

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**



**739th
PLENARY MEETING**

**Monday, 18 August 1958,
at 3 p.m.**

Official Records

THIRD EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

New York

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 5:

Questions considered by the Security Council at its 838th meeting on 7 August 1958 (*continued*)..... 71

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. de LEQUERICA (Spain) (*translated from Spanish*): The Spanish delegation considers that there are special reasons for gratification at the holding of this emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly. At a time so critical to the peace of the world, it was a wise proposal to invite all the nations to deliberate and to make a concerted effort to maintain peace. It is fitting that decisions should be taken by those who, because of their greater military strength and sense of their resulting responsibilities, can exercise the greatest influence in the solution of current problems. Their predominant position is a fact, which no one will be so blind as to ignore or to resent; it is the result of historical developments forming the framework within which we have to operate.

2. But this new form of diplomacy exemplified by the United Nations, which is an obvious step forward in the general improvement of international relations, involves a substantial measure of responsibility for us all. Each of us must shoulder this responsibility in the knowledge that we will thus gain in stature for, by assuming our share of the common burden, we shall be showing our good will and our desire to go forward in the right path. We should be displaying a lack of self-respect and even poverty of spirit were we to evade this responsibility and pass it on to others. Furthermore, should discussion take place later at a small top-level meeting, its participants will be fortified and encouraged by the sense of being supported by all the nations of the world. Finally, the presence here of the representatives of so many widely different peoples, men of knowledge and experience, gives hope that suggestions and ideas will be put forward, which may do something—may do much—to bring about the happy outcome which we all desire.

3. The reason for convening this Assembly was the concern felt in the Near East at the difficulties experienced by two nations which are Members of this Organization: Lebanon and Jordan. The cause of these events has been and still is the subject of extensive discussion. To many it appears relatively clear. The

cause of these events has to be known, because it will, to a great extent, determine the remedy. Once we have determined the source of these events, gauged their scope and ascertained the underlying reasons, we may find—in fact, I am sure we shall find—many areas of agreement, provided that we search for remedies at a level above polemics and ideological differences. The part the United Nations has played in solving other similar problems cannot but encourage us to follow the same course again—the course which the Secretary-General has outlined in his statements. This course has already proved its value in regard to the Suez question, to mention the most important and most recent one with which we have had to deal. It has also proved successful in maintaining the truce after a previous conflict between peoples of the Middle East, as well as in other problems which the Secretary-General has mentioned. There would seem to be good reason to adhere to this policy, which our delegation fully approves.

4. These problems of the Middle East are part of a larger general problem. This does not mean that we should not deal with them whenever a concrete issue arises. That would be unwise and would be counter to the interest of world peace. In doing so, however, we should not lose sight of the over-all picture, and the settlement of each individual problem should constitute a further step towards the over-all solution which is our aim. The general problem is the renaissance of the Arab world and the need for our help in providing a stable foundation for achievement of that renaissance. This foundation must be in keeping with history and in keeping with the national needs of the Arab peoples; it must blend their new status and their ancient rights; and all in such a way as to remove any possible source of anxiety.

5. In recent days and even as recently as today we have read how the once thorny problems of Suez are reaching final solution and we have already entered the peaceful and reassuring phase of compensation, the provision of loans and the carrying out of obligations assumed. The Arab problem is broader, but we must look at it in the same light and with the same desire to achieve a solution.

6. The Arab world in the Middle East is large both in area and in importance. It has a great history and has aspirations to unity. It would be a serious error to ignore or overlook this fact, if we are to perform our task in a manner worthy of the United Nations. Perhaps the most important part of the admirable and impressive statement made by the President of the United States of America, which we were privileged to hear at the opening meeting of this session was the brief but meaningful passage, in which he described the historic reality to which I refer. I will quote the President directly:

“Let me state the position of my country unmiss-
takably. The peoples of the Arab nations of the Near
East clearly possess the right of determining and ex-

pressing their own destiny. Other nations should not interfere so long as this expression is found in ways compatible with international peace and security.”
[733rd meeting, para. 31.]

7. These solemn words used by the President of the United States in his address to the United Nations define an international policy in regard to a specific problem, a policy which, I believe, has general approval. They in themselves would justify this session and give it human importance. They are words which we must remember. If the Members who are now so skilfully developing formulae—many of them from the northern part of the two continents on either side of the Atlantic—would accept a more southern approach, I would venture to suggest to them that they might include the words of the President of the United States in the preamble of the draft resolution to be submitted to us.

8. These widely applauded words were followed by interpretations of the Arab problem, which, as was to be expected, were polemical in character, ascribing the problem to the hypothetical schemes of individuals, to the ambitions of Chiefs of state, to expansionist and imperialistic aims or to dictatorships resembling others of evil memory to the present day world, factors frequently brought up in order to distract our attention from the main problem. But the true facts about the Arab situation have been well studied and are well known. We must take those facts into account and leave the way open for these peoples to re-establish relations between one another, lawful, and without disrupting the peace of the world, along the lines most in keeping with their historical destiny; we must not oppose contacts, alliances, coalitions or even unions between them, where these are the fulfilment of their desires and aims.

9. Once a powerful empire, then a people subject for centuries to foreign rule, reborn in division and with the natural limitations imposed by so long a period of eclipse, the Arab peoples of the Middle East are today seeking emancipation from foreign tutelage and are revealing a tendency towards concerted action.

10. The best observers, the British, have recognized this. There is ample evidence and some of it has been laid before us. Twenty years of British rule might have been accepted as a well-established *de facto* situation by countries with a less marked sense of national identity than was retained, for instance, by India after its long period of eclipse. Since 1945, however, the development of national awareness in the Arab East has been rapid. Not only has a new generation been born there, but a new educated class has also arisen with the firm resolve to make themselves masters of their own part of the world.

11. In his speech, the President of the United States also paid tribute to Arab culture, its historical importance, its contribution to human progress and its possibilities for the future. Some may think that the Spanish delegation, imbued with the traditions of Cervantes' hero, is displaying the characteristic failing of its nation and race in dealing first with the spiritual rights of the Arab people of the Near East before embarking on the discussion of sound and effective practical resolutions. But, even in the practical search for solutions in which we are here engaged, this hypothetical criticism would probably be ill-founded. For us, Spaniards, any other attitude would show a lack of self-respect.

12. The Arab people lived for many centuries in close association with Spain. The forms of association were various and did not exclude some imposed by force. Much of the Arab peoples' development took place in Spain. In the twelfth century, for example, Arab culture reached a peak and Cordova—under the Omayyads—was able to compete with Baghdad as the centre of a brilliant Arab culture. It was only the Arab rulers of our country who contributed to the development of Arab thought, studies and imaginative creative art. Spain itself made a contribution, a large area of southern Spain having formed part of the Arab cultural world. The peoples of the countries we are now discussing and our own Andalusians of the South of Spain were jointly responsible for the ideas and emotions which produced Avicenna, Aben Tofail, Averroes and the great Moslem lyricists and mystics who are the glory of Hispano-Moresque culture. We have participated in this culture, we have a feeling for it and we are grateful to those who have paid tribute to it. We contributed something to the Arab way of thought and our people have retained something of that way of thought. That is why we understand the present Arab claims, which are not only historical ones, and that is why we wish to co-operate with the other peoples of the world—to make our contribution to the common task—at a time when recognition is being given to their full status.

13. This view has not always been taken, however, and many errors have been made in dealing with this problem, due to forgetfulness and lack of vision. Frequently, for example, the well-intentioned search for a solution has taken only the material aspects of life in the Near East into account. It was thought that simply by satisfying material needs, the understandable desire of the Arab peoples to recover their nationhood and take their rightful place on the international scene could be met. Such a narrow approach to the problem was a serious mistake, since it overlooked human nature in general and the Arab character in particular. Satisfaction of these material needs did not suffice then and does not suffice today—even in the unlikely event that full satisfaction were possible—to allay the patriotic aspirations which are inflaming the Arab world. We Spaniards, in the limited part we play in world affairs, have taken a different attitude. Since the war, our foreign policy has been based on cordial relations with the Moslem peoples, the provision of reciprocal assistance and an attitude of friendly respect. On many occasions we have regretted that we were unable to see eye to eye in all matters with other more powerful nations, who placed a different interpretation on events in the Near East. The Chief of the Spanish State, General Franco, in statements which were fairly widely publicized here and which, though expressly and even forcefully worded, reflected a wise approach, recently urged, in regard to the Near East:

“A general revision of policy, which would take account of the real facts concerning these peoples, would eliminate any possible abuse, would follow and not run counter to the natural course of development, would ensure that the general and common interest triumphed over the private interests of capitalist and financial groups, and would do everything possible to avoid providing the communist propagandists with any basis for their claims. If we wish the freedom and independence of these peoples, we must prove it”.

14. This idea, although couched in different language, is close to the one that was expressed by President Eisenhower and was foreshadowed in certain aspects of United States policy which, though I believe they were well-intentioned, have not always been correctly interpreted by the Arab nations.

15. General Franco also said:

"A foreign policy has to take into account the domestic situation and the trends of opinion in the countries to which that policy is addressed, and the truth of the matter is that the foreign policy of the West towards the Middle East has in recent years been going against the natural trend of the people whereas the opponents of the West have been taking advantage of that trend."

16. We cannot overlook the fact that we are living in a very complex world, nor can we, out of a natural desire for concord and agreement, feign indifference, forgetfulness or ignorance in the face of Soviet imperialism and its acts of intervention in other countries. If we were to do so, we would be ignoring the other essential element of the problem. There is indeed an Arab renaissance, but the forces of Soviet imperialism are also at work, exploiting their struggle against the Western nations, certain legitimate feelings which sometimes reach passion pitch and not without cause. The Chief of the Spanish State then said:

"The events in Korea, Indochina, Hungary and the Middle East, over and above the individual peculiarities in each instance, reflect the one main fact that there exists a powerful nation which holds other nations against their will by means of a political and military occupation and is constantly threatening the peace by conspiring against the domestic order of other countries and by using every possible means and taking advantage of every possible opportunity to foster subversion. This action, which from year to year has been tolerated by other nations, is the over-riding factor which transcends all the others. The rest is but a logical consequence of that action and should have been foreseen".

17. The Chief of the Spanish State then added:

"This continuous action of external interference which the world has been tolerating should not, however, blind us to the reality of the internal conditions which enabled it to succeed: the economic and social conditions prevailing in many countries; the poverty or low standard of living of many peoples; the opposing political factions; the lack of authority of the Governments and the fact that the peoples are led astray; the resentment against the former protecting nations; and exacerbated nationalism. What to the West may appear to be the principal factor seems of secondary importance to the countries concerned."

18. Those countries which, unlike the Arab countries of the East, have not been subjected to the dreadful pressures of patriotic anxiety and an unfair distribution of wealth should not fail to see this exploitation by those who are fomenting world disturbance for their own benefit even under cover of noble pretexts, for only if we are able to see this can certain subtle temptations be understood.

19. Our gravest error would be to leave the Soviet Union as the only great Power to which the Arab peoples of the East, in their desire to be genuinely independent, would be able to turn in an attempt to pre-

vent other nations from imposing their will upon them. Such a policy would tend to prevent those peoples from seeing the universal danger because of their natural concern with more pressing and immediate problems. We must therefore abstain from crying "Soviet influence, Soviet infiltration" when faced with the just demands of the Middle East, and we must not interpret the desire of the peoples of that area to choose their own rulers as enmity towards the West. It is only by means of a trusting and generous policy that we can avoid alienating those who should be our friends.

20. These problems of national unity have always been difficult and complicated, as several outstanding examples in Europe have clearly shown. The obstacles encountered were similar, and the problems at times appeared insoluble. Arab unity cannot escape this general law. With our European background, we can recall the laborious process of unification of the various Italian States and the difficulties encountered in the unification of Germany. How could we expect anything different in an area that has been so deeply affected by the clash of opposing civilizations and is in many respects the victim of its own badly distributed wealth?

21. The Arab peoples must themselves give an example of understanding and moderation. Their patriotic feelings must not blind them to the peril in which their most deeply-held beliefs and ideals will be placed if their policy becomes too closely identified—even in the absence of any identity of doctrine—with that of the enemies of the universal moral order. My delegation has the utmost faith in the Arab peoples. I am fully aware that there is at present a school of thought which denies the importance of the religious and moral content of Arab culture and imagines that it has been—or at the least is very likely to be—gravely influenced by the moral corrosion of materialism. We are very far from holding that view as I said before, it is precisely because many Spaniards were, at a certain moment of history, actively associated with Arab cultural life that we are able to view differently the ideals of those countries now torn by serious dispute. When existing political difficulties have been overcome, we hope to have their co-operation in the struggle of civilization against materialism, a struggle in which perhaps we shall in the end be joined by the peoples of the countries which are at present the main exponents of error.

22. For that purpose, we can, without moving from Spain, look at the world from the Alhambra of Granada or the Mosque of Cordova and thus appreciate the indestructible spiritual treasures enshrined in the culture of the Arab East. Those of us who are Christians will not forget that the three wise men from the East were the first to adore the child of Bethlehem and offer him gifts.

23. On the one hand, the gravity of this dual problem of the genuineness and justice of the Arab claims and, on the other hand, the existence of political forces clearly bent on agitation and disturbance—as witness Greece and Korea, to go back only as far as 1945—serve in large measure to justify the concern of the West and to explain, without resort to imperialist or colonialist interpretations, the military action by the United States and the United Kingdom in Lebanon and Jordan.

24. This debate has revealed a general desire to put an early end to this military action which, though well-intentioned and easily explained, is not palatable to the world at large, starting, as I believe, with the countries

immediately concerned. The desire to maintain world peace and to avoid any terrible upheaval or conflagration in areas exposed to almost permanent conflict explains, in this particular case, the sending of United States and United Kingdom forces to Lebanon and Jordan—an action, moreover, that was in accordance with previous agreements with those nations and was requested by their Governments.

25. My delegation is concerned not so much at the events in themselves but at the possibility that the recent military action by the Western Powers with the greatest responsibilities in the Middle East may become an established policy. The real trouble might well begin if we were to establish as a policy that any nation threatened with aggression could call on others for assistance. What type of aggression? We are naturally thinking of external aggression. Such aggression might take the form of internal agitation provoked and even armed by a foreign Power. This is less clear and obvious than, as it seems to me, was suggested by certain distinguished speakers. There always remains a fluid area of interpretation, and even of possible confusion in many cases, between external aggression and a national movement aimed at altering the course of the internal political life of a country; in such areas, it is political honesty rather than legal definition which provides guidance. My delegation represents the country of Vitoria and Suárez, a country which shares with the Netherlands and its great Hugo Grotius the leadership in the creation of international law. This circumstance makes it incumbent upon us to show the utmost respect for the rules of law, and one way of doing this is to avoid any attempt to define those rules too precisely where the nature of the subjects of the law and the character of the relationships between them make such a definition difficult to formulate and hazardous to apply.

26. The representative of Argentina spoke on the subject today [738th meeting] with great eloquence—and I say this without having had time to comment upon or even give careful consideration to his statement—when he deplored the absence of international sanctions against the offence of starting a war. Such sanctions have to be established, but this must be done after careful and deliberate consideration, and we have here a basis for that. It is essential, however, to avoid improvising generalisations based on a particular case, no matter how justified the action taken in that case may be. Although the action in the present instance may have been justified, that is no reason for converting it into an established policy. Such a policy could, if applied by others having less authority, convert the international community into a monstrous sort of tacit Warsaw Pact with frightening results. Let us humbly admit that there is an area of predominantly political interpretation which presents great difficulties in practice, an area which at present is fortunately kept under closer observation because of the great moral authority of the United Nations.

27. When, however, the aid of the Western nations and of the United Nations itself is sought against an obvious case of foreign aggression, proved and only thinly disguised, they must not retreat merely out of fear of being involved in dangerous generalizations or because the legal consequences of such generalizations have not been determined. There is a well-known story attributed to the Countess d'Aulnoy, a French woman who is supposed to have travelled in Spain in the seventeenth century, about the Infanta whose clothes ac-

cidentally caught fire. She must have been one of those Infantas as painted by Velasquez, covered by an enormous framework of whalebone and cloth which could have caught fire quite easily. Her clothes were on fire, and the courtiers about her were faced with a problem. Protocol, according to the Countess d'Aulnoy, forbade anyone but the Lord Chamberlain of the Palace to touch the body of the Infanta and extinguish the fire. At the outside, the First Gentleman in Waiting might possibly do it, but never gentlemen of lower rank or the Ladies in Waiting or the dwarfs surrounding the Princess at that terrible moment. They went to look for the Lord Chamberlain and could not find him; then they went to look for the First Gentleman in Waiting and could not find him; and while they were searching, the Infanta was burned. This is meant as a jibe at etiquette and protocol, but there is a real lesson in it. The fear that a generous and necessary protective action that is seemingly contrary to protocol will be distorted must not serve as a pretext for letting the fire spread to countries where a tragic ferment of trouble is constantly seething and igniting. This defence of civilization can be accommodated within the framework of legal principles based on a higher law and justice and need not be converted into an established policy. We hope that the Western world and the United Nations will never, as in the case of the burning Infanta, sit idly by while the frontiers of nations menaced by the well-known danger of subversion are being devoured by the flames.

28. The President of the United States of America, having in view the interests of the Arab people, referred [732nd meeting] to problems and to suggested remedies which had at least been carefully studied—concern for Lebanon and concern for the peace of Jordan; a desire to prevent civil war, a stronger United Nations force; an economic development plan to raise the standard of living of the Arab peoples; and whatever will serve to prevent an arms race in that area. In all these matters we share his views. We also fully endorse the establishment of a well-endowed agency to provide forms of assistance that will improve living conditions in the nations of the Middle East, and we consider particularly appropriate the provision that the Arab peoples themselves shall be allowed to administer this agency. In this plan, attention is concentrated on one fundamental aspect of the political problem, the difficult but not impossible task of improving the economy of the Arab countries. The plan provides also that the interests of those who, in the last analysis, started the movement and also the right of these peoples to share in their own wealth shall be respected. Midas, the legendary King of Phrygia, received the gift of being able to turn whatever he touched to gold with the result that he nearly died of hunger and thirst. Like Midas, most of the peoples of the Middle East are dying of hunger and thirst while surrounded by gold, the black gold of their oil. It is fitting that the rest of the world should help to bring about a solution, as the President of the United States is doing, with full respect for Arab honour and independence.

29. We do not know what draft resolutions may be submitted, although we have read in the Press and heard the President say that the draft resolutions are being prepared, but we should like to say from the outset that our delegation will support anything likely to strengthen the United Nations force in the Middle East, thus facilitating the withdrawal of other troops

and maintaining a peace that is compatible with the freedom of all. We do not think this will offend anyone or be construed as an attempt to impose a trusteeship if the peoples concerned agree to it.

30. Not every country is as peaceful as Switzerland. The efforts of our Organization are aimed at achieving peace where the task seems most difficult. We have noticed that every representative who has spoken during the debate has done so with great moderation. We are therefore led to hope that it will be possible to prepare draft resolutions that are satisfactory to all the countries represented here. We will vote in favour of such draft resolutions without allowing ourselves to be misled by the persuasive language of other draft resolutions which, although fundamentally in harmony with our own views, do not seem to be best suited to a constructive task, either because they are mistimed or because they risk awaking passions which could be taken advantage of.

31. What was said by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom was as encouraging as the speech made by the President of the United States, nor did we find the reply of the delegation of the United Arab Republic discouraging.

32. We must say that, apart from the usual polemics, no one has exceeded the bounds of permissible speech or raised insuperable obstacles to agreement. As I said before, the world is acquiring increased confidence in United Nations action. Tragic situations cannot be solved by premature violence. In settling a quarrel everyone lends a hand. What is difficult is to discover how to avoid quarrels or at least to prevent them from breaking out. We may even find a way of delaying these conflicts, not in order to conjure them away but to enable us to make haste slowly, as the classic precept requires, when no other course is open.

33. In this hopeful atmosphere, the Spanish delegation, while recognizing the limited and concrete nature of this debate—and reserving the right to speak at greater length on the question at some other time—does not wish to lose the opportunity, while we are discussing the Middle East, of recalling its continuing interest, along with that of many other peoples with religious convictions, in the independence of the holy places. We associate ourselves with the eloquent remarks made on this matter by the Minister for External Affairs of Ireland [735th meeting]. We do so warmly and as a duty. The unavoidable briefness of my statement on this point must not obscure the weight which my delegation attaches to a problem which is of fundamental importance to the freedom of religion and the tranquillity of Christian consciences.

34. The reality of the Arab problem as a whole will have been explicitly recognized at this emergency special session of the Assembly. The achievement of Arab aspirations will, as has so often happened before in history, become a factor of stability. When their very understandable nervousness has been overcome and many of their aspirations achieved, the Arabs will see that they must apply the same level-headedness and realism to certain other problems of a similar kind, and I do not need to say which problems. The Minister for External Affairs of Ireland has spoken in similar terms.

35. These problems have not sprung up by chance but are the result of definite historical determinants. All the old nations know how long it takes, even when justice is on their side, to make their dreams a reality

in the face of the obstacles thrown up by countless complications in the course of history.

36. Although, in the final analysis, all ambitions are not always realized this should not be an obstacle to advancing peacefully along the path of progress. I repeat that the time for a concrete solution to the problems of the Middle East has not yet come, but now that the United Nations is probably going to deal with the problem—without prejudice to other forms of action at the appropriate time—my delegation wishes to take this opportunity to emphasize the advisability of establishing demilitarized zones under United Nations authority to separate rival peoples and thus avoid incidents and friction.

37. The views of my delegation on the Middle East problem may derive some worth from the fact that we are not an eclectic or a neutralist nation. For Spain there can be no neutrality, that is to say systematic neutrality, in the present-day world. With all due respect to those who hold contrary opinions, we are very far from sharing what we consider the illusion of those who sincerely and truly believe that they are co-operating in the cause of peace by steering a middle course between the two camps into which world opinion is now divided. Our attitude is definitely Western without hesitations or doubts; it is fully in harmony with our tradition of thought, which has often been rather uncompromising. We believe that we have been faithful to this tradition—we belong to the West—and we believe that we are furthering this position when we defend the stand that we consider just in the Middle East.

38. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia): It is a great privilege to have the opportunity of participating in this historic emergency session of the General Assembly—this body which is not only the forum but also the conscience of the world.

39. It was on the expression of the unanimous desire of the Security Council that this emergency special session was convened to consider a situation which had become explosive in character. This unanimity of the organ of our Organization which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security should be regarded as a good omen. In our view this unanimity reflects the great concern of all the members of the Council about the situation in the area, and I am confident that this view is shared also by all the members of this Assembly. We express the hope that this same spirit prevailing in the Council when deciding to convene this special session will also guide us in our deliberations.

40. My Government has followed with greatest care and attention the developments in the region of the Middle East with which it enjoys close ties of friendship. Significant events have indeed taken place in the past few years in the Arab world. Some may have been revolutionary in character and some may have taken the form of peaceful changes, but all are part of a process which emerged long ago towards the crystallization of a true Arab identity. As a matter of fact this turn of events is not limited only to the region we are discussing today. The rise of nationalism has engulfed the continents of Asia and Africa in the past two or three decades.

41. To students of Asian and African affairs it is plain that all efforts of forces, external as well as internal, to stem or retard this rebirth of nationalism in the Asian and African peoples have proven of no avail.

On the other hand, these efforts have in some instances unfortunately created bitterness and suspicion.

42. Turning back to the question of the Middle East, my delegation is of the view that the upheavals taking place in that part of the world are precisely a conflict between these opposing forces, from within as well as from outside the region, in their surge to establish their true identity. The intensity of these struggles can be fully understood in view of—and here I would like to quote the Minister for External Affairs of Ireland—“the artificial fragmentation of the whole region thirty years ago” [735th meeting, para. 87].

43. Indonesia, itself a new country born in the midst of this Asian-African resurgence, fully appreciates and sympathizes with the difficulties which go hand in hand with these struggles in various parts of the Middle East and is convinced that, left to themselves, the Arab peoples, known for their wisdom and tenacity, can successfully solve their own national difficulties.

44. Therefore, in the opinion of my delegation, we can make the greatest contribution to peace in the Middle East by confining our discussion at this stage to the immediate issue which gave rise to the emergency, namely, the presence of foreign troops in two States of that region. Once this irritating element has been removed from the scene, it will become possible for the natural forces within these States to reassert themselves, to establish an equilibrium and to create a climate in which their peoples and Governments will be able to co-operate with United Nations agencies and other nations in the solution of the deep and underlying social and economic problems which confront these areas.

45. In this connexion, I would like to refer to the statement of the President of the United States. On 13 August last [733rd meeting], we had the honour to listen to his address outlining plans for the solution of problems of the Middle East. There is no doubt that President Eisenhower's statement has left a deep impression on all the representatives assembled here. My delegation is especially interested in the non-military part of his plan. His blueprint for economic development of the Middle East deserves our earnest consideration. We view with equal interest the thoughts expressed before this body by the Secretary-General on economic development of the Middle East [732nd meeting].

46. While, therefore, all men of good will cannot but applaud the sentiments which inspired these proposals for social and economic development, it would seem essential to deal with first things first, namely, the presence of foreign troops. Once this immediate problem has been disposed of, there will be a more opportune time for full consideration of these most important proposals for economic development in the Middle East at the forthcoming regular session of the General Assembly.

47. Apart from the ever present danger of armed conflict which these troops engender, we must also consider the general principles which should govern the grant of foreign assistance to nations threatened with civil strife. Should we not bear in mind that in certain circumstances the giving of such assistance may create a possible danger to the free expression of the forces seeking to bring about social, political and economic changes in those areas of the world which have so long been deprived of independence?

48. In our opinion, we must act with discretion, lest we find ourselves at some time endorsing practices under which Governments which do not have the support

of their own peoples may be able to perpetuate themselves by calling in foreign assistance. If this should happen, it might mean the giving of our approval to foreign intervention whenever the opposition within such a country becomes strong enough to bring about changes in the Government or institutions of that country.

49. This position is, of course, not intended to diminish the legal right of nations to grant assistance to other nations threatened with civil strife. Rather, it is designed to emphasize that the right must be applied with extreme caution, to avoid the revival in modern form of the reactionary concept of the Holy Alliance which inspired the interventions against popular movements for changes in Governments in the nineteenth century.

50. Let us also recall that we are not dealing with a situation where there is a threat to a Government from external sources. In such a case the issues to be considered would be of an entirely different nature. But here the reports of the Observation Group appointed by the Secretary-General under the resolution of the Security Council dated 11 June 1958¹ failed to support the allegations of the existence of any massive infiltration with respect to Lebanon.

51. In its second report,² the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon, in summing up its findings, stated that it could not produce adequate evidence of massive infiltration of arms. With regard to the question of illegal infiltration of personnel, the report said that in no case have United Nations observers been able to detect the presence of persons who have indubitably entered from across the border for the purpose of fighting.

52. It cannot be denied that the presence of the Observation Group in Lebanon had the effect of reducing tension to the extent that both parties to the conflict had begun to take steps to solve their differences. In the Observation Group, the United Nations thus has an effective instrument which, in the words of the Secretary-General, “is fully equipped to play a part envisaged for it in the total United Nations effort”.³

53. In our view, the present situation in the Middle East calls for the rigid observance of the lofty sentiments expressed in the United Nations Charter, particularly in Article 2 (4), which calls upon all Members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. These noble sentiments were also reaffirmed at the Conference of the Asian-African nations at Bandung, particularly in the Declaration on the Promotion of World Peace and Co-operation, from which I quote the following principles adopted for the guidance of nations in relations with each other: respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations; abstention from intervention or interference in the internal affairs of another country; refraining from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country.

54. In the light of these principles, I trust that it will be possible for us to reach unanimous agreement on the speedy withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon

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

² Ibid., Supplement for July, August and September 1958, document S/4069.

³ Ibid., Thirteenth Year, 829th meeting.

and Jordan, so that the peoples of these countries may be in a position to go forward to the achievement of the common aspirations which inspire the rising nationalist movements throughout the world. The task of preserving the integrity and independence of these States may well be left to the United Nations in the spirit of the proposals put forward by the Secretary-General.

55. Mr. JOMARD (Iraq) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, it is both a great honour and a great pleasure for me to bring you the greetings of the Iraqi people and of the Government of the Republic of Iraq. We sincerely wish you every success in your task of presiding over our work, which we must strive to bring to a satisfactory conclusion so that an end may be put to the anxieties and tensions that are disturbing the world and threatening the peace of the Middle East.

56. I should have liked to be very brief and deal only with the problems under discussion, namely, the dangers to peace; but some of the previous speakers have felt called upon to make allusions to the Republic of Iraq. I want therefore first of all to express my gratitude to those representatives who wished our Republic a brotherly welcome to the great family of nations.

57. On the other hand, I do not think I need to deal with some of the other references to the Republic of Iraq. The new Iraq has already proved to the world in a very short time that it is a genuine and original expression of national feeling. The Republic of Iraq has shown, from its inception, its firm determination to co-operate with other countries within the framework of the United Nations Charter so as to promote the humanitarian ideals represented in this Assembly.

58. We are convinced that there are at present two kinds of dangers threatening the peace and security of the Middle East. One is invisible and the other is not. What is not obvious to everyone is the role played by the policy of certain Powers whose colonialist traditions are well known in that part of the world. Small and peaceful States of the Middle East have been forced against their will and against their interests to adopt a certain line of conduct in foreign policy. Owing to the continued pressure of the great Powers on these small States of the Arab world, it has often happened that Governments composed of partisans of the great Power policies have been set up and have governed their countries by force, using methods and pursuing objectives which were contrary to the interests of their peoples. It is this situation which has opened an unbridgeable and ever-widening gulf between the people and the rulers imposed on them. In the end, such a state of affairs could not but lead to the justifiable revolt of those long-oppressed peoples. The events in Iraq a month ago are only the most recent and most remarkable example of this inevitable trend.

59. Iraq was governed by a handful of individuals who had no regard for the dignity and the basic values of their people. They were interchangeable and for years they alternated in power. They openly falsified the elections and had obedient assemblies at their beck and call, ever ready to rubber-stamp their decisions, which were dictated by the interests of the Powers who supported them. Popular discontent, more and more openly expressed, forced them to dissolve the political parties and to deprive the people of such fundamental rights as freedom of the press, freedom of opinion and freedom

of assembly. They even went so far as to deprive of Iraqi nationality citizens whose only fault was opposition to their policy. The prisons were full and anyone who dared to whisper the word "peace" was severely punished. Machine guns were trained on demonstrators and thousands of innocent persons were shot down and killed. So as to consolidate their power and ensure the continuity of the policy which had been dictated to them, they surrounded themselves with self-seekers, who were given riches and honours. Corruption became an institution. The national resources were wasted while the brigands and their supporters settled themselves firmly in the seat of power. The Iraqi people groaned beneath their chains while public funds were squandered on harmful propaganda aimed at misleading world opinion about the real situation in Iraq.

60. The Iraqi people had no other alternative than to take up arms to recover their dignity and in the end they revolted and liberated themselves from tyranny. The Iraqi revolution sprang from the deepest aspirations of our people; it owes nothing to foreign instigation. The people unanimously supported the revolution. That is why the revolution succeeded in less than two hours and encountered no opposition. It was welcomed by the people of every class throughout the country with profound joy. Moreover, the Government of the Republic was formed, the same day, of individuals representing all trends of public opinion in the country. The peaceful character of the Government was subsequently demonstrated by its statements regarding its intention of conforming to the United Nations Charter, acting in accordance with the principles of the Charter, respecting its international obligations, protecting its oil resources and raising oil production to meet world needs. And so, only a few days after the formation of the popular Government, the nations of the world recognized the Republic and agreed that its delegation should be seated in this Assembly and co-operate with the other delegations in maintaining peace.

61. The example I have just given clearly shows that the interference of certain Powers in the internal affairs of the Arab States is one of the principal threats to world peace. I must in all frankness say that the situation in Iraq before the revolution was like the present situation in some other Arab States. In these countries, there is an ever-widening gulf between the peoples and the puppet Governments that have been imposed on them. Tension is mounting and will continue to mount as long as the causes of the tension are not removed. That is what I wanted to say about the hidden dangers which now threaten international peace.

62. The visible dangers which also threaten peace can be summed up as the presence of United States armed forces in Lebanon and of United Kingdom troops in Jordan. We are all aware of the dangerous situation in the Middle East. It was not a coincidence that these forces intervened in Jordan and Lebanon only a day or two after the revolution in Iraq. The Government of the Republic of Iraq considers the landing of foreign troops in a neighbouring country not only as a threat to its own security but also as a danger to world peace. The continued presence of foreign troops on the territory of these two countries arouses and at the same time justifies all the doubts and suspicions about the good intentions of the two Western Powers responsible.

63. Whatever the justification offered or reasons given, whatever the terms employed—whether direct

or indirect aggression, infiltration or some other term—the delegation of the Republic of Iraq considers that this intervention is both unwise and dangerous. It considers furthermore that any reasons for such action which have been or may be given are fundamentally artificial. Such reasons cannot possibly convince those who have a really objective view of the situation. The contention that these troops were landed simply to protect the independence of Lebanon and Jordan can convince no one. In actual fact, the integrity of these States has been and still is a constant and major cause of concern to the Arab States. The presence of foreign troops on the territory of these countries cannot but make this concern more acute.

64. The Government of the Republic of Iraq, while reaffirming its determination to defend the independence and integrity of its territory, declares once more that it intends to respect the sovereignty of its sister States, Lebanon and Jordan, and that it will not countenance any interference whatsoever in their internal affairs. The Government of the Republic of Iraq sincerely hopes for the re-establishment of normal conditions in these two States and the restoration of peace and security in the area.

65. I would no more think of passing judgement on the action of a foreign Government when such action does not affect us than I would take the liberty of discussing the internal affairs of any other country. However, at a time when we have all been summoned here in an effort to prevent a world-wide and devastating catastrophe, I cannot but express our very deep concern.

66. The landing of United States and United Kingdom troops in Lebanon and Jordan respectively explains some of our reactions and justifies those of the Arab nation as a whole. Arab nationalism is now an established fact and a recognized historical phenomenon both in the Middle East and in North Africa; the Arab peoples are one nation. The slightest injury or aggression affecting one of them reverberates through all the other Arab communities, so that the landing of foreign troops in Lebanon and Jordan, entirely against the will of the people of those two countries, is and will continue to be a source of anxiety and insecurity for all the peoples of the Middle East.

67. I must add that, apart from the immediate danger created by the presence of these forces, their position is becoming more and more precarious in view of the hostility of the peoples whose uninvited guests they are. Their presence is no help whatever in carrying out constructive and peaceful tasks. The Governments concerned are losing the authority they need to carry out their task because of the lack of confidence and, in most cases, the hostility of their people.

68. For the same reasons, the foreign troops themselves live in constant fear of conflict with the peoples who they are supposed to have come to protect, so that we are faced with a paradoxical situation in which the troops which have been landed keep the local authorities more or less prisoner while they themselves are immobilized. Such a situation obviously cannot continue without producing dangerous reactions.

69. After this brief statement of considerations which appear to us to be pure common sense and after studying most carefully the views of previous speakers, the Iraqi delegation feels obliged to state unequivocally that the United States and United Kingdom troops must

be withdrawn without delay from Lebanon and Jordan so that the political and social life of those countries may return to normal. By effecting a withdrawal which will not diminish their prestige but on the contrary will demonstrate their wisdom, they will do much to save the human race from a terrifying threat of a world war, which might break out as a result of the instability caused by them in the Middle East.

70. The Iraqi delegation reserves the right to speak at greater length, later in the debate, on some of the basic factors of the situation in the Middle East which I have merely outlined.

71. Mr. SHTYLLA (Albania) (*translated from French*): A month has already passed since the United States and the United Kingdom, acting in collusion, intervened with their armed forces in Lebanon and Jordan. This unprovoked aggression by two great Powers, which are permanent members of the Security Council, against two small countries, likewise Members of the United Nations, has aggravated international tension to the utmost degree, and has led the world to the brink of catastrophe and a third world war. The United Nations and public opinion have been rudely confronted with a *fait accompli*.

72. The firm, vigorous action of the peace-loving countries and the wave of unanimous protest from all the peoples of the world have prevented the aggressors from encroaching on the independence of other countries. However, the threat of a general conflict remains. It is noteworthy that the armed intervention by the United States and the United Kingdom in Lebanon and Jordan took place at a time when the Soviet Union and other peace-loving States were making great efforts and taking concrete measures to eliminate the danger of an atomic war and to ease international tension. These measures include the Soviet Union's decision to suspend unilaterally its atomic weapons tests, its proposal to call a meeting of the Heads of Government of the Eastern and Western countries, further reductions in the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact countries, and the offer by those countries to conclude a non-aggression pact with the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). It is a reasonable assumption that one of the purposes of the action against Lebanon and Jordan was to undermine these efforts.

73. The People's Republic of Albania, as a peace-loving country situated not far from the Near and Middle East area which the imperialists have turned into a theatre of war, cannot but express its concern at these grave events. The Albanian people throughout the country have protested vehemently against the intervention by the United States and United Kingdom armed forces in Lebanon and Jordan and have expressed their fraternal solidarity with the Arab peoples, with which Albania is linked by a traditional friendship. In a statement published on 18 July 1958, the Government of the People's Republic of Albania condemned the aggression by the United States and the United Kingdom and asked that the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly take measures to halt this military adventure and safeguard peace.

74. In the opinion of the Albanian Government, the Soviet Union's proposal for a meeting of the Heads of Government of the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and India, with the participation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations,

in order to avert a general conflict and restore normal conditions in the Near and Middle East has had a most profound effect in this grave situation. It is regrettable that the United States and United Kingdom Governments, by their obstructionist attitude, should have prevented this meeting. Let us hope that the present emergency special session of the General Assembly, convened on the initiative of the Soviet Government, will take an appropriate decision to ensure the immediate withdrawal of the interventionist troops from Lebanon and Jordan, and thus establish favourable conditions for the "summit" meeting between East and West which the peoples of the entire world have sought for so long.

75. The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania has noted with satisfaction that during the present debate few representatives have felt they could defend the interventionists or pretend to believe their attempts at self-justification; this proves how widespread and vigorous is the condemnation of the aggression committed against the Lebanese and Jordanian peoples. Indeed how could it be otherwise? The United States and United Kingdom Governments have tried in vain to give their armed intervention the appearance of legality by citing, with no foundation whatever, the provisions of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and the requests for aid allegedly made to them by the Chiefs of State of Lebanon and Jordan—unconstitutional requests which give every appearance of having been trumped up to meet the needs of the situation. The White House statement issued on 15 July 1958 asserted that the United States had sent its troops to Lebanon in order "to evidence the concern of the United States for the integrity and independence of Lebanon" and "to protect American lives" in that country, while the British Prime Minister stated in the House of Commons that the British intervention in Jordan had been carried out in order to help the Jordanian Government to "resist aggression". It might be appropriate to recall that almost two years ago, during the aggression against Egypt, the United Kingdom Government did not hesitate to declare that it had intervened in order to prevent Israel from attacking Egypt.

76. Well, the charges that there had been interference, that Lebanon and Jordan were threatened by the United Arab Republic, have proved to be wholly unfounded. The reports of the United Nations observers on the spot in Lebanon have completely refuted the allegations of the Beirut and Washington Governments concerning infiltration of arms and persons from outside. In Lebanon, as we all know, a popular uprising has been under way for three months. That is the Lebanese people's affair. In Jordan, on the other hand, nothing has occurred. The intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom has no justification, either *de jure* or *de facto*. Their contention that they are protecting their citizens does not hold water; nothing has happened to their citizens and they were under no threat. If this kind of thing were to go on in international relations, where would the world be? It was on such a pretext that Hitler launched the Second World War with all its consequences. Mussolini, too, when Fascist Italy attacked Albania in 1939, offered the same sort of pretext. Aggressors always seek alibis for their crimes, but they remain aggressors none the less.

77. The Lebanese and Jordanian peoples have vigorously opposed this foreign intervention. It has been

condemned without reservation not only by the leaders of the uprising but also by the President of the Lebanese Parliament himself. Speaking in the name of the Parliament and people of his country, he has called for the withdrawal of the United States troops. Two years ago, after a long, fierce struggle, the Jordanian people succeeded in driving the British invaders from their country. Is it likely that they now wish to see them back again?

78. The United States and United Kingdom Governments have usurped the right to intervene in these countries in order to rescue the régimes which are in power. In this very chamber, we have heard it stated that the United States would be prepared to intervene again elsewhere in similar cases. But who gives these Powers the right to set themselves up as judges of other people's affairs, to play the role of a Holy Alliance in order to defend certain régimes against their own people, to challenge the inalienable right of every people to choose the government it wishes, and, ignoring the United Nations and trampling its Charter underfoot, to send armed forces into foreign countries in order to crush the will of their people? If everyone acted in this way, what would remain of morality and of the principles of right and justice in international relations?

79. The aggression against Lebanon and Jordan has outraged the conscience of all decent people. It is an integral part of the imperialist policy of force and provocation. Lebanon and Jordan are recent victims of that policy but not the latest ones; the events in Cuba are even more recent. From Colonel Lawrence to Mr. Murphy's latest mission, with the Baghdad Pact and the Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine in between, the policy of the Western Powers in the Near and Middle East has always had the same goal: to hold on to that area for the sake of its oil resources and its strategic importance. Today, the banner has passed to the United States, which holds more than 50 per cent of the capital invested in the oil industry of the Near and Middle East; which since the defeat of the United Kingdom and France at Suez has come forward as the sole candidate for the task of filling the so-called colonial "vacuum"; and which, as the principal imperialist Power, aims at world domination.

80. As President Nasser has rightly observed, the United States Government has taken advantage of the internal revolution in Lebanon to accomplish its purpose of occupying Lebanon and intimidating the independent countries in the Middle East which refuse to submit to imperialism and have resolved to follow an independent policy.

81. The stratagems evolved by the Western Powers in order to maintain their colonial domination over these countries, such as the Baghdad Pact and the Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine, have met with the hostility of the Arab peoples and are collapsing under the impact of their opposition. Events in Iraq are an example: the régime of Nuri es Said was regarded as the pivot of imperialist policy in this area, but the valiant Iraqi people, in a matter of hours, overthrew it and set up the Republic of Iraq in its place. From this rostrum, on behalf of the people and Government of the People's Republic of Albania, I should like to salute the people of Iraq and congratulate them upon their historic victory, for it is an event of profound importance to the cause of the freedom of peoples and of peace in the area.

82. On 14 July of this year, in Iraq, the stronghold of the oil monopolies fell. This was an extremely serious and unexpected blow, and it was no coincidence that United States troops were rushed to Lebanon the very day after the event, while two days later Jordan was occupied by United Kingdom forces.

83. As reported in the United States and United Kingdom Press, the Anglo-American plan for landing troops was drawn up and agreed upon in advance by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister MacMillan at their meeting in Washington. Its details were later developed by the Foreign Ministers of the two countries. In its issue of 22 July 1958, *The Sunday Times* of London stated that the scope of the plan went beyond the borders of Lebanon and Jordan and extended to the Persian Gulf, the Sudan and Libya. What is more, according to the *New York Herald Tribune* of 23 July 1958, Mr. Lloyd requested United States support for a United Kingdom occupation of Qatar and Mr. Dulles three-quarters committed himself to this. The United Kingdom, for its part, virtually agreed that the United States should attempt to detain and hold Al-Hasa province, in which the majority of the oil-wells of Saudi Arabia are concentrated.

84. In the light of these facts, it can readily be seen why these Powers persistently refuse to agree to the proposal for non-intervention in the affairs of the Near and Middle East made by the Soviet Union on 11 February 1957. The real nature and objectives of the intervention in Lebanon and Jordan become evident, as does the reason for the concern professed by the imperialists for the integrity and independence of small nations. The occupation of Lebanon and Jordan is clearly intended to be a stage in the drive to extinguish the struggle for national liberation of the peoples still in subjection and to destroy the national independence of those already liberated. But these plans are doomed to failure. The struggle for national liberation is one of the distinctive and most positive phenomena of our time. The colonial system is doomed; it is approaching an end. One after the other, the former colonial peoples are winning freedom and national independence and are playing an increasingly active part in the great battle for the maintenance of peace and international co-operation on the basis of the principles of peaceful co-existence. The great Arab people is playing an important role in this mighty battle against colonialism.

85. In this connexion, the assertion that the colonial Powers themselves have encouraged nationalism and led the colonial peoples towards independence, and that they want to maintain the integrity and independence of small nations must be refuted as a denial of the truth. That assertion, in our opinion, is an insult to the countless sacrifices made by the peoples who have broken the chains of colonial rule after long and heroic endeavours; it is belied every day by the blood which flows in Oman, Algeria, the island of Cyprus, Kenya and elsewhere.

86. The General Assembly was expecting the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom to announce the withdrawal of their troops from Lebanon and Jordan. On the contrary, they have said nothing about this; they have even implied that their Governments were not contemplating a troop withdrawal and they have attempted to shift to other shoulders the grave responsibility which they have assumed. In that endeavour, they have advanced the

theory of indirect aggression and made charges concerning the radio propaganda of the United Arab Republic.

87. The Albanian delegation does not consider it necessary to discuss the theory of indirect aggression. It would, however, like to ask what indirect aggression can be involved in Lebanon and Jordan when it was been shown that nobody, except for the United States and the United Kingdom, has intervened in those countries, when everybody knows that direct aggression has been committed against them and that such direct aggression was committed by the United States and the United Kingdom whose armed forces are still there. The delegation of the United Arab Republic has already disposed of the charge regarding radio propaganda. I should, however, like to make this comment: is it not astounding to hear such a charge from the United States and United Kingdom Governments which have made subversive radio propaganda an instrument of their cold war policy? Through radio broadcasts, the United States and the United Kingdom are carrying on a campaign of hatred and incitement to violence against the countries of the socialist bloc and against other independent countries. For example, the "Voice of America", with its eighty-five transmitters, is poisoning the ether with hysterical charges against those countries. The United States has built a whole network of radio stations whose broadcasts are directed against the socialist countries. These stations have been set up not only on the territory of the United States and of certain NATO countries, but also on board ships. The United States radio station known as "Radio Free Europe", established in West Germany, is a veritable centre of espionage and conspiracy. The BBC of London does not yield an inch to the United States broadcasts in the campaign of hatred and incitement to criminal acts against the lawful Governments of the countries of socialism and the other free countries of Africa and Asia.

88. In the circumstances, is it not amazing that General Assembly resolutions against propaganda inciting to violence and war are now being invoked precisely by those Governments which have never observed them? We should like to hope for a change of heart. The Governments concerned would provide the best proof of this by putting an end to hostile radio broadcasts from their countries and by complying with the proposal made long ago by the Soviet Union to prohibit war propaganda. In Albania, as in other peaceful countries, this kind of propaganda is prohibited by law. Why should this example not be followed by the United States, the United Kingdom and other countries? There can be no doubt that such action on their part would be welcomed.

89. In his statement to the General Assembly [733rd meeting], the President of the United States suggested the establishment of a permanent United Nations peace force. Our delegation is opposed to the establishment of such a military force because it would not only not help to reduce tension, but would, on the contrary, be harmful and dangerous to the cause of peace and to the United Nations itself.

90. In the specific case of the situation created in Lebanon and Jordan, we consider that there is one solution and it is a simple one: let the United States and United Kingdom armed forces withdraw from those countries immediately and unconditionally. The

existing machinery of United Nations observers in Lebanon, which might also be extended to Jordan, as suggested in the Soviet draft resolution [A/3870 and Corr.1], would, in our view, be sufficient.

91. The Near and Middle East might well require friendly aid for its economic development, to which no strings would be attached. But can it be said that the plan laid before us by the United States delegation meets that need and the real interests of the countries of the area? Its initial reception in those countries is described by the Press as "reserved" and "cold". The peoples of the Near and Middle East have already had bitter experience of plans proposed by the Western Powers. I need hardly remind you that the Arab people has great ability and a very rich culture; it knew how to manage its own affairs and teach others to manage theirs many centuries ago, at a time when some States which would now like to give it lessons and impose their will on it, were not even on the map. In fact, the plan proposed has all the earmarks of an attempt to divert attention from the basic problem, the occupation of Lebanon and Jordan, and to establish a means of penetration and domination.

92. The United States and United Kingdom oil monopolies earn profits of several thousand million dollars a year on Middle East oil, which they have wrested from the true owners, the Arab peoples. If the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom sincerely want to help those peoples, why do they not take the simple step of ensuring that Middle East oil is not stolen by the monopolies, but is bought from the Arab Governments at world prices?

93. In the opinion of the Albanian delegation, the principal problem to be solved by the General Assembly is the restoration of the independence and national sovereignty of Lebanon and Jordan and the re-establishment of peace and security in the Near and Middle East. The situation in the area is still serious and a threat of war persists because, until the United States and United Kingdom forces leave the territory of Lebanon and Jordan, aggression continues to exist. My delegation is expressing the view of the Albanian people and Government in demanding immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the United States and United Kingdom armed forces from Lebanon and Jordan.

94. We consider that the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union proposes the most equitable and realistic solution. It offers the General Assembly an opportunity to fulfill its lofty mission, to guarantee the independence of Member States and international security.

95. The General Assembly has just been seized of a draft resolution [A/3878] submitted by Norway, Denmark and Canada—all members of NATO, an organization which is led by the United States and whose active part in the aggression against Lebanon and Jordan is well known—and by four other States. Even on first reading, it becomes clear that this draft resolution cannot contribute to a just solution of the problem before the General Assembly. It evades the basic issue, as it contains no specific provision requesting the withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan. In our opinion, the withdrawal of those troops is an essential condition for any examination of all the other problems of the Near and Middle East. For that reason, the new draft resolution is unacceptable to our delegation and we trust it will also be unacceptable

to the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Assembly.

96. The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania will vote in favour of the Soviet draft resolution because it offers the best solution. It urges all other delegations which hold peace dear and which cherish the freedom of peoples and the principles of the United Nations to do likewise.

Mr. Slim (Tunisia), Vice-President, took the chair.

97. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan): In this Assembly of the United Nations we represent a small nation at a time when the issue before the Assembly is one that affects the small nations more than anybody else. This is one of the reasons for our intervening in the debate of this emergency session on the item on its agenda which, as described by the Secretary-General, refers specifically to situations in the Middle East which have arisen only recently.

98. Another reason for our participation in the debate is our belief that the United Nations is an Organization of small nations, although we do appreciate and recognize the place of the big Powers, inasmuch as they uphold and maintain it in accordance with the laws of international justice and democracy. Another reason which persuades my delegation to take part in the debate is the deep conviction of my Government that all nations should devote their efforts to contribute to the cause of peace through the United Nations.

99. A constructive contribution can be made only if the Members of the United Nations will allow themselves to be led by an unselfish and impartial judgement and an earnest and sincere desire for the strengthening of the spirit of reconciliation, not only as an act of diplomacy, but as evidence of adherence to the principles which have brought them together in the General Assembly of the United Nations for the purpose of peaceful and friendly negotiations.

100. Afghanistan, as you all know, is an impartial country following a policy of peace and friendship with all peoples and nations of the world. We consider this the only natural policy for a small country that has suffered in the past. While we are trying to forget these sufferings by hoping for a better future, we are naturally disturbed when we are reminded of regrettable events which still confront small nations of the world with great difficulties.

101. On the basis of our friendly relations with all nations inside and outside the United Nations Organization, we can have but one cause, and that is the cause of peace and security in the world. We cannot speak but in the interest of small nations, and I repeat, our views are led by an impartial and independent judgement.

102. In putting these views before you I must say that in the face of all the difficulties with which we are confronted we do not feel unhopeful of finding a solution to the problem of the Middle East for which this emergency session of the General Assembly has been called. To explain this note of hope that we cherish, I wish to express the appreciation of my delegation for certain developments, after the failure of the Security Council, which resulted in bringing the question of the Middle East before the General Assembly.

103. First, it was a source of encouragement for the Afghan delegation that the General Assembly was convened. We always believed that all major problems should be solved through the United Nations, particu-

larly its supreme authority. Secondly, we were happy to see that the Secretary-General of the United Nations maintained his policy of making the efforts of the United Nations as fruitful as possible by outlining some of the basic needs for action in the region. Thirdly, it was a source of encouragement that the President of the United States addressed the General Assembly [733rd meeting].

104. We were glad to hear Mr. Eisenhower, as the Head of a big Power, proclaim that "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". We were pleased to hear him state that "the United Nations has a particular responsibility" in the problem of the Middle East. And we were happy to hear him when he spoke of the right of nations and peoples to determine their own destiny and of the preservation of this right to be consistent with the obligation to respect the rights of others, and when he said that "the peoples of the Arab Nations of the Near East clearly possess the right of determining and expressing their own destiny . . ." and that in any institution "the function of leadership must belong to the Arab States themselves". It made everything sound better when he, the President of the United States, spoke of the coming to life of the modern Arab community and said that the goals must be Arab goals. We wish also to give a most sincere expression of our support to his words: "This world of individual nations is not going to be controlled by any one Power or group of Powers."

105. In the same manner, it was a source of encouragement when Mr. Gromyko expressed [733rd meeting] the trust of his Government that the General Assembly would carry out the task which faces it and when he described the task as "restoring peace in the Near and Middle East" in a worthy manner. We wish to support him in his belief that "this session can serve the cause of peace well, if we are all imbued with a sense of high responsibility for the outcome of its work". We believe that the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR was completely right when he said that with the genuine desire to contribute to the work of the General Assembly it was not difficult to find a formula. We do appreciate his statement that the USSR is prepared to enter into official or unofficial consultations, any sort of consultations, with any delegations, including the delegations of the United States and of the United Kingdom, concerning the preparation of such a constructive decision which could be adopted by the General Assembly in the interests of peace.

106. In the light of this statement we think that the draft resolution put forward by the delegation of the USSR [A/3870 and Corr.1] should receive most serious consideration. As I reserve the right of my delegation to make our views known about the draft resolutions which may be presented to the General Assembly at a later stage, that is, when all drafts are presented to the General Assembly, I shall not speak about this draft resolution at the present time.

107. The final source of encouragement to the Afghan delegation is the fact that many delegations are engaged in searching for a suitable formula.

108. Now I would like briefly to put our general views before the Assembly. First of all, we would like to emphasize the necessity for firm and quick action

to be taken by this emergency session, which action should recommend the necessary steps to be taken without delay and with a view to ending the emergency situation in the Middle East. In this connexion, we believe that a recommendation of the General Assembly for the withdrawal of the United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and from Jordan at the earliest possible time is essential.

109. The consideration of the long-term programmes, economic or otherwise, for the solution of the basic problems facing the United Nations in the Middle East is obviously of great importance, and this we think should be dealt with in a separate resolution of the General Assembly, which would give the Secretary-General of the United Nations the authority and the time for the proper consideration of these problems in consultation with the countries directly concerned, after which the Secretary-General should be asked to report to the General Assembly, if possible, at its thirteenth session.

110. While we shall not oppose a resolution that would combine these two purposes, we would like to state that we would favour separate resolutions. In the opinion of the Afghan delegation, two considerations should lead our thinking, namely, that no resolution would be either desirable or useful if it did not have the support of the Arab States and if it did not keep the solutions within the framework of the United Nations.

111. I think it is proper repeatedly to remind ourselves of the fact that the United Nations cannot ignore its great responsibilities in connexion with any situation that has arisen or might arise in the Middle East. The United Nations—and we would like to emphasize this—should by all means avoid the creation of new problems in this region. It should always be kept in mind that, if the solution of serious problems concerning small nations is not sought through the United Nations, this Organization will no longer exist as a place of hope in the minds of small countries. It should be remembered that this Organization will no longer mean what it does without small nations.

112. At this point, we wish to address ourselves particularly to the small nations represented with us in the United Nations and to call upon them to think of their common responsibilities on such occasions most seriously in their own interests, as we are sure they do. If nowhere else, at least in this Organization these small nations can play their role in support of the cause of preserving their own interests, which can in no way be considered apart from the cause of peace.

113. Speaking of the desirability of a resolution of the emergency session that would be acceptable to the Arab States, we had in mind to add that the responsibility of these States is great indeed, not only to themselves, but to the whole world. Their demonstration of a spirit of understanding and co-operation with the United Nations is of great significance and of great importance. Their attitude and their approach to the ways and means for the solution of their problems should be such as not to allow the creation of any precedents that would confront them or other nations in other areas of the world with situations which would not be in the interests of all nations, including their own, in the future.

114. We are not an Arab country. We do not belong to any bloc. We are not committed to anybody. We have no obligation towards anyone. But we are closely related by bonds of culture and friendship to the Arab

world. We belong to the United Nations. We are committed to the United Nations and we have obligations to the United Nations. That is why we can only appeal to the Members of the United Nations to do their duty in a manner worthy of this world Organization and not let this General Assembly fail. The failure of the Security Council could, in the circumstances, be considered the failure of the big Powers, but the failure of the General Assembly would mean the failure of the United Nations and, consequently, the disappointment of the people of the world.

Sir Leslie Munro (New Zealand) took the Chair.

115. Mr. PICCIONI (Italy):⁴ At the stage we have reached in the current debate, I believe we can already draw some positive conclusions. However, before setting forth the views of the delegation of Italy in this respect, I should like to express our sincere satisfaction for the fact that these discussions have taken place and that the survey connected with the recent crisis in the Near East has been kept within the framework of the United Nations, as my Government has suggested and recommended since the very beginning of the crisis. I wish to specify that at no time has Italy favoured the choice of one or the other body of the United Nations or raised objections against any one of them. I will not dwell on the circumstances which have brought about the calling of this special session of the General Assembly, for they are indeed too well known. Here I merely wish to emphasize that, if the Italian delegation is taking part in the current debate, we do so without pretence, convinced as we are that, owing to the geographical position of our country as well as to the traditional relations which we maintain with the Near East, we are in a position to offer some suggestions which may prove to be useful and constructive.

116. I have followed closely the statements made by the speakers who have taken the rostrum before me. I have noted with interest and satisfaction that the constructive and positive approach, which we consistently held to be the only way to cope with the problem of the Near East, has here been supported by many distinguished representatives, including in the first place the President of the United States.

117. It is quite clear that the reason for which we are meeting here is the situation in Lebanon and in Jordan. I believe that on this point, as well as on the need to undertake adequate measures in respect of this situation, there is an apparently general agreement in this Assembly. We should not, however, stop at a superficial diagnosis of the illness and merely try to eliminate its exterior symptoms and be satisfied with that. This would mean to lose sight of the real nature of the illness and to fail in our task. I feel, on the contrary, that this Assembly should face the basic problems. These problems should at least be approached in a realistic way if we are to meet the expectations of our respective nations and of the world.

118. First of all, due consideration should be given to the fact that a situation has arisen in the Near East which carries the risk of spreading over the whole region and of endangering the peace. It should be admitted, as a matter of fact, that the prompt response of the United States and the United Kingdom to the appeals of Lebanon and Jordan has had a timely stop-gag effect.

119. In the second place, it should be kept in mind that, in the absence of an adequate international machinery which could be put into action speedily to cope with situations of this nature, it would appear, to say the least, unreasonable to challenge the right of every State to seek appropriate means of defence when its integrity and independence are imperilled. Failure to recognize such a right would be tantamount to denying one of the essential attributes of sovereignty and thus denying one of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations, a principle upon which international relations rest.

120. Until the rules which govern international relations have provided otherwise, this right plainly entails an independence of judgement on the part of each individual State. Although the merit of each case might be subject to scrutiny on the basis of the practical forms of implementation, this principle should nevertheless be considered beyond challenge.

121. What is important for me is to keep close to the real facts. In my opinion, these facts should be examined in the light of the following circumstances: two countries, feeling their independence and integrity imperilled, made a formal appeal for help to two friendly Powers. But the United States and the United Kingdom were certainly not frivolous in responding to such a request. Suffice it to recall, in this connexion, the statement made by Mr. Lodge on 15 July 1958 in the Security Council⁵ in which he declared that this was not the ideal method and that the United States hoped to see the United Nations take over such responsibilities in the near future. May I also recall the statements of the representatives of the United States and of the United Kingdom in which they have declared repeatedly and specifically the intention of their respective Governments to withdraw their forces from Lebanon and Jordan.

122. In other words, the cases of Lebanon and Jordan should suggest the urgent necessity of defining, by means of international instruments, the measures applicable to similar cases in the future. The Secretary-General of the United Nations has already given some attention to the possibility of establishing a permanent specialized force and groups of observers that could speedily be sent to the spot upon the request of any legitimate Government. Italy feels that this idea should be promptly and seriously taken into consideration and is determined to offer its contribution if requested, in the belief that the creation of such bodies would precisely serve the purpose of eliminating the gap which we have noted. Such means would enable every Member State of the United Nations that might feel imperilled to have recourse to them rather than to individual Powers, thus discharging the latter from a serious responsibility.

123. It is our contention that the smaller States would apply for assistance to these new bodies of the United Nations all the more confidently, the more perfect the balance of the international composition of such units, which would be formed by nationals of countries having neither general political positions nor specific interests in the area in which the units are to operate.

124. We also realize that when such bodies are operating they might possibly entail a temptation for certain régimes to utilize them for their own purposes. Accordingly, at the same time, adequate rules should be

⁴ Mr. Piccioni spoke in Italian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

⁵ *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirteenth Year, 827th meeting.*

studied and devised—laying down specific engagements on the part of the States requesting the assistance—in order to ensure the possibility of orderly and peaceful evolution, which is indeed desirable.

125. The Italian delegation realizes that a problem of such magnitude cannot be dealt with during this special session of the General Assembly, but that it should be broached in the course of the forthcoming regular session. The Secretary-General, who has been so responsive in this respect, intends to submit a report on the matter then. We feel, however, that the current situation in the Near East should be considered in the light of these general ideas. In the first place, taking into account the gap in the present international order which we have noted and the desirability of adopting adequate measures to fill it, as well as the intention so explicitly expressed by the United States and the United Kingdom to proceed to the withdrawal of their forces, we feel that the most urgent task before us is to examine the procedure and means which would allow us to overcome the situation currently existing in Lebanon and in Jordan.

126. The Secretary-General has already submitted, at the opening meeting of this session [732nd meeting], some ideas and proposals which, in our opinion, should be considered and carried out in so far as they meet the wishes and the requests which will be set forth respectively by the Governments of these two countries. As Mr. Hammarskjöld said, such measures are merely measures of safeguard. The Italian delegation feels that it is advisable to pursue, within the framework of the United Nations, the search for permanent solutions which would take into adequate account the special characteristics of Lebanon and Jordan.

127. Secondly, we should take up the over-all political problem of this area. The Near East is today the scene of historical movements, sprung from the autonomous force of an Arab nationalism in full development. The attitude of Italy in respect of the changes which have taken place in the area under the impulse of the Arab national movement has been consistently inspired by an objective evaluation of this historical reality and by a full and impartial understanding of it. In this connexion I recall the prompt recognition by my Government of the union between Egypt and Syria as well as of the new Republic of Iraq. Italy, having the utmost interest in the events occurring in an area which is so close geographically, has equally at heart that such changes should take place in ways that will not affect order and peace and that will be fully consistent with the freely expressed will of the peoples concerned. Furthermore, we believe that this Assembly cannot but share this concern. Allow me, therefore, to point out in this regard that a settlement of the preceding specific cases would be precarious in the event of further disturbances occurring in the near future, and the autonomous strengthening of the internal structure of the Near East against new serious troubles would not be promoted.

128. The Italian delegation realizes that whatever the measures on which we may agree and whatever the powers to be delegated to appropriate United Nations bodies, these would be altogether ineffective should they lack the broadest and most spontaneous co-operation. I thus feel that the reference to prior resolutions approved by the General Assembly, calling upon the countries of the region and outside it to refrain from actions

or interference in the internal affairs of each other, is most wise indeed.

129. However, this is but one of the aspects of the basic problem. Aside from the political causes, there are others, just as important and real, which have to be eliminated in order to guarantee the orderly and peaceful evolution of this area.

130. I am referring to the aspirations of the Arab peoples to benefit from the material and moral advantages that higher standards of life offer to the individual and to populations economically more advanced. Italy has for a long time made clear its understanding of such legitimate aspirations, being convinced that the independence and freedom of the peoples are inseparable from certain standards of prosperity. The ideas that the Prime Minister of Italy, Mr. Fanfani, has offered on this subject on several occasions are well known. I therefore do not feel it necessary to repeat them. I wish merely to recall certain essential points which may help to focus the problem.

131. The ancient social structure of the Near East appears more and more inadequate under the pressure of the new needs which, for their satisfaction, demand bigger and bigger investments as well as a better use and a more equitable distribution of the local resources. Certain characteristics of the local production would also require the establishment of a special fund with the participation of the Near East countries themselves in order, first, to ensure stabilization of the economic life through periodic interventions in the purchasing and marketing of the products; and, secondly, to promote the relief and the rehabilitation of refugees.

132. My delegation wishes to confirm its opinion that the desired economic development of the Near East is a necessary element for a real and lasting recovery of the internal situation of those countries. We also feel that every initiative in this field belongs, in the first place, to the Arab countries themselves.

133. In this connexion we also believe that the proposals set forth by President Eisenhower [733rd meeting] deserve the most careful consideration, particularly where they call upon the Arab countries of the Near East to set up a regional institution for the development of their water, agricultural, mining and industrial resources, as well as to further progress in the fields of education and health. My delegation cannot but reject the suggestion advanced by the Head of the Soviet delegation [733rd meeting] that this proposal was aimed at diverting the attention of this Assembly from the question of the withdrawal of the Anglo-American forces from Lebanon and Jordan. And the more so inasmuch as my country had voiced this necessity a long time before the present emergency situation arose.

134. No one will fail to see that such an institution, if its establishment is decided upon by the countries concerned, would create the strongest basis for a strict and effective regional co-operation, the management and control of which would be in the hands of the Arabs themselves. It would be up to them, besides uniting their efforts in a development plan for their territories, to decide which international agencies and friendly Governments they should call upon for assistance in carrying out the specific projects.

135. As far as Italy is concerned, we would give favourable consideration to any request for co-operation, whether for aid or for the sharing of experience gained from the economic development of our own territory,

in the solution of similar problems now existing in the Near East.

136. In short, the Italian delegation is of the opinion that, firstly, the Secretary-General should be entrusted with the study of ways and means that would enable the United Nations to respond promptly to the plea of any State which felt that its security was endangered and to determine at the same time the conditions to which the granting of such assistance would be automatically subject. This would avert the danger that safeguarding the independence of a country might be confused with the maintenance of the protection of a given régime.

137. Secondly, we should take into account the reasons which have prompted the United States and the United Kingdom to take action in Lebanon and Jordan and to take note of their intention to withdraw their forces from these States.

138. Thirdly, we should entrust the Secretary-General with the adoption of the measures which would be suitable, taking into account the wishes expressed by Lebanon and Jordan and the characteristics of those two countries.

139. Fourthly, in conjunction with or in support of the above-mentioned measures or others that may seem fit, reference should be made to existing general provisions calling on the countries of an area as well as outside it to refrain from actions or initiatives which might foment new disorders and thereby hinder the peaceful development or evolution of this region.

140. Fifthly, immediate consultation between the Secretary-General and all Arab Governments of the

Near East should be recommended with a view to establishing an institution for regional economic development. This institution, pooling the resources of those States with contributions from other countries, international agencies, and private enterprise, would undertake the effective utilization of the resources of the area and would implement specific projects in order to raise the standards of living of the peoples concerned.

141. As I have already said, my country feels the deepest understanding for Arab aspirations. I was pleased to note that the statements of the heads of delegations who have gathered here show that these aspirations are meeting with increasing understanding. A chance has thus been given to the countries of the Near East to pool their forces, with the assistance of the friendly peoples, in order to raise their standards of living, strengthen and develop their political institutions, and promote a programme of economic development in the area to which they belong. They will thus be able to pursue peacefully and in full freedom of decision the political and economic aims which they have set for themselves.

142. If I may conclude by expressing a wish, this would be that this appeal be heeded by the Arab peoples of the Near East. It would be a great undertaking which they would assume, and its success would yield undeniable benefits for them and would also strengthen peace and well-being in one of the most vital areas of the world.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.