

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**



737th
PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 15 August 1958,
at 3 p.m.

New York

THIRD EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 5:	
Questions considered by the Security Council at its 838th meeting on 7 August 1958 (<i>continued</i>).....	51

President: Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).

AGENDA ITEM 5

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

1. Mr. DAVIN (New Zealand): I should like to begin by recalling the statement which the New Zealand Prime Minister, Mr. Nash, made on 9 August 1958. In welcoming the Security Council's decision to convene this session of the General Assembly, Mr. Nash made clear the New Zealand Government's belief that the Assembly is confronted with responsibilities which it has not always faced squarely in the past. The special problems, he said, relate to Lebanon and Jordan, where United States and United Kingdom forces remain in response to calls for assistance against the danger of external interference. The Prime Minister went on to say:

"It will be the first task of the Assembly to create the conditions in which the independence and territorial integrity of these States may be assured and the assisting forces may be withdrawn. It is imperative, however, that the Assembly look beyond these immediate issues. It must, if its work is to have full meaning, endeavour to elaborate measures which will provide small States with effective protection against indirect aggression. And it must, if the Middle East situation is not to be a source of continual danger and discord, endeavour to work for a comprehensive rather than piecemeal solution of the political, social and economic difficulties of the area."

These are the broad objectives which we would hope the Assembly would at this session seek to secure.

2. The Middle East, as all of us know, is an area of critical importance. What happens there is of far more than regional concern. None of us can remain immune to the consequences if present dangers should grow without check. If this Organization is to give practical help to the countries of the Middle East in creating more tranquil conditions, it cannot afford to take a narrow and hesitant view of the challenge it faces, or of the opportunities now presented for fruitful action. Nor can it afford to waste its energies on partisan wrangling.

3. It may be suggested that those who urge on the Assembly a resolute attempt to deal with the fundamental problems are trying to divert attention from the presence of United States forces in Lebanon and

United Kingdom forces in Jordan. Those who would make this suggestion are, we submit, obscuring present realities, misrepresenting the conditions under which the assisting forces went into the two countries, and doing the United Nations a disservice by denying its ability to pursue positive and necessary initiatives. As my delegation sees it, it is not a question of discussing the general in order to evade the particular; it is a question of solving the particular issue in terms of a wider and more broadly based solution.

4. In the New Zealand view, any analysis of the problems now affecting the Middle East should not fail to take account of the following facts.

5. First, a political and social revolution of vast scope is taking place in the Middle East as a result of the working of nationalism among the Arab people and their yearning for a better life. It is natural that this revolution should be accompanied by far-reaching changes; that it should have as one of its results a renewal of the sense of kinship among a proud and ancient people and a movement towards a wider measure of unity. It is natural, too, that it should release great constructive energies and that political emancipation should be followed by a desire to free the Arab people from their age-old enemies, poverty and disease.

6. It is, moreover, to be expected that the recently independent Arab countries, in exercising their full freedom to decide their own future, should sometimes differ in adjusting their relations among themselves and with other countries. Such adjustments must naturally bring their own difficulties. But these difficulties clearly ought not to include the development of subversion, indirect aggression, and systematic and deliberate incitement to violence as a means of imposing uniformity in the Arab world. There may be one Arab world, but it comprises a number of independent, sovereign States. All of those States, as Members of the United Nations, are bound under the Charter to practise tolerance and to respect the equal rights of their neighbours. The conclusion cannot be avoided that there are forces in the Middle East directed more to the pursuit of national aggrandizement than to genuine international co-operation and interdependence. Those forces have not been content to see a peaceful commerce in ideas and to encourage peaceful change, but have pursued courses dangerous to peace in the Middle East as well as in a much wider area. That is the second fact to which I wish to draw attention.

7. Thirdly, I would refer to the efforts of one of the great Powers to play upon existing divisions in the Middle East, to impair long-established and mutually beneficial commercial and political relationships between Middle Eastern countries and the Western democracies, and to make its own influence pre-eminent.

8. Fourthly, there is the persistence of the Palestine problem, which continues to feed Arab hostility to Israel and to threaten international peace and security.

9. Finally, there is the mounting need for co-operative measures to develop the Middle East's economic resources and to ensure their employment for the betterment of the people of the area as a whole.

10. There is a further urgent and inescapable issue: I refer to the place to be occupied by the Middle East in great-Power relations. It seems hardly necessary, in this context, to emphasize the responsibility resting on the major Powers. The recognition of this undeniable fact does not, of course, mean that other countries outside the region do not have an important part to play. Nor does it carry any implication that the major Powers could, or would, attempt any accommodation among themselves which did not have the understanding and approval of the Governments which are sovereign in their own Middle Eastern homelands. But, having regard to the influence which the policies of the permanent members of the Security Council must inevitably exert on the future of the Middle East, New Zealand regrets that it has not been found possible to arrange a meeting of heads of Government within the framework of the Security Council. It had been our belief and our hope that a meeting at such a level and within the United Nations setting would have encouraged frank exchanges among smaller groups of the leaders of the countries concerned. It would have permitted the consideration, with the least delay, of proposals designed to safeguard the Middle East against domestic turmoil and external threat. And it would, in particular, have enabled the top-level participants to explore the possibilities of agreement on restraints on the supply of arms to Middle Eastern countries, on frontier guarantees and on some measure of neutralization of the area.

11. There are, however, certain aspects of the Middle East situation which can, in my delegation's view, appropriately be considered by the General Assembly.

12. The first of these is the issue of indirect aggression, which has been raised specifically in respect of Lebanon and Jordan. Let me say at once that New Zealand regards as well-founded the fears expressed by those two small countries. It is equally our belief that the United States and United Kingdom were fully justified in acting as they did to allay those fears.

13. As to the repeated allegations of one delegation in this Assembly that this action constitutes aggression, it seems only necessary to recall that the requests for assistance came from independent and lawfully constituted Governments, in the free exercise of their sovereign rights. Even those who differ from the Governments concerned in their assessment of the gravity of the threat can hardly deny that it was for those Governments concerned, and not for any other country, to reach the determination on which they based their requests for aid. In this charge of aggression, however, it is possible to detect a sinister consistency of approach. The question therefore arises: is the one great Power which stands condemned in this Assembly for a cynical and tyrannous exercise of its strength against a small neighbour capable of judging the acts of others except by the standards it applied in its own case?

14. Now, as regards Lebanon, while it must be conceded that there have been political differences within the country, differences primarily of domestic origin, my delegation nevertheless believes that interference from outside has given the situation a special danger. We have studied with care the debate in the Security Council, but remain to be convinced that any defence

against the impressive case brought forward by the Lebanese representatives can be based on a selective use of the preliminary reports of the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon,¹ on blank denials of complicity in the acts complained against, or on bland protestations of innocence. In the circumstances, we fully support the continuance and, if necessary, the expansion of the Observation Group in Lebanon. The Group has carried out, and is continuing to carry out, a valuable function. It has made notable progress in overcoming its earlier difficulties and has worked conscientiously to help to improve conditions in the country. We warmly endorse the Secretary-General's observations concerning the desirability of maintaining in Lebanon, should this be desired by the Government of Lebanon, United Nations representation, which would substantially establish the Organization's concern for the maintenance of the country's independence and integrity [732nd meeting].

15. In the case of Jordan, my delegation has no doubt, in view of the interference which took place and nearly succeeded in 1957, and in view of the developments made known to us yesterday by the representative of Jordan [735th meeting], that a similar threat exists at the present time. As we view it, the special danger of the Jordan situation is that, if subversion and external interference were to succeed, the immediate consequence might be a breakdown of the armistice arrangements negotiated in 1949. In his address on Wednesday last [733rd meeting], the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, reminded us of the particular interest the United Nations has in this matter. We consider that the United Kingdom forces now in Jordan in response to Jordan's request provide a valuable stabilizing influence at the present time. It is, however, important that the United Nations should assume responsibility as quickly as possible and that it should do so in more than symbolic form. My delegation would support immediate measures to strengthen the existing armistice machinery and would urge that consideration might also be given to the possibility of establishing, in consultation with the Government of Jordan, a United Nations observation group within Jordan and near its frontiers. It will be clear that this course would require the consent of Jordan. I say this with due respect to the observations made yesterday by the representative of Jordan.

16. Rapid United Nations action both in regard to Lebanon and to Jordan is, we consider, imperative. But more than that, there is a clear necessity for constant vigilance in relation both to those areas and to other regions of the Middle East. The apprehensions which have been expressed elsewhere lend emphasis to the continuing possibility of indirect aggression. Accordingly, it seems to my delegation that in these conditions there is a need for permanent United Nations machinery which would bring together contingents contributed by Governments of Member States to act in a police and supervisory capacity at the request of the Organization and of the country affected. The establishment of this force would bring to fruition a plan advocated by the President and by one of his distinguished Commonwealth predecessors in office, Mr. Pearson of Canada. My delegation warmly welcomes the inclusion of a proposal for a stand-by United Nations peace force

¹ Official Records of the Security Council, Thirteenth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1958, documents S/4051 and S/4052.

in the imaginative six-point programme outlined to the Assembly by President Eisenhower [733rd meeting]. We hope that there can be general agreement that the establishment of such an agency of the United Nations should be set down for specific and early consideration by the General Assembly.

17. I should like now to turn briefly to the problem of economic and social progress in the Middle East. I shall not dwell on present conditions, but would simply note that, in spite of the strenuous endeavours of the people of the area, with the important supplementary aid of the international community, a vast gap still exists between the hopes of the people and their capacity to realize those hopes. The general situation clearly demands a co-operative effort by the countries of the region and increased international assistance. The valuable observations of the Secretary-General in this respect and the suggested consultations on a development plan which form part of the constructive programme outlined by the United States indicate the direction that regional effort might take and the way in which international assistance might be most effectively applied.

18. New Zealand welcomes these proposals and the promise they hold for fruitful action. We believe that there is rich scope, even as things stand today, for economic co-operation among the Middle Eastern countries; and more propitious circumstances may perhaps be provided by the current impulse towards a wider unity among the Arab States. But we think it must be recognized that the possibility of the comprehensive development which the area as a whole most needs is unlikely unless an effort is made to diminish political differences. Constructive suggestions offered in the past—for example, the plan to develop the Jordan River—have been frustrated by unresolved political conflicts.

19. Among these conflicts the Palestine issue is central. It is now six years since this Assembly carried out an examination of the full range of the problem. United States proposals made in November 1956 were not pursued. It was my delegation's view at that time that the Assembly should make a serious effort to formulate recommendations which might serve as the basis for a lasting reconciliation. We believed that the Assembly should also decide what obligations it was prepared to assume in order to give its recommendations meaning. It seemed obvious to us then, and it seems obvious to us now, that, unless steps are taken to make the situation better, it is bound to get worse.

20. We have, I believe, not been alone in voicing our disappointment that there should have been a reluctance at earlier sessions of this Assembly to extend our work from the study of effects to the study of causes and to accept the responsibility from which we have retreated in recent years. We have listened with great interest to the eloquent appeal of the Minister for External Affairs of Ireland [735th meeting] and we share his view that the Palestine issue cannot be ignored.

21. I need not remind the Assembly that the situation in Jordan is directly related to the problem of the Arab refugees, hundreds of thousands of whom provide a focus of discontent in view of the rootless and hopeless existence to which they have been reduced. It seems to my delegation that the Assembly's practice of considering this problem only in its so-called humanitarian aspects is becoming increasingly unreal and inadequate. The work of the United Nations Relief and Works

Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East [UNRWA], which is charged with the care of the refugees, is admirable. But so far as the Assembly is concerned, the humanitarianism of an approach which keeps the refugees barely above subsistence level and leaves the political elements of the problem untouched, is open to question. And it can hardly be gainsaid that the political necessities of the problem are growing more pressing.

22. United Nations organs such as the United Nations Emergency Force, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, and UNRWA are all making an indispensable contribution to the reduction of tension in the area. They are helping to bring about conditions in which political action may ultimately be possible. But it is for the parties directly concerned to take that action. As the Secretary-General has reminded us, the activities of the United Nations in that part of the world are only safeguards created to assist the Governments concerned [732nd meeting, para. 38]. The primary role remains to be assumed by the parties to the dispute. This Organization, however, cannot afford to retreat from its own responsibility to blunt the edge of the conflict and to assist in the search for a settlement.

23. My delegation is aware that the present debate does not provide the appropriate opportunity for detailed consideration of proposals concerned with this aspect of the Middle East problem. But we do retain the hope that the General Assembly at this emergency session might acknowledge the need to examine the wider issue and consider the desirability of placing it on the agenda of its thirteenth session.

24. Mr. LUKANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to the third emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly has been instructed to express the grave concern of the Government of Bulgaria and the whole Bulgarian people at the situation that has arisen in the Near and Middle East as a result of the absolutely unprovoked aggression by the United States of America and the United Kingdom against Lebanon and Jordan.

25. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Bulgarian people cannot fail to be alarmed by the events that have occurred not far from their frontiers. Any conflagration in the Near East threatens Bulgarian frontiers also.

26. That is why at the very outset of the aggression in Lebanon the Bulgarian Government issued a declaration expressing its unequivocal condemnation of this new act of blatant interference in the domestic affairs of the Arab peoples and insisting that the United Nations should take the necessary measures to put an end to this aggression and to secure the withdrawal of United States troops from Lebanon. The Bulgarian Government, like the Governments of other countries concerned with the maintenance of peace, cannot remain indifferent at a time when a dire threat to peace exists in an area close to its frontiers.

27. The Bulgarian people as a whole rose up in protest against the United States and United Kingdom violators of peace. A wave of protest meetings swept the entire country, and many resolutions insisting upon the immediate withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan and on the Arab peoples being allowed to exercise the right of

mastery in their own house were adopted and sent to the United Nations.

28. In appealing to the General Assembly to take effective measures without delay for the withdrawal of the United States and United Kingdom forces from Lebanon and Jordan, I am once again expressing the fervent desire of our people and our Government to strengthen peace and the security of the peoples of the Near and Middle East.

29. I should particularly like to stress that acute crises have arisen in the Near and Middle East in three consecutive years. Egypt was attacked in 1956, armed intervention against Syria was being prepared in 1957 and the peoples of Lebanon and Jordan fell victim to imperialist aggression in 1958. It is obvious that the whole Arab East is attracting the special attention of certain Western States and that this periodic repetition of aggression in that part of the world is no mere coincidence. On the contrary, the events of recent years point to the existence of long-standing and extensive plans, going far beyond the direct purposes of the aggression. The real goal of the aggressors is to deal a blow at the powerful movement of the Arab peoples towards national liberation, in order to facilitate control over the wealth of these peoples and to use their territory for strategic military bases serving the aims of far-reaching aggressive plans.

30. It was in order to achieve this goal that the theory of the so-called "vacuum" and of indirect aggression and the fable of the conspiracy of "international communism" were spread abroad. And just as the wolves in the story gave themselves out as shepherds of the flock, the imperialists are representing themselves as zealous champions of the independence of the Arab States. But these self-styled champions have shown by their deeds how they interpret Arab independence and, in particular, how they intend to preserve this independence. When they realized that in the Arab East there was not only petroleum, but also peoples struggling for freedom and independence, and that there was no "vacuum", the imperialists resorted to armed aggression.

31. A number of peace-loving countries, realizing the great danger to world peace which is inherent in the expansionist aspirations of the United States and the United Kingdom, have made exceptional efforts to prevent the use of foreign forces for solving the purely domestic problems of the Arab peoples. Despite this, however, the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom did not listen to the voice of good sense; they violated the rules of international law, disregarded principles and the United Nations Charter itself, and invaded Lebanon and Jordan. At the same time, a build-up of the forces of the United States, the United Kingdom, and other countries also began on the borders of the Republic of Iraq.

32. In order to mitigate world-wide indignation at such aggressive action in the Near and Middle East, the United States and the United Kingdom tried from the outset to "legalize" their aggression. With that end in view, they dragged out from the archives invitations to send forces which had been signed by rulers who had long since lost the confidence of their peoples. It is well known for example, that, in inviting the United States forces, Mr. Chamoun, the former President of Lebanon, was expressing his personal wishes only. Mr. Chamoun was not followed by the Parliament; on the contrary, immediately after the landing of the inter-

ventionist troops, the President of the Lebanese Parliament sent a message to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Government of the United States, in which he strongly emphasized that the only authority representing the people was the House of Deputies and stated that he protested on behalf of the House against the violation of the sovereignty and independence of Lebanon and considered the landing of American forces a threat to the peace and independence of the peoples of the Middle East.

33. As we know, however, the chief "motive" given for the landing was that forces were being sent to the Near East to protect the integrity and independence of the of the countries concerned against so-called "indirect aggression". We consider that, if there was any question of indirect aggression, it was being committed against independent Arab States by none other than the United States and the United Kingdom, long before the present direct aggression. Is everyone not aware of the many plots to subvert and forcibly to overthrow lawfully-elected Arab Governments which are not to the liking of imperialist circles and of the part played by the United States Sixth Fleet, which carries out military demonstrations off the shores of countries under constant United States pressure? Apparently, the aggressors have become so accustomed to such practices that they see nothing unusual in behaving as though they owned foreign territories, in threatening neighbouring countries and in aggravating international tension. That is probably why they are trying to convince world public opinion that nothing out of the ordinary has really happened. On the contrary, we have even heard here that the United States "reserves the right" to commit similar acts of intervention in the future, and that the receipt of an invitation from some Government repudiated by its own people would provide a sufficient pretext. We feel obliged to ask on what grounds and by virtue of what international decisions the United States has assumed the right to police nations which have arisen against Governments that have forfeited their confidence. Is it not clear that if this course is followed, the world will be faced with anarchy, the consequences of which it is difficult to foresee?

34. What is the crux of the matter? Recent history can scarcely provide a more obvious case of barefaced falsification of the facts, or one in which the circumstances are so unfavourable to the perpetrators.

35. It is well known that, at the request of the Lebanese Government, the Security Council sent a special observation group to Lebanon, to investigate on the spot whether any illegal infiltration of personnel or supply of arms or other *matériel* was taking place across the borders. The representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom voted in favour of sending such a group.

36. The Observation Group has already submitted two reports to the Security Council. The information assembled by the Group proves the absolute unfoundedness of the Lebanese Government's complaints and fully confirms that this is a case of internal civil strife.

37. Incidentally, by the line they have adopted in regard to recent events in Iraq, the United States and the United Kingdom have themselves dealt an irrevocable blow to the theory of "indirect aggression" in the Middle East, which was their own invention. I shall confine myself to quoting Mr. Walter Lippman, the

United States commentator, who expressed surprise in the *New York Herald Tribune* of 5 August 1958, that Mr. Dulles, "having announced his doctrine about indirect aggression on Thursday—followed it up on Saturday by recognizing the revolutionary government of Iraq, presumably a product of indirect aggression".

38. The fiction of "indirect aggression" is not believed by anyone with a vestige of intelligence; it is not believed either by its authors or by those who, according to their plans, were intended to believe it and hence to support the aggressive actions of the United States and the United Kingdom.

39. Even the United States public, which has recently been displaying considerable concern, has expressed widespread criticism, some of which has emanated from highly responsible individuals. For example, in a speech made on 6 August 1958, Senator J. William Fulbright, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, after analysing the reasons for the many failures of United States foreign policy, said that the main reason was the readiness of the United States "to use the spectre of Soviet communism as a cloak for the failure of our own leadership". To quote his own words, he said that "for years now we have taken the easy way. Let something go wrong—whether it be in China or Nigeria—and we have had a ready answer. The Soviet Union was behind it. What a perfect formula . . .".

40. Is it not clear from all this that the direct and indirect aggressors are the imperialist circles of the United States and the United Kingdom and in no way the United Arab Republic or other peace-loving States? Is any comment needed, for example, on the United States assertion that it was not interfering in the domestic affairs of Lebanon, when it tried to influence the conduct of the presidential elections in that country, which is occupied by United States forces? Is any comment needed on the United Kingdom's assertion that it is not interfering in the domestic affairs of Jordan, when we have heard from the representative of the very Jordanian circles which invited United Kingdom forces to its country that they need the occupation troops for use against their own people, who are shouting the slogan "Down with imperialism" in the streets of Amman? The representative of the United Arab Republic, at the 735th meeting, quite rightly drew the Assembly's attention to the unwillingness of the present rulers of Jordan to receive United Nations observers in their country. What does this mean? The observers could discover external interference, if such existed. But United Nations observers could not save any Government from its own people. The Jordanian authorities do not want observers, who would have nothing to do, owing to the absence of any outside threat to Jordan, but they want occupation forces for their own protection. And are not those who are providing this protection interfering in the domestic affairs of that State?

41. Moreover, what right have those who are maintaining and directing the foreign propaganda of such stations as the British Broadcasting Corporation, the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, whose principal purpose is to commit indirect aggression and to interfere in the affairs of other States, to talk of indirect aggression by the United Arab Republic through Radio Cairo?

42. It is obvious that, in discussing the present situation in the Middle East, the question of so-called indirect

aggression by the United Arab Republic must be rejected outright as a fiction which can explain nothing and can lead us nowhere. But if we reject it, what remains? There remains the real and actual, direct aggression of the United States in Lebanon and the United Kingdom in Jordan, which has been committed before the eyes of the whole world.

43. In order to make it even clearer that the United States and the United Kingdom had long-range and more far-reaching objectives in carrying out their present military action, we believe it would be useful to draw attention to the most important reasons—the real, and not the invented, reasons—for this action, which are known to the whole world.

44. The two basic reasons for the tension which now exists in the Near and Middle East are, first, the interest of Western capitalist monopolies in owning, under various arrangements, the resources of the countries in the area, especially their petroleum resources, and in increasing their profits to the detriment of an improvement in the living and cultural levels of the Arab peoples and at the expense of the economic backwardness of these countries. There is, secondly, the wish of the imperialist powers to turn this part of the world into a strategic base, to be used against the rapidly growing national liberation movement in the Near and Middle East, against the Arab countries which are fighting to strengthen their national independence, and against the USSR and other socialist States.

45. I could give many facts to confirm this, but I shall confine myself to a few typical examples. It is enough to point out that 95 per cent of the shares of the Iraq Petroleum Company, the principal oil company in Iraq, are owned by British, American, Netherlands and French petroleum monopolies to make it clear why the revolutionary upheaval in Iraq caused such great concern among the imperialist circles in the United States, the United Kingdom, France and other Western countries. They were alarmed not only because the Iraq Government might become master of its own natural resources, but also because the example of Iraq might prove contagious and might serve as an inspiration to other neighbouring peoples who are determined to free themselves from colonial enslavement for once and for all.

46. Despite all the efforts of the United States Department and of Mr. Dulles personally to make it appear that it was not to protect the vast profits of oil monopolies, but on some humanitarian grounds, that United States and United Kingdom forces had been sent to Lebanon and Jordan and towards the frontiers of Iraq, they did not succeed in doing so. They were unmasked even in the United States Senate, in which it was stated that the profits of the international petroleum cartel were estimated at \$3,000 million per year.

47. Many items of news and information which have been published in the United States Press also provided conclusive proof of the real motives for United States and United Kingdom intervention in the Near and Middle East. For example, the periodical *The Nation*, in its issue of 2 August 1958, criticizing the landing of United States troops in Lebanon, states *inter alia*, that, according to information from the United States Department of Justice, the oil cartel in the Near and Middle East pumps crude oil at a cost of twenty to thirty cents a barrel and sells it at a monopolistic rate of \$1.75 to \$2.16 a barrel.

48. Moreover, the extent of the influence of the petroleum monopolies may be judged from a letter sent by Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney to the United States Secretary of the Interior, which contains the following statement:

"I am deeply convinced that the activities which may affect or determine the foreign policy of the United States must not be left to a group of private oil companies, whose economic interests may not always coincide with the best interests of the United States."

49. The strategic situation of the countries of the Near and Middle East is another reason for the tension created by the United States and the United Kingdom in their efforts to retain that area as a base for aggression. Imperialist theories on the division of the world into spheres of influence and aspirations towards world domination are very clearly in evidence here. The geographical situation of the Arab States has long been regarded by imperialist strategists as particularly favourable to the achievement of their aims, and they have long considered that they have some sort of legal entitlement to seize and retain strategic positions in this area. But what are the aims of this imperialist policy? They are to use the countries of the near and Middle East as bases for an attack against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

50. It is quite obvious that the motives for aggression should not be sought where they do not and cannot exist, namely, in the legitimate right of the Arab peoples to gain and strengthen their independence and to control the wealth of their countries. The Bulgarian people, together with all the freedom and peace-loving peoples of the world, sympathize deeply with the efforts of the Arab peoples to free themselves from the last shackles of imperialist and colonialist dependency. We are convinced that this struggle is their sacred right, the exercise of which not only should not be hindered but, in the interests of the peace and progress of mankind, should receive the full support and understanding of all States Members of the United Nations.

51. The fact is that the Arab peoples, like all other peoples struggling for liberation from colonial enslavement and imperialist dependency, will not and cannot relinquish this struggle for anything in the world. It is a question of life and death to them. The fact that this struggle is directed against colonialism is perfectly logical and historically normal, since colonial domination and imperialism bring disaster to these peoples, cause the backwardness and misery in which tens of millions of human beings live, and constitute an obstacle to their further development. The struggle of the Arab peoples will be crowned with complete victory, and no one can prevent this.

52. Some representatives have tried to assert in their statements that the tension in the Near and Middle East has already passed its height, that the situation is returning to normal and that there is no longer any danger of military conflict. Such statements are harmful and dangerous; their purpose is to lull the vigilance of the peoples, to conceal the real state of affairs and thus to enable the aggressors to choose a suitable time for carrying out their schemes.

53. We still remember clearly the similar case of the 1956 Suez crisis when, after two international conferences and after some unequivocal decisions by the Security Council on the peaceful settlement of this dispute, the world was confronted with the *fait accompli* of the British-French-Israel aggression against Egypt.

It is the duty of the United Nations to prevent a repetition of that situation.

54. No one can believe the declarations by the United Kingdom and the United States concerning their "peaceful intentions" in Jordan and Lebanon as long as they keep their forces in those countries. If they do not intend to use their forces, why do they not withdraw them, and why do they talk of plans of some kind for the settlement of problems in the Near and Middle East and, at the same time, carefully avoid any mention of when these forces, which are the reason for tension, will be withdrawn?

55. Furthermore, the United States and United Kingdom representatives have created the impression that they are not yet prepared to withdraw their forces from Lebanon and Jordan. Instead of an announcement, long awaited both by the General Assembly and by public opinion in the world at large, of their decision immediately to withdraw their forces from these countries, we hear all kinds of reservations and conditions which must be fulfilled before the ruling circles of the United States and the United Kingdom will agree to withdraw their forces. That is the only construction that can be placed on the assertion that the United States and the United Kingdom will completely withdraw their forces only when this is requested by the lawfully-elected Governments of Lebanon and Jordan. It can hardly be expected that Governments which have applied to United States and United Kingdom forces for help will ask for these forces to be withdrawn.

56. We consider that there are still no grounds for reassurance. Under the pressure of world public opinion and of their own peoples, the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have been forced to delay the attainment of their ultimate goals for the time being. But this in no way means that tomorrow they will not confront the world with another *fait accompli*. Their troops are in Lebanon and Jordan; further units are being concentrated at bases in Cyprus and Turkey; their navies in the Mediterranean are being reinforced; their air forces in West Germany, Italy, Cyprus, Turkey and elsewhere are being regrouped; United States military aircraft are violating the air space of a number of countries for the purposes of reconnaissance and provocation; frontier skirmishes are taking place on the Syrian-Turkish border, and so on and so forth. It has been officially announced that the United States Government has advised its citizens in Jordan to leave that country.

57. Can all this be called evidence of the relaxation of tension in the area? No, we have no grounds for reaching such a conclusion.

58. That is why it is the primary duty of the United Nations to eliminate the danger, by doing everything possible to bring about the immediate withdrawal of United States forces from Lebanon and of United Kingdom forces from Jordan.

59. The tension that has arisen in the Near and Middle East as a result of imperialist aggression imposes an exceptional responsibility upon the United Nations in this connexion. The United Nations, through its observers, must control the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom forces from Lebanon and Jordan and must supervise the situation on their frontiers. I should like to stress that I am referring to observers, and not to United Nations police or armed forces. Both in this case and in general, we regard as unsound, and

even dangerous, the trend to set up United Nations forces for use in similar situations. If this trend were to be pursued, there would be a definite risk of turning the United Nations into a police force, which would be contrary to the principle proclaimed in the United Nations Charter that the Organization should seek the settlement of international disputes by peaceful negotiation, and not by the use of force. Our delegation will express its views on this matter in greater detail at the appropriate time.

60. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the present situation urgently requires the immediate withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom forces from Lebanon and Jordan. No plan for settling the problems of the Near and Middle East can lead to positive results, unless United States and United Kingdom forces are first withdrawn.

61. Any consideration of a solution of these problems which fails to deal with the main cause of the situation that has arisen would be, as they say, putting the cart before the horse. In the first place, it is essential to establish normal conditions for the discussion of outstanding questions and problems in the Near and Middle East.

62. Those who think that they can dictate conditions for agreement at gun-point are making a great mistake.

It is high time they understood that the "positions-of-strength" policy has proved a complete failure. Common sense calls for a break with the old imperialist methods.

63. Of course, no one will deny that the Arab peoples are faced with many outstanding economic and other problems, which were also referred to by various speakers in their statements in the Assembly. It is also obvious that, for the rapid solution of such problems as the provision of a fresh water supply for the Arab East and the successful combating of disease, to which Mr. Eisenhower, the President of the United States, referred [733rd meeting], the Arab peoples will need the help of other nations. But is the presence of foreign troops in the territory of Arab States essential for the solution of such problems? On the contrary, foreign troops must leave the Arab East as a primary condition for the transition of real assistance to the people of the area in establishing a higher standard of living.

64. That is why the Bulgarian delegation fully supports the draft resolution of the Soviet Union delegation on the immediate withdrawal of the United States and the United Kingdom forces from Lebanon and Jordan [A/3870]. It will vote in favour of that draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.