of the world always in the grip of a most serious crisis? Is it because the Arab peoples are profoundly divided? Is it because the area is particularly sensitive to what is called the cold war? Certainly not. To be quite frank, let me say that we think the principal reason for this unrest lies in the conflict between the national aspirations of the peoples of that area and the stifling of these aspirations by those who fail to understand them.

5. What is the real issue? As you know, the Arab peoples, like some other peoples of Africa and Asia, have suffered for a long time under colonial occupation. This occupation has taken, and still takes, many forms, both direct and indirect: military occupation, political domination, economic exploitation, cultural frustration, to mention only a few aspects. But we have to admit that the world is at present in full evolution. The awakening of the colonial peoples is one of the essential features of our time and there is general agreement that the era of colonialism is over; but actions should speedily be brought into line with words.

6. Everyone is aware that the satisfaction of these peoples' demands is one of the imperative needs of our time. Some countries are still fighting to consolidate their recently acquired independence, others are fighting to gain recognition of the very principle of their independence. Thus, as far as my country is concerned, the Powers involved have certainly recognized the independence of Morocco, but contrary to logic and common sense, foreign armies continue to be stationed in our territory.

7. The Algerian people, who wish only to live in freedom and independence, have for four years been in the throes of a murderous and inhuman war. It will perhaps be thought that we are raising a problem which is not on the agenda. I beg to disagree with that view. It is, in fact, in the interest of the General Assembly, which is seeking to understand the underlying causes of the Middle East crisis in particular and of Arab nationalism in general, to recognize once and for all that freedom is one and indivisible.

8. The struggle of the Middle Eastern countries must be viewed in this general context, and it is not surprising therefore that these countries are participating in these efforts directed against the last vestiges of colonialism. The demands of the peoples of that area are legitimate and natural, and we think it would be unwise to continue to ignore them.

9. We understand and support the purposes of their struggle because we are ourselves engaged in a similar struggle and because, in view of the many ties linking us to the rest of the Arab world, the events in the Middle East, as Mr. Balafrej, Morocco's Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, recently said, have profound repercussions in North Africa.

10. In that part of the world, we are at grips not with abstractions, but with sociological and human realities. We are convinced that Arab nationalism is neither sub-
versive nor dangerous; neither is it negative. On the contrary, it is in line with the Arab tradition of freedom, and tolerance and symbolizes long-frustrated aspirations.

11. No doubt, final settlement of the Middle East crisis is not an easy task; to achieve it, we must retain our composure and shed a great many prejudices. We are convinced, however, that the General Assembly is now in a position to draw up a comprehensive settlement in broad outline. In my Government's view, such a settlement should be based on the following principles:

First, the recognition that Arab nationalism is justified, which implies that any settlement of the crisis must accord with the wishes of the people of the area and that the Arab peoples must be free to determine their own destiny; second, the Middle East must no longer be considered as an area of international competition, and it must not be exploited for political, economic or military purposes. Following this, I must now say a few words on the situation in Lebanon and Jordan.

12. The General Assembly should, as I said earlier, study the many aspects of the situation in the Middle East; but we are nevertheless faced with the immediate problem of the presence of foreign troops in Lebanon and Jordan, a solution of which is urgently required. In this connexion, I must state that the Moroccan Government regrets the dispatch of United States and United Kingdom troops into these two countries. We consider that there is no legal or practical justification for the presence of these troops in Lebanon and Jordan, and the reasons advanced to justify it appear to us to be artificial. In the first place, we think that the arguments used conform neither with the letter nor with the spirit of the Charter. In the second place, Article 51 of the Charter has been cited. I must point out that, as we see the situation in Lebanon and in Jordan, the difficulties of those countries are purely domestic in character. In fact, as we all know, the Security Council has not established the existence of any aggression against these two countries.

13. That is why our delegation has serious doubts as to the application of Article 51 in these circumstances. The presence of the foreign troops is certainly not a means of reducing tension in that part of the world. We consider that the prime objective of the General Assembly should be to seek a settlement which would facilitate the withdrawal of these troops in the shortest possible time. Such a step would alleviate tension in that part of the world and would then enable us to study the other aspects of the Middle East crisis in a more relaxed atmosphere. These are the comments which we have thought useful to make today.

14. The problem is clearly both political and psychological. The psychological aspect of the crisis is very serious, because re-adaptation to the exigencies of national movements is not always as rapid and as sincere as the movements themselves might desire.

15. The Moroccan delegation is happy to note, however, that Arab nationalism is beginning to be recognized as justified. We are convinced that it will triumph over the difficulties it is encountering, because, as His Majesty the King of Morocco recently declared, the Arab peoples have awakened and have taken the road of renaissance. We are certain, the King continued, that, thanks to their unity, they will be able to foil the plots and manoeuvres directed against them and will emerge from the crisis through which they are passing, with their strength intact and their dignity respected, and that they will shake off the last vestiges of imperialism and all forms of exploitation.

16. Mr. ENGREN (Norway): I wish to make some observations with respect to the resolution which Norway, together with Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Liberia, Panama and Paraguay, has submitted to the General Assembly [A/3878].

17. This draft resolution is based on one basic premise, namely, what we believe the United Nations can legitimately contemplate doing in the present crisis in the Middle East, it can only be achieved by measures taken, or safeguards created, in order to assist the Governments concerned. The extent to which the United Nations efforts are to be crowned with success or doomed to failure, must ultimately depend on the attitude and the actions taken by the Governments directly concerned.

18. This philosophy, if I may use that expression, has been the point of departure for the endeavours of the sponsors of this draft resolution. We have, as a process of constant negotiations and explorations with the parties most directly concerned, sought to devise not only a formula which could win approval of the constitutional majority of this Assembly, but one which also entrusted the Secretary-General with a task which it is within the realm of reality and possibility for him to accomplish. I am stressing this point because, as we all know, the Secretary-General is the executor of the Assembly's decisions, and it flows from this that the Assembly must take great care in formulating the instructions which it wants the Secretary-General to carry out in order not to put him into untenable positions.

19. The basic rule for the Assembly to follow in this respect flows, of course, from the Charter provision that no action by the General Assembly can be carried out in matters directly concerning Member States without the consent of the Governments of those Member States. From this it follows, speaking in practical terms, that the Secretary-General should never be instructed to act from extreme positions. His field of operation is the middle ground, the ground of mutual accommodations, the ground of conciliation and of mutual confidence. The draft resolution of the seven sponsors seeks to establish this middle ground position from which the General Assembly may want the Secretary-General to act in these particular circumstances.

20. During this delicate and extensive discussions which the sponsors have had with all the directly interested parties, one basic fact has emerged. It seems to us to be firmly established that an area of agreement exists between the parties which may be the key to a solution of the present difficulties. This agreement is the following: all the parties want to see established, at the earliest possible date, a situation in the area, where the peoples of that area will be free to shape their own life, undisturbed by violence, interference from outside, and strife. If this is the case, it seems to me that the approach to shaping United Nations actions, is an obvious one: that is, to enable the Organization, through its chief executive officer, to assist Member countries concerned to achieve this goal.

21. This approach explains the philosophy of our draft resolution. It starts out by noting the explicit undertakings of the United States and the United Kingdom, two countries directly concerned in the present situation, with respect to their intentions to withdraw their military forces now in Lebanon and Jordan. The form in which these undertakings are expressed, will be found...
in official United Nations documents circulated to the Members of this Assembly. The draft resolution reaffirms the principle of coexistence between States in tolerance and good neighbourly relations, a Charter aim which also has found specific expression during the Asian-African Conference at Bandung more than two years ago.

22. Section I of the operative part seeks to formulate a policy in specific terms, which it would be incumbent upon all Member States to pursue in their relations with each other, and especially in this instance, since we now deal with the Middle Eastern area, with respect to and between the countries of this region. The specific terms of this policy are taken from resolution 290 (IV) of the General Assembly; that is why they are in quotation marks. As all students of United Nations history will know, these formulations have emanated from "both sides of the House", so to speak.

23. The stating of this policy in section I of the draft resolution seems to us to be a necessary basis for the request the Assembly is invited to make to the Secretary-General in section II. In this section, we seek to define the role of the United Nations when assisting the Government directly concerned in establishing the situation of normalcy of which I spoke a moment ago.

24. The terms of the request to the Secretary-General are, admittedly, rather general in nature. We feel, however, that there are very valid reasons for this. In our view, the emphasis should be on the statement of policy and obligations for the Member States, and that is the case as far as section I is concerned. However, when it comes to practical measures which the United Nations, through the Secretary-General, could take in order to assist the Member States in their endeavours to pursue the policy of which I have spoken, then I think we are well advised in not being too specific, but in leaving a fairly wide field for the discretion of the Governments concerned. It goes without saying, of course, that membership in the Organization should invite the utmost of co-operation from Member Governments in this respect. In fact, representatives will find such an appeal to Members in paragraph 1, section IV, of our draft resolution.

25. I now come to section III of our draft resolution. The two provisions in this section are, admittedly, of immediate consequence to the concrete problems before the Assembly. Nevertheless, we have felt that the Assembly should on this occasion lift its eyes for one moment above the immediate business of the day, and take a look into the future. It is not a question of arriving at decisions here, but only of giving the General Assembly, at this emergency session, an accent of a forward-looking spirit and not merely the matter-of-fact spirit of the fire brigade.

26. I am representing a small country which, on occasions, has been able to share in the contributions of many Members to United Nations measures dealing with critical situations. We, for our part, are prepared to carry on with this policy. Our experience is such, however, that we do not but welcome the news that the Secretary-General has been giving thought, for some time, to the many problems of a practical and principal nature which naturally arise in connexion with contributions in personnel or kind in times of emergency. We have felt that the Assembly should not disperse without expressing a desire to have the Secretary-General's studies thoroughly discussed in the General Assembly, at its thirteenth session. While we recognize that this desire could be expressed in another way, we, for our part, find it natural that it should be done in the way here proposed.

27. With respect to paragraph 2, section III, I should like to say that we are glad that the Arab countries in the area have developed organs for economic co-operation. This corresponds, I am sure, to the deep wishes of the people of the Middle East. If they should want co-operation and assistance in this work from the United Nations and from other agencies outside the area, we feel that such co-operation and assistance should be made available. But in order to meet such requests from the countries, the United Nations must be prepared. It was therefore with real appreciation that we learned from the Secretary-General in his statement on the opening day of this session [732nd meeting] that studies have been under way in the Secretariat for some time in order to prepare the United Nations to respond positively to any requests from the countries in this area in this respect. I think that the Assembly could very well encourage the Secretary-General to carry on with his studies of these problems.

28. Finally, I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to the last paragraph of our draft resolution. This invites the Secretary-General to report, not later than 30 September 1958, on the implementation of this draft resolution. It is our hope, indeed it is our firm belief, that the Secretary-General's first report will show us a picture of the Middle East where tranquillity and normalcy are the reigning features.

29. Members of the Assembly will have noted that I have carefully refrained from entering into any discussion of substance with respect to the situation in the area. To have done so, would certainly have been contrary to the spirit and the purpose of the draft resolution which we have submitted. I have ventured to point out a road forward where the roadblocks of condemnation as well as those of condemnation do not appear. It is a road along the middle ground where the Assembly has its best opportunities, indeed I would say, where the Assembly has its only opportunity for constructive action. The draft resolution we have submitted, may not be perfect, but I know that it contains very fundamental elements representing some of the positions of all the parties directly concerned. This is the reason why we confidently commend its adoption to the Members of the Assembly. We firmly believe that this is the basis upon which the United Nations can act in this situation, and thus avoid the alternative of letting things drift aimlessly into an uncertain future.

30. Mr. SMITH (Canada): I am sure that Members of this Assembly by now have had time to study the draft resolution which the Canadian delegation is pleased to sponsor with the delegations of Colombia, Denmark, Liberia, Norway, Panama and Paraguay.

31. After the lucid presentation of this joint draft resolution by the representative of Norway—whom it has been an honour and a pleasure for me to cooperate closely during the past week—there is no need to attempt to analyse again the, that we could not attempt to analyse again the, that we could not
32. Along with Mr. Engen, I concede immediately that this draft resolution is not perfect, it is not ideal. It will probably be found entirely satisfactory or perfect to no country or grouping of countries. That is perhaps inevitable, but I do suggest that it is not necessarily a weakness when the objective of the draft resolution is a reconciliation of conflicting interests; for, if it were otherwise, there could be no common ground, no point of departure from which to seek conciliatory and compromise solutions which will safeguard the essential interests of all parties without requiring of any undue risk or sacrifice.

33. This draft resolution is designed, therefore, to serve as a point of departure and a basis of discussion, and we would hope that it would lead to further developments in two main areas where special support to it must be given, if the draft resolution is to achieve its purposes.

34. I speak first, very frankly, of the Arab States themselves, without whose positive and indeed active cooperation there can, of course, be no durable settlement of the problems of the Middle East. It may be that some of the Arab countries have their difficulties with this draft resolution, some parts of which may seem to fall short of what they may believe they have a right to expect. But we earnestly hope that they will weigh the merits of the draft resolution as a whole and find in it not an impediment to evolution, but a new basis for harmony, prosperity and growth in the Middle East.

35. But regional support by itself cannot resolve issues which, as recent events have shown, can have repercussions extending far beyond the Middle East. Complementary to the cooperation of the countries of the area, and not necessarily of secondary importance, is, therefore, the need for special recognition by the major Powers, including the Soviet Union, of the obligations which rest upon them as a consequence of their involvement in different ways in the affairs of the Middle East. Of course, every nation represented in this hall has an interest in seeing to it that the Middle East is not allowed to become a part of the world that endangers global security and peace. I now ask this question: would it not be reasonable to look to the four great Powers for at least their unanimous support of this draft resolution as a form of acknowledgement of the risks which can flow from any great Power confrontation in the Middle East, or perhaps for some more tangible expression of their common interest in pursuing policies of restraint in that troubled area?

36. It was precisely because my Government considered that a durable Middle East settlement required the active endorsement of the major Powers that we welcomed, some weeks ago, the original proposal for a meeting of the great Powers at a high level to deal with Middle East matters, and we welcomed the further proposal that these high-level talks should take place within the Security Council, where the responsibility under the Charter for matters affecting international peace and security properly belongs. Those early efforts had to be abandoned, but I for one believe that in the General Assembly today we have been given an equal or even better possibility of engaging great-Power support for a Middle East settlement through the joint endorsement on the part of the great Powers of whatever resolutions and action may flow from this emergency session. One might even be permitted to hope that, on the basis of a recognition of joint great-Power responsibility in a limited area such as the Middle East, it might be possible to develop a wider approach to other problems requiring four-Power agreement for their effective settlement, problems such as the testing and control of nuclear weapons and disarmament and such other topics fundamental to international peace and security concerning which preparatory discussions for talks at the summit have been proceeding now for many months.

37. I repeat, then, that, in my opinion, the active cooperation of all the Arab States and the identification of all the major Powers with the purposes underlying this draft resolution are essential underpinnings on which its successful fulfillment must be founded. That is not, however, to say that there does not rest upon all of us and, in particular, those with direct interests in the Middle East, a solemn obligation to exercise self-denial and restraint while our search for answers to the immediate needs of the current crisis and for a peaceful and prosperous pattern for that area in the future is in progress. The first responsibility of nations, both inside and outside the area, is to see to it that no word or deed of theirs precipitates a dangerous situation which could jeopardize the whole efforts of this Assembly. Any nation which failed to heed this warning, would bear a grave responsibility before the bar of world opinion.

38. Turning to parts II and III of this draft resolution to which Mr. Engen has referred, dealing respectively with the short- and long-term problems with which we are attempting to grapple, may I say first a word about the Secretary-General's role.

39. The fact that this Assembly is going about its tasks in a purposeful way, can, I think, be attributed in large measure to the Secretary-General's timely intervention on 8 August, at the opening meeting of the emergency special session, when he outlined in such broad and comprehensive terms the course which this Assembly could most usefully steer. In identifying what he described on that day as "basic needs for action in the region", the Secretary-General focused attention on the constructive purposes of the Assembly. He provided us with a cogent survey of the problems of the area which require urgent attention—a survey which has, in fact, guided the discussions here in large measure, from the outset of this session, along productive channels—and that is reflected in no small measure in the proposals embodied in the draft resolution before us. The nature of the Secretary-General's statement illustrated the ever-increasing burden of responsibilities which he has been called upon to assume in recent weeks, acting always within the broad powers which the Charter confers upon him. Because the United Nations is now being called upon to attempt an entirely new role in the maintenance of stability and peace in respect of a particular area, and because the Secretary-General symbolizes the authority of the United Nations, he will be asked, under this draft resolution, to take on even more responsibilities. The draft resolution seeks to strike a balance between the support and guidance which he must have from this Assembly in approaching his task, and the need to give him scope for consultation and effective action on his own initiative, as circumstances may require. None of us should underestimate the difficulties or delicacy of the tasks which we are asking him in this draft resolution to assume, but I am sure that I reflect a unanimous opinion when I express confidence in his unique qualifications to meet successfully this new challenge.

40. The intervention of the Secretary-General is in Lebanon and the whole withdrawal of the political we should realize that there is a formula to cover the statements of the great Powers of the United Nations, as the United States of America, the Soviet Union, and many other great Powers, have been asking for many weeks. But I would like to ask that the United Nations, as an organization, recognizes, and the international community, would welcome, an early date on which each great Power would be free to redemonstrate its support this Assembly in a manner acceptable to the great Powers, as a basis for a resolution of this Assembly.
The immediate issues with which the Secretary-General is being asked to deal, are those relating to Lebanon and Jordan where there is the matter of troop withdrawal to be faced, and which is not unrelated to the political future of those two countries. Perhaps we should recognize it as possible that this search for a formula which is thoroughly and universally satisfactory could greatly complicate the search for peaceful adjustments of situations that might contain a threat to peace. These are problems of policy for which our present canons of international law do not give adequate guidance.

43. Similarly, the way in which the succession to power in a State is effected, may have a profound impact on the structure and sense of security of neighbouring States. A sudden and violent change of régime in one country may have repercussions which may lead neighbouring States to feel that their external security is threatened. How can we work out a tolerable reconciliation between the principle, central to the whole conception of the United Nations, that each has the right to determine its political future, and the equally important consideration that no country should have the privilege of jeopardizing the peace and security of its neighbours? These considerations must both be taken into account in attempting to formulate an appropriate United Nations treatment of the problems which are before the Assembly.

44. In attempting such a reconciliation, it will help, I think, for us to recognize that not all the concepts of international law, or all the assumptions on which our Charter is based, are realized with equal fullness and precision in all parts of the world.

45. We in the British Commonwealth of Nations, for example, are independent sovereign countries, freely accepting the obligations which arise from our membership in the United Nations and in the international community. At the same time, we attach a high degree of importance to the special relationships, often very hard to define and delineate, which link us, one with another, in the Commonwealth connexion. We do not think of the other members of the Commonwealth as "foreign". There is a large body of opinion in each of our countries within the British Commonwealth which, I believe, resent and resist any suggestions which might come from other parts of the world that we should reduce our mutual relationships within the Commonwealth to the bare minimum that international law expects of the relationships between members of the international community.

46. I cite the Commonwealth example because I venture to suggest that we would do well to recognize that the members of the Arab region in the Middle East may feel that they too are in a special relationship with one another. Their relationship with one another may come under the heading of external affairs, but it is probably misleading to regard them as foreign affairs in the classical meaning which diplomacy gives the term. The relations among the Arab nations in the Middle East have been developing and evolving very rapidly. National sentiments and aspirations are rapidly taking political and constitutional shape in what, not so long ago, were the non-self governing parts of the British Commonwealth and Empire. In a sense, the emergence of new national governments in the Arab area represents a challenge to the imagination and sympathy of older and longer-established members of the international community.
somewhat the same way as the emergence of new Asian and African Commonwealth countries has represented a challenge to the sympathy, the understanding and the support of older members of our British Commonwealth.

47. It is for reasons like these that I should be doubtful of the wisdom of anyone attempting from the outside to prescribe and codify any very precise pattern for the relationships of the Arab countries inter se, or even for their individual or collective relationship to the countries that make up the rest of the world. The United Nations has, perhaps, a collective responsibility to show its sympathetic concern for the political evolution of the Arab countries, but even the United Nations cannot dictate the pace of that development or attempt to influence the political form that it may ultimately assume. What is important, particularly in this transitional stage, is that we should recognize that the pattern of economic and political relationships has not reached a settled equilibrium in the Middle East any more than it has reached an equilibrium in the British Commonwealth or, for that matter, in Western Europe, where economic, social and political forces are creating new systems of international and, in some cases, supra-national co-operation in forms whose ultimate shape none of us can foresee.

48. While these processes, all natural enough, perhaps even inevitable, are working themselves out, our chief responsibility in the United Nations is to see that our thinking and that our institutions should be sufficiently flexible and realistic to accommodate themselves to the facts of change. Changes will have to come, but they must come peacefully. This much the world has a right to expect, and all our efforts, either within this Organization or in fields of policy beyond it, should be directed to this task. This is in the common interest of all of us, whether we are members of the Warsaw Pact, of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or whether we belong to that group sometimes referred to as the uncommitted nations in the cold war. The whole world has ultimately a single interest in preventing the strains and stresses arising from rapid and unequal rates of development in these areas, from bringing us all into fatal collision.

49. I am on surer ground when I turn to the economic provisions of the draft resolution before us. Just as the unequal pace of political development in the Middle East has produced stresses in the relations among the States of the area, so also has the unequal distribution of economic resources had its impact on the rate of economic and social development in various parts of the Middle East. The invitation—that is what it is—to the Arab States to create for themselves, with the technical assistance available through the United Nations specialized agencies and other United Nations organizations, development institutions serving the interests of the region as a whole, is an attempt to make possible the lessening of the economic disparities between one part of the area and another.

50. The need for a regional approach of this nature was foreshadowed in the Secretary-General's able statement on 8 August, to which I have referred, and has already met with a quick and constructive response on the part of the United States Government. The proposals which President Eisenhower outlined on 13 August [733rd meeting] from this platform, could have far-reaching and beneficial consequences for the Middle East, and no one, I suggest, should underestimate the significance of the new policies which President Eisenhower thereby enunciated. The willingness of the United States to support materially and technically the kind of initiative envisaged by the Secretary-General to solve problems which have been a source of friction and an obstacle to progress in the Middle East for so long, is to be highly commended, as is the recognition on the part of the United Nations that it is through the United Nations that the means to carry out these proposals should be found. It is unfortunate that bilateral economic programmes which ought to have benefited this area, should often, in the past, have been spurned for political reasons, or have been the occasion for an intensification of political rivalries within the area and political rivalries between the great Powers. The Canadian Government, for its part, has already endorsed in principle the concept of a Middle Eastern economic development plan under United Nations auspices, and we would sincerely hope that the Arab States will themselves see the advantage of taking the initiative to implement the suggestions contained in paragraph 2 of section III of the draft resolution.

51. A further long-term project which will be carried a step further, if the present draft resolution receives the general support that it deserves, is that relating to the creation of a stand-by United Nations peace force. The Canadian Government's support, over many years, for the creation of such a force is a matter of record in this Assembly, and, as recently as in September 1957, when Prime Minister Diefenbaker addressed the opening meeting of the twelfth regular session [863rd meeting].

52. It is indeed an essential element in Canadian policy to accord high priority to the honouring of commitments to preserve the peace through United Nations action, and to provide the Organization with instrumentalities to accomplish its purposes. Canada welcomes a new, or perhaps I should say a renewed effort in the direction of a more permanent and workmanlike arrangement to meet the requirements of the United Nations in this regard. Our willingness to respond to specific United Nations requests has led to a long record of our service to the Organization of which Canada is justly proud.

53. Operations of the United Nations Emergency Force in Gaza have required the greatest numerical contribution on the part of Canada, but we have borne, with equal willingness, our share of responsibility in other United Nations peace efforts: in Kashmir, in the Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, and now in the Observation Group in Lebanon. It is no more than a coincidence that three of these efforts in which Canada has found itself involved under the aegis of the United Nations, are in the Middle East, a region in which we otherwise would have no more direct interest than that which flows from the normal cultural and commercial intercourse between nations. But, as a middle Power, we do, however, have a very direct interest in the preservation of international peace and the promotion of understanding among nations, and it is as a manifestation of that interest that Canada has men in the Middle East participating in the United Nations Emergency Force, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, and now in the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon.

54. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, at this emergency session of the General Assembly [734th meeting], has endorsed the suggestion that ...
gestion that a stand-by United Nations peace force should be created to make possible quick action in an emergency, and he has referred to the studies which the Secretary-General has been conducting. This important matter will require most careful study. The experience of the past has shown that United Nations proposals can involve a wide variety of types of service, none of which may offer an exact precedent for a permanent stand-by force. The further examination of alternative possibilities will be greatly assisted by the report which the Secretary-General will make to the General Assembly, at its thirteenth session, next month.

55. Although the immediate situation with which we are faced may perhaps not require the kind of action for which a stand-by force may be designed, it will give, I pray, renewed impetus towards the creation of such an instrumentality, an objective which was clearly in the minds of the authors of the Charter in 1945, and which we would do well to explore further at a moment when the role of the United Nations as a peace-preserving body is once more uppermost in our minds. Despite the darkness of this crisis, there are lessons to be learned from it; may we profit from them and let us not forget them.

56. There is a third long-term objective that we hope to see result directly or indirectly from our present deliberations. This objective is not to be found in the draft resolution. I refer to Canada's hope that there could be laid a network of interlocking non-aggression agreements in the Middle East region, which could guarantee the independence and the integrity of each and all of the States of the area, and thus provide a solid basis for the economic and other constructive proposals which are within the grasp of the States of that area, if this draft resolution accomplishes the objectives which we and the other co-sponsors have in mind.

57. I have spoken about the results which we are confident would flow from individual parts of the draft resolution, but I would revert to the thought that I expressed earlier, that the draft resolution be assessed as a comprehensive approach which attempts to reconcile widely divergent points of view. It deserves careful study, for it points the way to constructive action through and by the United Nations.

58. The draft resolution does not attempt to apportion responsibility for the past in relation to the problems of the Middle East. It does not invite the Assembly to commend or condemn the national policies that any of us has pursued. It asks us all to recognize the situation that exists de facto, and outlines a course of action which, if we all pursued it scrupulously, could lead us out of that situation. It requires good will and restraint, and it will require the best efforts of the Secretary-General, on whose shoulders we have perforce to place so heavy a load.

59. It is our hope, in commending this draft resolution to the Assembly, that every one of us will find it possible to endorse it. This, I believe, is a moment in the history of the United Nations where a conventional majority is not enough. In the minds of some, this may not be a perfectly balanced draft resolution, but time does not always work on the side of peace. It is important to make a beginning, and a beginning in the right direction. If we could all—and I address this argument directly to the members of the Soviet delegation—vote for this draft resolution, we would have made a start—a transforming start—in the slow process of bringing order and mutual respect into our several approaches to the questions relating to the Middle East. This emergency session of the General Assembly would thus make a great, a unique, contribution towards the foundation of peace in an area from which war could all too easily come.

60. I am not saying this by way of winding up my remarks, but I say it very seriously and with deep feeling. Humanity today awaits our decisions. Will we fail humanity?

61. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (translated from Spanish): The United Nations was founded on the assumption that complete harmony and co-operation would prevail among the great Powers. Unfortunately, the signatures on the Charter were not yet dry when this assumption was gravely undermined. And yet, in spite of that, a true miracle has occurred. The United Nations has performed its function. In the atmosphere of faith in justice and peace which it created, war-ravaged Europe has, with the generous help of the United States and through its own efforts, achieved a remarkable recovery. Greece and Turkey have revived, and in this same atmosphere of hope we have witnessed the splendid recovery of Germany, Italy and Japan.

62. In spite of the disagreement among the great Powers, the United Nations—and this is a truly extraordinary fact in the history of mankind—has surrounded such grave crises as the Berlin blockade, Korea, and Suez. Before that, it solved the seemingly insoluble problem which attended its creation: that of achieving universality, which was absolutely necessary if we were to speak with complete authority and in the name of all mankind.

63. This brief historical sketch, which I have felt it useful to present, even though it is familiar to all of us, enables me to begin my speech with words of faith and hope. But we have another reason for faith: the Charter. The United Nations Charter, so far as it concerns measures for the pacific settlement of disputes, is a document of profound wisdom. The Charter has imposed a tremendous responsibility upon us, for it has provided us with all the means for achieving peace. Perhaps we have difficulty in taking enforcement measures; it is true that we lack certain machinery. The Security Council has not functioned well or has been unable to function. With regard to the maintenance of peace, however, the powers of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and of the General Assembly when the Security Council is unable to act, are so broad that we cannot evade the performance of this task without assuming a tremendous responsibility before mankind and before history.

64. Indeed, there are no limitations on those powers. Apart from the provision stating that recourse must be had to the means specifically agreed upon by the parties, which must take precedence inasmuch as the will of the parties is sovereign, there are no limitations on the pacific settlement of disputes. There is no limitation with regard to subject-matter, for both disputes and situations are submitted to us, and every problem is either a dispute or a situation. There is no limitation with regard to time, for the Charter clearly states that, at any stage of a dispute or situation, we may examine it in the Security Council and, hence, in the General Assembly. Finally, there is no limitation with regard to the means that may be employed. Article 37, which vests powers in the Security Council—powers which may be transferred to the
General Assembly when an emergency session has been convened—authorizes us to adopt a resolution. But Article 36 has even broader scope. If we are unable to adopt a resolution, we may recommend procedures or methods of adjustment, i.e., a compromise, a means of bringing the opposing points of view closer together, a solution which, at all events, ensures the maintenance of peace. We must therefore ponder, before voting for any draft resolution, the tremendous responsibility of the Members of the United Nations to find, at all costs, a peaceful solution of these problems. That has been the spirit of the Charter. That is also the spirit which has prevailed in Europe in spite of the conflict among the great Powers.

65. At this point, I should like to recall a statement by Disraeli, which, if I remember correctly, was made on 9 February 1876 in the House of Commons. Observing that the world was subjected to continuous changes, Disraeli declared that transactions and compromise must be accepted, the rights of others respected and reconciled with one’s own assertions, and problems must be settled by peaceful means. If, then, a great British Prime Minister and leader of the Conservative Party said in 1876 that it was necessary to respect the rights of others, to try to reconcile them with one’s own rights, to accept compromise or adjustment, as our Charter states, and solve all problems by peaceful means, then today, more than eighty years later, we must surely follow the same principle, which not only is in keeping with the generous spirit of all the peoples of the earth but is the legal and binding obligation imposed by the Charter.

66. However, I am aware that, in spite of the great prestige of the United Nations and the broad powers conferred by the Charter, we face today an exceedingly grave problem. This problem cannot be viewed merely in its own terms but must be viewed against the background which explains it, in its larger context and surrounding atmosphere. In my opinion, it would be a mistake to try to employ diplomacy, history, or sociology the method which is possible in the mathematical sciences and even in philosophy, and which consists in isolating the various factors of a problem and considering it purely in a specific situation and from a specific point of view. This method is impossible in international affairs.

67. The problem of the Middle East does have its own special aspects. We are well aware that complex economic questions remain after the liquidation of the old spheres of influence. These are obviously the legacy of the old colonialist policies. However, these are not the only questions existing in the Middle East. We must bear in mind that today, more than ever, all international problems are related. We are living today in an era of international tension, in a situation that is far graver than those which prevailed in earlier days, when there were periods of stability in which favourable conditions could be created for the solution of problems, when, in any event, there was some limit to the elements which could be employed in the struggle between the political forces, the struggle for power, the conflict among the great Powers. There were factors then which made it possible to calculate the risks or, at least, estimate them.

68. In recent years, whether because a striving for power has encountered a spirit of resistance, or because of an arms race caused by mutual distrust, or because of attempts to achieve a psychological ascendancy which would make it possible to gain the fruits of a victorious war without having fought one, or perhaps because of all these factors, mankind has been living in a state of acute anxiety.

69. We are not merely living in an atomic age, for the word “atomic” has been replaced by the word “nuclear”. It would be more accurate to say that we are living in a “nuclear-ballistic” age which is fraught with the greatest dangers. Mankind is truly living in an age of anxiety. Our daily life sees a constant threat to the lives of our extreme peril, and world events quickly bring this agonizing consciousness to us. It is in this awareness and with this tragic sense of reality that we must view the problem of the Middle East. Certain aspects of the problem can be explained only by the existence of these dark forces which today weigh upon mankind, by the fact that we live in danger of extinction, that the very existence of human civilization and life is threatened.

70. Now, however, I wish to turn to the practical aspects of the problem. We are dealing with a problem which consists in precisely the interest of the Middle East region, and the Arab countries in particular. I wish to state at this point that a close bond exists between the Latin American countries and the new nations of Africa and Asia. I have said so before from this rostrum, and the sincerity of my words is attested by the fact that they were spoken on earlier occasions than this one. Whereas the nineteenth century was marked by the emergence of the Latin American countries, the twentieth century is marked by the emergence of new nations in that part of the world where human civilization was born. We have a feeling of solidarity with those peoples and, particularly, with the Arab countries. Yesterday, we heard the magnificent speech in which the representative of Spain, full of wisdom and eloquence, described this intimate bond between Spanish and Arabic civilization. In our own America, there are still vestiges of what might be called Arab influence: the Moorish balconies which are found in some Latin American capitals, principally that of Peru, and perhaps the veil worn by our women. How many aspects there are to this, quite apart from the Arab peoples’ contributions to the civilization, we heard extolled here in the highly authoritative words of the President of the United States.

71. Thus, there is a close bond between these countries and ourselves. In addition to this sentimental tie, however, we have an even closer feeling of solidarity. What is it that these countries desire? Freedom and independence, complete self-government, which is what we ourselves need, what we desire, what we have fought for and shall go on fighting for. What is it that they need? First of all, development based on work, and, secondly, peace. A programme of freedom, work, and peace has created a indispensable, sacred bond between the countries of Africa and Asia of the Old World and the young democracies of the New World.

72. Consequently, any problem that affects them affects us as well. Any legitimate aspiration of theirs must be viewed with sympathy and understanding. It has been stated here—without dissent—that the powerful movement of Arab nationalism must be respected. Nationalism is one of the great dynamic forces of history. It might be said that modern history, which begins with the American and French Revolutions, is the age of nationalism. The entire history of nineteenth-century Europe revolves around nationalism. Our own history is one of nationalism.

73. In the New World, independence and the principle of self-determination are expressed in the same coin. In Spanish and Latin countries, the idea of integrating towards self-determination based on national identity, the meaning of this idea is something about which we have long discussed and which we must accept. The question is not merely a political question. It is a moral question as well. How well we respect this principle of nationalism, and to what extent, is in keeping with the principles of the Charter. Mankind is truly living in an age of anxiety. Our daily life sees a constant threat to the lives of our extreme peril, and world events quickly bring this agonizing consciousness to us. It is in this awareness and with this tragic sense of reality that we must view the problem of the Middle East. Certain aspects of the problem can be explained only by the existence of these dark forces which today weigh upon mankind, by the fact that we live in danger of extinction, that the very existence of human civilization and life is threatened.

74. We, in Latin America, are aware of our own rights, to accept compromise or adjustment. We are aware that the development of self-determination and that of non-interference are not in opposition but are closely related to each other. They are two sides of the same coin. Any attempt to stifle the movement of Arab nationalism within the Arab countries without considering it in the broader context of the world situation, is in direct contradiction with the principles of the Charter. That is also the spirit which was expressed by Disraeli when he said: We have a feeling of solidarity with those peoples and, particularly, with the Arab countries. Yesterday, we heard the magnificent speech in which the representative of Spain, full of wisdom and eloquence, described this intimate bond between Spanish and Arabic civilization. In our own America, there are still vestiges of what might be called Arab influence: the Moorish balconies which are found in some Latin American capitals, principally that of Peru, and perhaps the veil worn by our women. How many aspects there are to this, quite apart from the Arab peoples’ contributions to the civilization, we heard extolled here in the highly authoritative words of the President of the United States.

75. These are the reasons why we can offer a solution to the problem of the Middle East. We wish to state at this point that a close bond exists between the Latin American countries and the new nations of Africa and Asia. I have said so before from this rostrum, and the sincerity of my words is attested by the fact that they were spoken on earlier occasions than this one. Whereas the nineteenth century was marked by the emergence of the Latin American countries, the twentieth century is marked by the emergence of new nations in that part of the world where human civilization was born. We have a feeling of solidarity with those peoples and, particularly, with the Arab countries. Yesterday, we heard the magnificent speech in which the representative of Spain, full of wisdom and eloquence, described this intimate bond between Spanish and Arabic civilization. In our own America, there are still vestiges of what might be called Arab influence: the Moorish balconies which are found in some Latin American capitals, principally that of Peru, and perhaps the veil worn by our women. How many aspects there are to this, quite apart from the Arab peoples’ contributions to the civilization, we heard extolled here in the highly authoritative words of the President of the United States.

76. As far as the question of the Middle East is concerned, the meaning of the moral authority of the United Nations must be free. Lastly,
is one of nationalism. Our freedom is a product of our nationalist sentiments. Thus, when nationalists and nationalism are being discussed, Latin America is the thing to say, because, for the emergence of nations in Europe was, as the professors of law would say, extra-legal, whereas in America nations arose on the basis of certain legal standards, on the basis of the legal principle of self-determination.

73. In the New World, this principle determined the independence and establishment of nations. While in North America the process has been one of integration, in Spanish or Latin America it has been one tending towards self-determination, to differentiation of the various national identities. Necessarily, therefore, we know something about nationalism. We know perfectly well how respectable Arab nationalism is, but we also know that nationalism operates and moves within certain principles. America has contributed two great principles to the development of a universal law: the principle of self-determination in the establishment of nations and that of non-intervention in their development. These principles are complementary, they are the two sides of the same coin. Any nationalist movement, whether it is directed towards integration or whether, inspired by a respectable group feeling, it tends towards differentiation, towards the creation of new national entities, must act spontaneously, from purely internal motives, involving none but internal factors and no material foreign influence. Spontaneous nationalism is respected because they are intangible and uncontrollable and must be exerted in accordance with the principle of non-intervention.

74. We, in Latin America, studied the question of intervention at the Ninth Conference of American States held at Bogotá in 1948, and succeeded in defining the personality of the State, which should be respected not only with regard to its territory, its economic structure and its political institutions, but also in regard to its cultural features. Such delicate respect, such an attitude of absolute respect is a prerequisite of what we might term the fulfillment of nationalism. We have therefore been gratified to see that from all groups represented at the General Assembly sessions there has been moved to assert that no one can contest the right of the Arab countries to integrate themselves by peaceful means, with due respect for the national features and the special personality of those sectors or nations which may wish to retain their own identity within a higher association integrated either from an economic point of view or from a point of view of international policy.

75. These are the problems facing us. What solution can we offer? Of course, there are, as I have said, underlying factors. What can we do beyond simply wishing for international tension to disappear? We can use this emergency special session of the General Assembly to address a sincere appeal to the great Powers that they should at once set up legal machinery to control armaments and substitute a policy of co-operation for one of armament rivalry.

76. As far as the problem itself is concerned, there is no better solution than the presence of the United Nations in the Middle East. We must clearly define the meaning of this presence. It represents solely a moral authority offensive to no one. The advantage of a moral authority is that it does not detract from anyone's dignity or restrict anyone's freedom; that it is a means of exploration, of negotiation; and negotiation must be free. Lastly, it is an agency for economic aid.
no less than offer high praise for both the Secretary-General’s plan [73rd meeting] and the admirable words spoken by President Eisenhower from this rostrum [73rd meeting].

84. We cannot disregard the economic aspect, because, without being Marxists, we must admit that many aspects of human life are related to and depend entirely on that factor. Economic difficulties, however, is merely a likeness, a reflection, a symbol of something more valuable: spiritual co-operation and understanding, which constitute the true foundation of peace. Briefly, therefore, I believe that this programme provides the basis for a draft resolution such as that submitted jointly by Norway, some Latin American countries, Canada and other Powers [A/3879].

85. It is our duty to find a way out of the present difficult situation, perhaps the gravest that we have yet come to, which may be the cross-roads in the history of the United Nations. I ask in fear and trembling, even in terror: what would happen if the United Nations does not adopt a resolution, if failure in the Security Council is followed by failure in this Assembly when the eyes of humanity and the hopes of all are focused upon it? what would be our situation if a resolution were approved with less than a two-thirds majority, or with a bare majority, which would mean that there is no real possibility of co-operation and joint effort?

86. So many interesting speeches have been made and, with a few exceptions, the debate has maintained the level which the President expected and recommended to us. There is in all of us the will to do what is right and an ardent desire for peace; we have an irrevocable mandate from humanity to find a solution, and I cannot, therefore, resign myself to the possibility that we may not find it.

87. I cannot resign myself to that thought and I believe that, with the co-operation of all concerned and making use of all the elements at our disposal—first and foremost the Charter, which is imperative, categorical and binding, the plan outlined by the Secretary-General, the admirable speech made by President Eisenhower, and all the plans and suggestions which have been made here, including even the last part of the Soviet draft resolution, which recognizes the jurisdiction of the United Nations—we may find an agreed solution such as that proposed by Norway and the other co-sponsors of the draft resolution. The solution will not be a perfect one, but there is a wise old proverb which says that the better is the enemy of the good and that theoretical perfection is often incompatible with that perfection which we are compelled to seek: the possible and the practical.

88. I represent a country which has behind it a long juridical tradition, one going back over a thousand years—because I include not only our Spanish culture but also the admirable Inca and pre-Inca cultures. I belong to a group of people who have lived and wish to live under the sign of freedom, justice and peace, and I wish to make an appeal to all countries, without exception. Let us wind up this emergency special session of the General Assembly with a further triumph for the United Nations which will represent a further triumph for the cause of humanity.

89. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) [translated from Russian]: This emergency special session of the General Assembly has been convened at the proposal of the Soviet Union to consider the present situation in the Near and Middle East caused by the intervention of the United States in Lebanon and of the United Kingdom in Jordan, and to seek solutions which will prevent the situation from deteriorating and help to safeguard security in that region of the world.

90. It is quite obvious to the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic that our duty at the present session is to put an end to the aggressive actions of the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near and Middle East and to secure the withdrawal of their forces from Lebanon and Jordan. Hence Mr. Lloyd’s contention that the purpose of the present emergency session is to consider the complaints of Lebanon and Jordan is strange, to say the least. Those present here are well aware that, if the world is apathetic, it is not because the stormy gusts of revolution—set in motion by purely internal processes—have swept away the corrupt former régime in Iraq. Millions of people are still deeply concerned not because social and political forces have been mobilized in Lebanon for the purpose of solving that country’s own problems, but because the United States and the United Kingdom have invaded Lebanon and Jordan with their armed forces and have thus brought the world to the brink of a military catastrophe.

91. Hence, there is no justification for obscuring the basic question with which the General Assembly, at its emergency special session, is confronted. The United Nations cannot under any circumstances conceal the fact that there has been armed intervention in the Near and Middle East and blatant interference in the domestic affairs of two small Arab States. We are here not to endorse aggression but to oppose it. The United States and the United Kingdom, by committing flagrant armed intervention in Lebanon and Jordan, have violated the United Nations Charter which calls upon States to “refrain . . . from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State” [Art. 2, para. 4]. They have also violated General Assembly resolution 1236 (XII) concerning peaceful and neighbourly relations among States. In addition to defining other important principles of peaceful coexistence, this resolution, adopted unanimously, calls upon States to show mutual respect for each other’s sovereignty, equality and territorial integrity and to refrain from intervention in one another’s internal affairs.

92. The events in the Near and Middle East which now confront the United Nations are not completely unrelated to disturbing events of the recent past. The aggressive attack upon Egypt in 1956, the military campaign prepared against Syria in 1957 and the present intervention in Lebanon and Jordan are part of one and the same policy of suppressing the national liberation movement. That very aim is frankly stated in the notorious “Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine” and the military Baghdad Pact. These are facts we cannot forget, even though there are some who, for understandable reasons, do not at present bear them in mind. The causes of the extreme aggression must be sought, not in the far-reaching and natural internal processes which are occurring in the countries of the Arab East, but in the attempts by the colonial Powers to thwart the invincible desire of the peoples for a change in their old way of life, and thus to preserve their dominant position in these countries and retain the possibility of extracting oil and other resources from the area.

93. We are living, the national liberation of colonialism from the Nile floods quench the old thirst of the peoples. Thus the Revolutionary State, was born, and unity and truth and public emerge as the unum of the Arab system, is collapsing, the imperialistic circles merely those who be the North Atlantic East Asia Collective designed to preserve freedom of peoples, in order to retain the United States and the other western countries, like small and large, to become, coupled with privileges, are drawn most reckless advent powerful United States oil reserves of the pipe-line was rightly stated by the Arabian delegation [the national wealth and legitimate desire to the United States for the revenue which was mined on the revenue].

94. The oil monop of the United States for the East, nevertheless of a relationship with the United States, the Arab population, upon satisfaction of their right to freedom, the United States itself defend the interests of the United States by force of arms.

95. In this connexion, made by Senator Kefauver on 1 March in Dulles-Eisenhower referred. He said that Mr. L. national intervention in the Middle East which might be the purpose of protecting the French of some of the warning was confirmed by the informed as Senator.

96. Having played States of America in the States there is no escape, to conceal it. United Arab have accomplished fact. The monop of some of the inhabitants and Jordan, and, for maintaining the inhabitants.
93. We are living in an age when the flood tide of the national liberation movement is erasing the shame of colonialism from the face of the earth. Just as the Nile floods quench the thirst of the fields, so does this flood, in the words of Arab patriots, quench the age-old thirst of the people for national freedom and independence. Thus the Republic of India, that great Eastern State, was born, thus did Indonesia gain its freedom and unity and thus, finally, did the United Arab Republic emerge as the living embodiment of the idea of the unity of the Arab nation. The world-wide colonial system is collapsing before our very eyes. That is why the imperialistic circles of certain western powers, particularly those whose interests are directly involved, are resorting to every possible device in order to retain their privileges.

94. The economic advantages which the monopolies of the United States, the United Kingdom and certain other western countries have derived by plundering the wealth of small and economically under-developed countries, coupled with their reluctance to forego their privileges, are driving the western countries into the most reckless adventures. It is common knowledge that powerful United States monopolies own over half the oil reserves of the Near East. Fabulous profits flow through the pipe-lines into their coffers. However, as was rightly stated by Mr. Shukairy, head of the Saudi Arabian delegation [736th meeting], Arab oil constitutes the national wealth of the Arab States. Does their just and legitimate desire that this oil should in the first instance benefit the Arabs themselves create a threat to the United States farmer? Are the Arabs cutting into the revenue which the United States can and does obtain from mining its own oil? Of course not.

95. The oil monopolies which determine the trend of United States foreign policy in the Near and Middle East nevertheless completely rule out the possibility of a relationship with the Arab countries based on equality. When the Arab peoples insist, in one form or another, upon satisfaction of their aspirations and upon recognition of their right to attempt to solve their problems themselves, the United States and the United Kingdom defend the interests of their monopolies and their puppets by force of arms.

96. In this connexion, it is useful to recall the statement made by Senator Kefauver in the United States Congress on 1 March 1957, during the consideration of the "Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine" to which I have already referred. He said on that occasion that it had been indicated that Mr. Dulles wanted to bring about international intervention (referring, of course, to the Near East) which might include going to war simply for the purpose of protecting the enormous profits and holdings of some of the international oil companies. This warning was confirmed sooner than could have been foreseen even by a United States politician so well-informed as Senator Kefauver.

97. Having played at anti-colonialism, the United States of America is now openly defending colonialism. There is no escaping this reality and no "plans" can conceal it. United States intervention has become an accomplished fact. The armed forces of the interventionists have invaded the territory of Lebanon and Jordan and, for more than a month now, have been keeping the inhabitants of these two Arab States covered by the muzzle of their guns. Although there has been more than enough time to take steps to put an end to aggression, the United Nations organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace, namely the Security Council, because of its present composition and the position taken by the Governments of the States which have committed armed aggression, has proved incapable of discharging its duty to maintain peace and to remove the danger of a military conflict. Can it be that the General Assembly, too, will be unable to make a useful contribution towards ending the intervention? 98. We are told that, had the Security Council not rejected the resolutions submitted by the United States [S/4058/Rev.1] and the Government of Japan [S/4055/Rev.1] the United States forces would have already been withdrawn. This slick formula cannot mislead anyone, because it is contrary to the facts and reflects the wide gulf between United States words and deeds.

As we know, the Security Council decided [825th meeting] to despatch observers, who proceeded to discharge their duty of ensuring that there is no illegal infiltration of personnel or supply of arms or other matériel across the Lebanese borders. These observers found that there was no infiltration and no intervention by some Arab States in the affairs of others. But Mr. Dulles, speaking yesterday before the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, said again that there was such infiltration and that indirect aggression of some kind was taking place.

99. Whom are we to believe here—the impartial United Nations observers who are in Lebanon or Mr. Dulles who claims in New York that he has a better view of what is happening in Lebanon from the other side of the ocean? No, in this case we shall believe the United Nations observers, not Mr. Dulles.

100. The Security Council has not determined the existence of a threat to international peace. This threat arose after the United States committed armed intervention in Lebanon. The purpose of the United States draft resolution submitted to the Security Council on 15 July 1958 [829th meeting] was to obtain the cover and sanction of the United Nations' name and authority for this intervention.

101. A somewhat paradoxical situation has arisen: the United States has engaged in intervention and now seeks to justify the presence of its troops in Lebanon on the ground that the Security Council rejected its resolution which would, in effect, have sanctioned the military invasion.

102. We have heard statements from this rostrum minimizing the degree of tension in the Near East. Moreover, some speakers virtually describe the invasion of Lebanon and Jordan by United States and United Kingdom forces as a righteous peace move. However, it is obvious to all who do not wish to close their eyes to what is actually happening in that region that the United States and United Kingdom troops sent to Lebanon and Jordan have created a situation in which the advocates of a brink of war policy already have one foot over that dangerous brink.

103. History teaches us that great wars begin with attacks on small States. Can we accept this state of affairs? No, we cannot. There is absolutely no justification for the action of the United States and the United Kingdom. If we are genuinely concerned to remove the threat of a world conflict, we must not accept a situation in which aggressors achieve their objectives by force nor take the line of appeasing those guilty of a
breach of the peace. Only the immediate withdrawal of the aggressors' troops from Lebanon and Jordan will reduce tension and restore conditions to normal in the Near East and throughout the world.

104. Reports are being circulated to the effect that the United States Department of Defense intends to withdraw another battalion of marines from Lebanon. But to where will they be withdrawn? They are to be transferred to United States warships in Lebanese waters. The United Kingdom Government resolved to similar tactics towards the end of November 1956, when it announced the withdrawal of a battalion of troops from Egypt. The withdrawal of the United Kingdom battalion was represented as a symbol of United Kingdom virtue by the zealous champions of the Atlantic policy and was used for discreditable manoeuvres in the General Assembly against the immediate and complete withdrawal of all the aggressor's troops from Egypt.

105. An amazing coincidence of tactics! But is the General Assembly meeting in order to be misled by such tactics? What is expected of the General Assembly at this time? In the first place, a decision calling for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan. Once this is done, we can consider other matters.

106. A Soviet draft resolution [A/3870 and Corr.1] has been submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration. Under it, the General Assembly would recommend the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom to withdraw their troops from the territory of Lebanon and Jordan without delay, and instruct the Secretary-General to strengthen the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon and to send an observation group to Jordan with a view to the supervision of the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops, and of the situation along the frontiers of those countries.

107. The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic fully endorses and supports the constructive Soviet proposals in the draft resolution. It is convinced that adoption and implementation of the Soviet Union's proposals would remove the danger to peace in that region, put an end to actions which violate the United Nations Charter, and increase the peoples' confidence in the United Nations as an instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security. Furthermore, implementation of the Soviet proposal for the withdrawal of troops is a first and essential condition for the settlement of other Near and Middle Eastern problems on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence and in accordance with the national interests of the peoples of the Near Eastern countries. Without a settlement of the question of the immediate withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan, it is useless to think in terms of stabilizing the situation in the Near and Middle East and of settling Near Eastern problems in conformity with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter.

108. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is guided by these considerations in assessing the plan outlined in the statement made by the President of the United States. What strikes us first about this plan is that, while it claims to lay the foundations for a great new prosperous era of Arab history, it makes no reference to the withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan. It would seem that the United States wants to found a new era of Arab history on the bayonets of the United States marines.

109. While this is not the time to consider general plans relating to Near Eastern problems, since to do so would be to divert the emergency special session of the General Assembly from its primary task, we must refer to the proposal for the creation of a stand-by United Nations peace force.

110. The argument used in support of the need to set up a special United Nations armed force does not hold water. Those who, like the United States representatives, try to attribute the development of tension in the Near and Middle East to the existence of some kind of indirect aggression are distorting the real state of affairs. I need hardly say, to further their own ends.

111. The threat to peace and security in the Near and Middle East does not arise from the desire of the Arabs to be masters in their own house or their desire to control their own wealth, but from interference by the United States and the United Kingdom in their domestic affairs. If you, gentlemen, desist from interfering in Arab affairs, you will soon see how well they will settle their domestic affairs and solve their domestic problems, both in their own interests and in those of the whole world.

112. Attempts to replace United States and United Kingdom intervention by United Nations intervention are also useless. No self-respecting people will allow itself to be defiled by the title "stand-by United Nations Peace Force". Such a force is a screen for one thing only, namely, the desire of certain circles in the United States and the United Kingdom to keep the peoples of the Arab countries dependent on them. What will this force do in these countries? Against whom is it to be stationed there? Perhaps it is to defend the Arabs against Israel? Of course not. The intention is, with the help of this United Nations police force, to bring in through the back door what could not be brought in through the front. In other words, the way is being cleared for the "Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine".

113. The United Nations is an international organization for the defence of peace, not a body for the suppression of the freedom and independence of peoples. If we take the course proposed here by the United States of America, the United Nations will be turned into an instrument of aggression. This must not happen. But that is precisely how the function of a special United Nations armed force is interpreted by Mr. Dulles, the Secretary of State of the United States, who said at his news conference on 31 July 1958 that there ought to be a standing group of the United Nations which could go to any place which felt itself endangered by indirect aggression and throw a kind of mantle of security around it. Today this force is being used in the East, tomorrow it will be used against the countries of Latin America, and the day after tomorrow Mr. Dulles will begin to settle the affairs of the United Kingdom and France themselves.

114. We cannot support those who are impelling the United Nations into a course which will be fatal to itself. It is not the introduction of any new troops, even though they might be United Nations troops, but the withdrawal, and only the withdrawal, of all foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan that is the first and most important condition for restoring the situation to normal in the Near and Middle East.

115. By juggling with the concept of indirect aggression, the United States and United Kingdom representatives to the General Assembly are taking the at-
119. Small countries have equal rights with others. They make their contribution to the maintenance of peace. Their line of conduct must not be dictated to them; they must be treated as equals. They must not be subjected to dictatorship by the United States and United Kingdom oil monopolies.

120. Another draft resolution on the question before the General Assembly has been submitted for our consideration. I am referring to the draft resolution which Norway and several other countries submitted to the Assembly today [A/3877].

121. In our delegation’s opinion, this draft resolution bypasses the main question which this emergency special session of the General Assembly has been convened to discuss. The very name of the resolution implies that it has been convened to discuss an urgent problem. The possibility of war in the Near and Middle East must be averted. This can be done by withdrawing United States and United Kingdom forces. But this draft resolution contains no recommendation for the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom forces from Lebanon and Jordan. Moreover, its second preambular paragraph proposes that the Assembly should note the letters of the United States of America [A/3876] and the United Kingdom [A/3877] addressed to the President of the General Assembly, and thus indirectly endorses the motives for the intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near East.

122. The draft resolution is nothing more than a slightly reworded version of proposals which have already been discussed. In the draft resolution, it states that the United Nations are being used against other countries and, in particular, against the states of the Arab East. This may be illustrated by the generally known fact that the close ties between the conspirators who were preparing a coup d’Etat in Syria in 1957, and the relevant Government agencies of the United States.

123. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, therefore, considers the joint draft resolution unacceptable and will vote against it.

124. The Ukrainian people and the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, being concerned at the situation that has arisen in the Arab East, strongly urge that those who are prepared to gamble with the future of millions of human beings in order to achieve their covetous aims should be made to see reason.

125. Our delegation, therefore, supports the proposals of the Soviet Union, the purpose of which is to seek for solutions capable of leading to a relaxation of tension in the Near and Middle East in the interests of the preservation of world peace.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.