water development which can make this possible.

All this requires money.

Compensation is due from Israel to the refugees. However, it may be that Israel cannot, unaided, now make adequate compensation. If so, there might be an international loan to enable Israel to pay the compensation which is due and which would enable many of the refugees to find for themselves a better way of life.

President

President Eisenhower would recommend substantial participation by the United States in such a loan for such a purpose. Also he would recommend that the United States contribute to the realization of water development and irrigation projects which would, directly or indirectly, facilitate the resettlement of the refugees.

These projects would, of course, do much more than aid in the resettlement of refugees. They would enable the people throughout the area to enjoy a better life. Furthermore, a solution to the refugee problem would help in eliminating the problem of recurrent incidents which have plagued and embittered the settlements on both sides of the borders.

## II.

The second principal problem which I mentioned is that of fear. The nature of this fear is such that it is hardly within the capacity of the countries of the area, acting alone, to replace the fear with a sense of security. There, as in many other areas, security can be assured only by collective measures which commit decisive power to the deterring of aggression.

President Eisenhower has authorized me to say that given a solution of the other related problems, he would recommend that the United States join in formal treaty engagements to prevent or thwart any effort by either side to alter by force the boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors. I hope that other countries would be willing to join in such a security guarantee, and that it would be sponsored by the United Nations.

By such collective security measures the area could be relieved of the acute fears which both sides now profess. The families located near the boundaries could relax from the strain of feeling that violent death may suddenly strike them; the peoples of the area whose standards of living are already too low would no longer have to carry the burden of what threatens to become an armaments race if indeed it does not become a war; the political leadership of the area could devote itself to constructive tasks.

## III.

If there is to be a guarantee of borders, it would be normal that there should be prior agreement upon what the borders are. That is the third major problem. The existing lines separating Israel and the Arab states were fixed by the Armistice Agreements of 1949. They were not designed to be permanent frontiers in every respect; in part at least, they reflected the status of the fighting at the moment.

The task

The task of drawing permanent boundaries is admittedly one of difficulty. There is no single and sure guide, for each of two conflicting claims may seem to have merit. The difficulty is increased by the fact that even territory which is barren has acquired a sentimental significance. Surely the overall advantages of the measures here outlined would outweigh vastly any net disadvantages of the adjustments needed to convert armistice lines of danger into boundary lines of safety. In spite of conflicting claims and sentiments, I believe it is possible to find a way of reconciling the vital interests of all the parties. The United States would be willing to help in the search for a solution if the parties to the dispute should desire.

#### IV.

If agreement can be reached on these basic problems of refugees, fear, and boundaries, it should prove possible to find solutions for other questions, largely economic, which presently fan the flames of hostility and resentment.

It should also be possible to reach agreement on the status of Jerusalem. The United States would give its support to a United Nations review of this problem.

#### CONCLUSION

I have not attempted to enumerate all the issues on which it would be desirable to have a settlement; nor have I tried to outline in detail the form which a settlement of any of the elements might take. I have tried to show that possibilities exist for an immeasurable improvement and that the possibilities do not require any nation taking action which would be against its interests whether those interests be measured in terms of material strength or in terms of national prestige and honor. I have also, I trust, made clear that the government of the United States is disposed to enlarge those possibilities by contributions of its own, if this be desired by those concerned.

Both sides in this strife have a noble past, a heritage of rich contributions to civilization; both have fostered progress in science and the arts. Each side is predominantly representative of one of the world's great religions. Both sides desire to achieve a good life for their people and to share, and contribute to, the advancements of this century.

At a time when a great effort is being made to ease the tension which has long prevailed between the Soviet and Western worlds, can we not hope that a similar spirit should prevail in the Middle East? That is our plea. The spirit of conciliation and of the good neighbor brings rich rewards to the people and to the nations. If doing that involves some burdens, they are burdens which the United States would share,

just

just as we would share the satisfaction which would result to all peoples if happiness, contentment and good will could drive hatred and misery away from peoples whom we hold in high respect and honor.

overall advantages of the arrangement here outlined would outweigh very much the disadvantages of the adjustments needed to convert armistice lines of danger into boundary lines of safety. In spite of conflicting claims and sentiments, I believe it is possible to find a way of reconciling the vital interests of all the parties. The United States would be willing to help in the search for a solution if the parties to the dispute should desire.

\* \* \*

IV.

If agreement can be reached on these basic problems of refugees, fear, and counter-terror, it should prove possible to find solutions for other questions, largely economic, which presently face the lines of hostility and resentment.

It should also be possible to reach agreement on the status of Jerusalem. The United States would give its support to a United Nations review of this problem.

CONCLUSION

I have not attempted to enumerate all the issues on which it would be desirable to have a settlement. I have tried to outline in detail the form which a settlement of any of the elements might take. I have tried to show that possibilities exist for an immeasurable improvement and that the possibilities do not require any nation taking action which would be against its interests whether those interests be measured in terms of material strength or in terms of national prestige and honor. I have also, I trust, made clear that the government of the United States is disposed to enlarge those possibilities by contributions of its own, if this be desired by those concerned.

Both sides in this strife have a noble past, a heritage of rich contributions to civilization; both have fostered progress in science and the arts. Each side is predominantly representative of one of the world's great religions. Both sides desire to achieve a good life for their people and to share, and contribute to, the advancements of this century.

At a time when a great effort is being made to ease the tension which has long prevailed between the Soviet and Western worlds, can we not hope that a similar spirit should prevail in the Middle East? That is our plea. The spirit of conciliation and of the good neighbor brings rich rewards to the people and to the nations. If doing that involves some burdens, they are burdens which the United States would share.

CAUTION -- ADVANCE RELEASE

Not to Be Made Public  
before 6 p.m. (EDT),  
Friday, 26 August 1955

NOTE TO CORRESPONDENTS:

COMMENT BY SECRETARY-GENERAL ON ADDRESS BY US SECRETARY OF STATE

JOHN FOSTER DULLES BEFORE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

In the Introduction to my Report to the General Assembly I said concerning the situation in Palestine:

"It should be one of the principal objectives of the United Nations in the coming year so to influence conditions in the area as to create a basis on which the parties may find it possible to consider a more lasting settlement. The fate of the Palestine refugees has been far too long upon our conscience. The security and the economic and social progress of all the nations in the area depend upon the outcome. Even a partial solution of the problems of the refugees might well be the beginning of a general stabilization of conditions in the area."

Holding these views I welcome warmly the generous and constructive spirit of which Secretary Dulles' speech on the Middle Eastern problems gives evidence. His suggestion concerning financial assistance from the community of nations to the solution of the refugee problems and the willingness of the United States to carry its part of the burden, may well prove to be an approach to this humanitarian problem which would mark a beginning of a general stabilization of conditions in the area. I hope that this farsighted suggestion will be received with all the attention that it deserves and give us a basis on which the "parties may find it possible to consider a more lasting settlement" of those unresolved political questions to which Secretary Dulles also refers.

\* \* \* \* \*