



Wednesday, 20 August 1958,
at 8.30 p.m.

THIRD EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

New York

C O N T E N T S

Page

Agenda item 5:

Questions considered by the Security Council at its
838th meeting on 7 August 1958 (*continued*)..... 143

President: Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).

AGENDA ITEM 5

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

1. Mr. EBAN (Israel): The Security Council has called the General Assembly into emergency special session to discuss two questions on which it has failed to reach a conclusion [A/3866]. These items, which now form the agenda of the General Assembly, consist of complaints by Lebanon and Jordan charging intervention in their internal affairs, "the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security".
2. On 14 July 1958, Lebanon invited the United States to station forces on its territory to help maintain its independence and integrity. On 16 July, Jordan made a similar request to the United Kingdom. The United States and the United Kingdom responded to these calls.
3. For many weeks, while these events were under review in the Security Council, we maintained a total reticence. The disorders in Lebanon and the peril of Jordan had arisen in the context of relations between Arab States. The representatives of Lebanon and Jordan have told the United Nations where they believe the causes of these disputes to lie. But today we are called upon to make our voice heard. We have a part in the burden of judgement which falls collectively upon the eighty-one Member States, who are custodians of the United Nations Charter and sentinels of world peace. Nor is this the full extent of Israel's concern. We are neighbours of the two States whose anguish and turmoil lie in the centre of the Middle Eastern crisis today. With each of them we share a common frontier. If their independence and integrity were diminished, ours would be gravely imperilled. Moreover, we believe that our own experience in relation to the forces pressing upon them gives us a special insight into the origins of their present ordeal.
4. The discussions in the General Assembly have raised a question of international law, the general importance of which transcends its specific application in the present case. The competence of States to seek and offer assistance to each other is inherent in their sovereignty. This right has always been an axiom of international law and a crucial element in the security of small na-

tions. Collective security is based on the right of States to enlist the support of other States to repel aggression when it has occurred or to deter it before it is launched. In many parts of the world, including both western Europe and eastern Europe today, agreements exist and arrangements are in force which are based on the right of a government to invite the armed forces of another government to help strengthen its capacity of defence. Except when there has been evidence of coercion or infringement of international agreements, or a threat to the integrity of other States, it has never been assumed that such arrangements are subject to criticism by other Governments or by the United Nations.

5. More is at stake here than a basic premise of international law. Freedom-loving nations owe themselves and each other the moral obligation to become as effective as possible in protecting their security by their own independent strength. But if they were to lose the right of receiving assistance from outside, small nations would live by the grace and mercy of more powerful States, near or far.

6. Every small State represented here will doubtless ponder its course with care before accepting any doctrine which would deny the legitimacy of a collective concept in maintaining the security of nations.

7. The discussion initiated by Lebanon and Jordan has called attention to the broader problem of inter-State relations in the Middle East. Swift and profound changes have come over the life of this region. After centuries of subjection to foreign rule the Middle East has won a great inheritance of political freedom. The region is now almost totally composed of peoples who have gained or restored or completed their sovereignty within the past few decades. The Arab peoples have been the chief beneficiaries of this emancipation. Six independent Arab States are established in the central core of the Middle East; and four new Arabic-speaking sovereignties in Africa have been admitted into our membership by unanimous consent within the past two years. These manifold sovereignties comprise a vast expanse of territory and a great aggregate of natural resources, full of promise for future abundance and progress. Never in history have the Arab peoples commanded such potentialities of freedom and opportunity as those which now lie within their grasp. There is not one Member of the United Nations—not one—who does not wish them well in the cultivation and advancement of their liberated domain. The opportunities of today are enriched by the memories of yesterday, for a long historic tradition and a proud cultural legacy are amongst the assets which Arab nationalism carries with it into its future. In a world in which few men and few nations achieve their total ambition, the Arab peoples must, in any objective judgement, be deemed to have prospered greatly in the historic evolution of the last few decades.

8. It is not for others to determine the ultimate relationship between the independent Arab peoples. The issues

of union or separatism are not new in the history of this area. The scholars of Middle Eastern history have long observed two tendencies at work—the one making for centralization and union, the other emphasizing regional differences, decentralization, diversity and separatism. The tension between these two forces has determined a great part of Middle Eastern history, and it is doubtful if it will soon be resolved by any clear-cut single formula.

9. The circumstance which gives others a duty to concern themselves with this problem is that to which the representative of New Zealand has referred [*737th meeting*], namely, that despite their cultural and linguistic unity the Arab States are organized as separate sovereignties within the United Nations. This means that their relations with each other are governed by the rights and obligations, the disciplines and restraints, which prevail amongst all Members of the United Nations family. There is nothing in the Charter to prevent a State from seeking voluntary union with another. The Charter does, however, protect the right of any State to maintain its separate existence and identity, should it so desire. A Member of the United Nations loses none of its separate and individual rights as a result of being culturally akin to other Members.

10. The Middle East, which in many domains has been the teacher of mankind, may itself have something to learn from the political experience of other continents. A fruitful example can be found amongst the Latin American republics. There we see many States linked by strong ties of linguistic and cultural unity. But each State conserves its political entity and juridical personality without challenge or grudge. Political separatism and cultural unity are in no sense beyond reconciliation. The United Nations cannot dictate the choice of Member States between union or separatism. It must, however, protect any Member State against coercive union or constraint.

11. But the relations between the Arab States in the Middle East are only one part of the situation. Together with the liberation of the Arab peoples other nations in the Middle East have secured their independence. One people, older than any in the continuity of its language, tradition and sense of peoplehood, has, with full international sanction, been restored to its independence, albeit within a domain far more modest than that in which Arab national freedom has been established. The eloquent addresses by the representatives of Turkey and Iran [*736th meeting*] have served to remind us that other important parts of the Middle East lie outside the range of Arab nationhood. The sovereignties of Africa, too, include nations which are an organic part of the Middle Eastern expanse. It is vital, therefore, to recall that every non-Arab Member of the United Nations in the Middle East has complete equality of rights with every Arab member of the region. The Middle East, as defined in the general practice of the United Nations, is a composite area inhabited by 54 million Arabs, taking language as the broadest criterion, and 76 million non-Arabs; it is composed of eight Arab States and at least four non-Arab States. In the light of this fact about the composition of the Middle Eastern region, official declarations about some continuous area between the Atlantic Ocean and the Persian Gulf as the inheritance of any one nation must be regarded as an offence against international peace as well as a distortion of history, geography and law. While full respect is due to the rights of Arab nations, it remains true that the Middle East has not been in the past, is not now and cannot be in the future an exclusively Arab domain.

12. Amidst the flux and diversity which mark the life of our region today there is one clear beacon or guidance. It is the Charter of the United Nations. This contains the decisive answer to the problems of unity and separatism, of national rights and international duties. The fact that the Middle Eastern nations are members of the Charter community must have a compelling influence on the course which their relations will take. The Charter is permeated by a deep respect for nationalism—but with a profound rejection of hegemony and forcible expansion. It enjoins all States, including those of the Middle East, to respect the political independence and territorial integrity of each other. It denies any State the right to impose its domination on other States, whether culturally akin or not. It refutes the claim of any State to interfere in the affairs of other States on matters such as the composition of their governments, or the character of their régimes, or their sovereign right to determine their course in the international issues of the day. The Charter is the even-handed custodian of the rights of each Middle Eastern State, Arab and non-Arab alike. It stands at the crossroad which divides voluntary union from coercive constraint. It is often said that the world must come to terms with nationalism. But there is a prior condition—that nationalism must come to terms with the Charter. No nation can justly seek rights for itself which it denies to another nation. It is by this principle of equality and mutuality, and not in accordance with uncritical or fatalistic resignation, that the world community must judge whether any particular ambition of nationalism must be regarded as legitimate or not.

13. Similarly the slogan of regional unity must be carefully scrutinized. A few decades ago an attempt was made to unite Europe by subversion and force. That movement for continental unity left behind a fearful toll of agony and havoc. Today the peoples of Western Europe are building their community in freedom and consent with no renunciation of their identity as sovereign States. This, then, is a matter in which the means are no less decisive than the ends. A calm, selective judgement must be applied both to the claims of nationalism and to slogans of regional unity. Above all we must recognize that universality is the condition of Charter observance both in general and within any region. Regional security can only be based on a total community of the States which make up that region. It cannot be left to any exclusive racial groupings. A partial, a discriminatory, a selective application of the principles and obligations of the Charter would alarmingly increase the prevailing tension in the region.

14. The need for a clear criterion of judgement is especially compelling in the Middle East, for the relations of Arab States with each other and with their non-Arab neighbours are not likely to achieve full stability in the early future. Deep emotions are involved, some of which will only be allayed by the passage of time and slow reconciliation of spirit. Peace between Israel and its neighbours is more likely to emerge from a long period of tranquillity, carefully nursed, than to spring from some spectacular diplomatic initiative or from the clash and thunder of public debate. And elsewhere in the region there are factors of economic stress, social inequality and rival ambitions, as well as the overshadowing conflict between the great Powers. Indeed, the factors making for tension are so diverse that the situation in the Middle East may, for some time ahead, fall short even of that degree of stability which other parts of the world have achieved. Precisely because of this prospect, it is important that we anchor ourselves to some framework of principle within which the

regional turbulence can be contained and kept short of explosion. Chaotic collapse must be avoided; affirmative, peaceful relations may not yet be in early view. In that case an alternative middle course must be found. If the Middle East cannot yet have peace, it must at least have security. If it cannot have fruitful exchanges of friendship, it must at least have the protection of law.

15. The rule of law is even more vital in the absence of peaceful, friendly relations than in their presence. Legal systems, after all, are designed far less to regulate the intercourse of friends than to promote the relations of temporary adversaries. The rule of law in the present context means the application of the United Nations Charter to the relations between Middle Eastern States, whether Arab or non-Arab. In advance of a substantive solution of disputes, a basic system of conduct for Middle Eastern States must be applied. The first element in such a system of Charter observance must surely be universal respect for the political independence and territorial integrity of all States. Another vital principle is the settlement of disputes by peaceful negotiation, not by pressure or force. Charter observance involves abstention from economic warfare. It rules out acts of belligerency, including the blockade regulations in the Suez Canal which the Security Council forbade in 1951. It would demand the integral observance, conditioned only by reciprocity, of all the provisions of agreements and treaties. There are some provisions of existing agreements, such as article VIII of the Israel-Jordan General Armistice Agreement, which have been denied implementation for many years.

16. Beyond specific incidents of lawlessness there are general habits which cannot be reconciled with any concept of security under the rule of law. There is the invocation and practice of a "state of war" as a source of juridical and political action. And there are the wave-lengths of the Middle East which vibrate with monstrous echoes of hatred, invective and incitement to subversion and violence. Those who invented the wondrous techniques of modern intercommunication surely believed that they were constructing bridges for understanding and not sharpening new weapons of war.

17. There is surely nothing excessively ambitious in the idea of applying the fundamental law of the Charter to inter-State relations in the Middle East. If such a system of law had been in effect, the complaints of Lebanon and Jordan would never have arisen. In other Middle Eastern problems too, a period of tranquillity marked by a basic standard of Charter observance is a necessary prelude to advancement along the road of positive co-operation.

18. Much has been said of the duties and opportunities of Middle Eastern States in the task of containing and reducing the regional tension. Contributions to this goal are also needed from the United Nations itself, and especially from its more powerful Members.

19. The United Nations is already represented in the Middle East by agencies established in certain territories by national consent or bilateral agreement. It is important for all States in the Middle East to be able to feel that the United Nations, in its corporate capacity, will constantly defend the sovereign equality of States; will accordingly give sympathy and aid to States striving to resist encroachments, whether by claims of hegemony or by threats of aggression; will steadfastly decline to accept the inadmissible principle that any Middle Eastern nation has a right of what is called "leadership" over others; will be alert in combating doctrines and practices of belligerency; will not hesitate to focus the full light of world opinion on

all efforts at interventionism and infiltration, such as those against which two Members States have presented massively documented complaints; and will give its alert attention to unilateral breaches of contractual obligations, some of which have remained unremedied for seven, eight and nine years.

20. The great Powers in their turn can do much to strengthen security under the rule of law. They can do this by positive action—by guaranteeing the territory of States against forcible change, and by helping Middle Eastern States to develop their new political freedom into broader visions of economic and social progress. They can also do much for the Middle East by acts of abstention; by avoiding dislocation of the intra-regional military balance; by redressing this balance when dislocation has unhappily occurred; and by sheltering this fragile area from the stormy gusts of great Power rivalry.

21. The nations of the Middle East would all surely welcome agreement by the great Powers in support of a programme for strengthening Middle Eastern security under the rule of law on the basis of respect for the political independence and territorial integrity of States.

22. In the shelter of security under the rule of law the Middle East will find an enhanced prospect of economic, social and cultural advance. Nationalism does not exhaust its responsibility by political liberation alone. The new flags, coins, stamps, constitutions and all other emblems of institutional liberty are a just cause for exhilaration and pride. But they are not meant to be a façade behind which squalor, illiteracy and disease will continue to fester. Throughout the newly liberated continents nations are awakening to the truth that man can win all the trappings of liberty and yet lose the essence of his freedom in the throes of hunger and want. The quest for political freedom must be accompanied, and not merely succeeded, by a vision of society looking to expanding horizons of economic and social progress. Many representatives of countries great and small have stressed the importance of increasing the preoccupation of the Middle East with problems of economic progress. The speech by the President of the United States [733rd meeting] was touched by a deep understanding of the theme of development within the concept of nationalism; and this is one of the reasons why it evoked universal respect.

23. The new age in natural power offers Middle Eastern nations a greater prospect of plenty than their own resources once seemed able to promise. Any people which develops a sound scientific tradition can now become heir to the abundance which science bequeaths to our universal potentiality. While Israel understands and shares the special zest of newly won political independence, it is firmly convinced that a sound national movement will give a great part of its attention to social, economic, cultural and scientific progress. We shall continue to seek advancement in these fields in co-operation with friends in all the five continents with whom we are associated in the development of commerce and communications and in programmes of economic development and mutual technical assistance. If other countries in our region, linked by historic and cultural bonds, desire to co-operate for economic development, we shall follow their efforts with sympathy and good will. Despite the disharmony in our political relations, we have always looked with positive interest on economic development in neighbouring lands.

24. The question whether development in the Middle East will be pursued on a collective or on a national basis is far less important than the question whether it will

be pursued at all. If water resources can be used and developed in direct co-operation, we are ready now, as before, to work within such a framework. If others are not psychologically ready for this, then each State should be helped to carry out its national programmes in such manner as will not encroach on the rights of others. The only unforgivable thing would be a kind of sterile, negative reciprocity, a paralysis of development, whether national or regional, while waiting for the remote goal of political harmony to be achieved.

25. While there can be no objection to economic development within selective or limited frameworks, the greater vision is surely one which sees the States of the Middle East—Arab and non-Arab alike—uniting their efforts for regional welfare and universal peace. It is the vision of a commerce in commodities and ideas passing freely across the frontiers of States, through the ports into the hinterlands, and across the vast expanses of the air—with full respect for the sovereignty and integrity of each State in the region. While this vision now seems far from view, we continue to hold it. We have faith that the compulsions of our common humanity will one day bring it to radiant fulfilment.

26. Many representatives have paid tribute to the historic achievements of the peoples whose national birth took place in the Middle East. One of these achievements was the insight of Israel, in the previous era of her independence, into the unity of the national and human worlds. It was in this region that men first taught that history itself has meaning and that progress, not endless repetition, is the law of human life.

27. In our own age, the scientific revolution has majestically vindicated this concept of unity in the life of nature and of man. It has taught us that the source of natural power lies in the indivisible unity of the microcosm. It has warned us that in the new age, mankind like nature is united in destiny for ill or for good. It is tragic that the region which first gave the world its understanding of unity in nature and unity in man should itself be the most ravaged and disunited of regions, and should sometimes be envisaged as the arena from which man's final tragedy of error may explode. The Middle East has a better destiny than this. Its mission is peace, not war. Its vocation is progress, not conflict. There is not a single State in its midst which cannot well afford to live in peace with every other State in the region. The world community of nations has summoned the peoples of the Middle East to the realization of their underlying kinship. A government which now rose from this Assembly and trod the old path of hostility and hatred would surely be committing deep offence against the universal conscience.

28. In this connexion, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union has referred [743rd meeting] to what he calls talk in the lobbies about Israel's policy. The policy of the Government of Israel on the integrity and independence of all States in the Middle East has been set forth in numerous statements, including that which I am now concluding. Speculations or conjectures made by other parties or by organs of the Press cannot commit us in any way. The only way to understand the policy of the Israel Government is to read what the Government says.

29. Our policy, as I have just explained, has been and is based on mutual respect of all Middle East States for the integrity and independence of each other; on the need, in our view, to defend and guarantee the territorial integrity and political independence of States; and, under strict observance, on integral implementation of ex-

isting agreements on the basis of reciprocity. This is our policy. It has been stated by the Prime Minister; it has been explained by the Foreign Minister; it has been expounded by me today.

30. The agenda does contain a complaint by Jordan about a threat to her independence and integrity. That complaint is not against us. Indeed, there is no change in our constant policy of readiness to conclude here and now mutual pacts of non-aggression with each other or all of our neighbours. So nobody who wants to find out what Israel's policy is need go into the anterooms, the corridors, or the lobbies. The question at issue, I respectfully suggest, is not Israel's policy towards her neighbours. The question is, what their policy is toward us—respect for our sovereignty, independence, and integrity; abstention from any intention to use force or the threat of force against Israel's integrity and independence; strict observance of existing agreements; co-operation for the welfare of our region? Is this their policy? Anyone who could clarify these questions from this rostrum would render a great service to the Middle East and to the United Nations.

31. There were some who doubted when this session was convened whether it would leave any impression on the course of events. As our discussion draws to a close, we see a real prospect that a turning point can be reached. The basis of our discussion today is the draft resolution [A/3878] which seven States have submitted for the judgement of the General Assembly. Some of these seven States are smaller in territory and population than many States in the Middle East. But in their historic evolution they have entered a world of tranquillity and tolerance which the Middle East has yet to inherit. Their disinterested efforts to help our tormented region inherit that world should command the gratitude and respect of all Middle Eastern peoples.

32. The need today is surely to lay down solemn precepts of conduct for all Middle Eastern States and for all States in relation to the Middle East. The most important of these principles is the need for all Middle Eastern States to respect the political independence and territorial integrity of all other Middle Eastern States. This principle must be endorsed as a point of reference for Middle Eastern life in many years to come.

33. The General Assembly cannot in strict realism offer us and our region that peace which can only spring from voluntary acts of will by Middle Eastern Governments themselves. It can, however, issue an impressive international call for abstention from hostility. It can demand the observance of basic civilized restraints. It should seek nothing less than a transition in the Middle East from unbridled antagonism to a basic international tolerance. If such a transition is now put into effect, then a greater and more glorious transition, a transition to peace and fraternity, may yet lie in store.

34. Mr. NUÑOZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): As certain Member States have a bad habit of making statements which completely ignore the official United Nations documents with the object of causing confusion and raising doubts in international public opinion, it seems advisable to establish once and for all that this emergency special session of the General Assembly has been called at the request of the Security Council to deal with the complaints made by the legitimate Governments of Lebanon and Jordan that foreign interference in their domestic affairs has created problems and is seriously threatening their national sovereignty and territorial integrity and in consequence the

stability of their Governments, in defiance of the Charter of the United Nations and the most elementary rules of international law.

35. The Secretary-General's notice of the meeting, the Security Council resolution [A/3866] and the agenda of the emergency special session of the General Assembly amply bear out our assertion.

36. This above all else is what we have to discuss and settle; the landing of American and British troops in these countries is a consequence of the main topic and can therefore logically be regarded as a side issue.

37. The Cuban delegation has studied very thoroughly the whole background of the events which the General Assembly has to consider. It has carefully analysed the reports of the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon, the statements of the Governments concerned, and the arguments of the Governments accused of an unlawful type of intervention which—let us say again—is prohibited by the Charter and by international law; and we have come to the conclusion that such intervention has in fact occurred. We need not consider to what extent it has occurred, since the prohibition laid down in the Charter is absolute and not relative.

38. The statements we have listened to by various delegations, particularly those of the States against which the charge is made, serve to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that we are not mistaken in taking it for granted that there has been intervention in the domestic affairs of the complainant States, since it is clear that even in the United Nations their internal problems are spoken of as if they were not sovereign States at all; we are actually told that the President of Lebanon and the King of Jordan are not the lawful rulers of those countries, when all the States involved in the dispute have maintained and continue to maintain diplomatic relations with those very rulers.

39. The question with which the General Assembly has to deal is more vital than any other it has come up against since it was established. If we were to allow ourselves here to be influenced by the barrage of propaganda which the Soviet Union and its satellites have been and are still pouring forth, we should be striking a death blow at the United Nations—of this my delegation is firmly and sincerely convinced.

40. Is a Government legally recognized by all the Members of the United Nations, among them the Soviet Union, entitled to ask for military aid from a friendly State, when it is the victim of external aggression threatening not only its territorial integrity and sovereignty but its very existence as a State, and when, as happened in the case of Lebanon, the Security Council proved incapable of stopping the rapidly rising tide of aggression, owing to the use of the veto by the Soviet representative?

41. If the General Assembly were ever to declare that lawful Governments do not possess this right, it would be giving *carte blanche* to any great Power with aggressive intentions to make short work of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of small States if it saw fit, with utter impunity. Let us not forget that not even possible action by the Security Council can be put forward as a means of halting the aggression in such emergencies, since the very Power which abets and plans all those cases of aggression has a seat in that body and the right of veto.

42. On this point Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter is quite explicit;

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

This injunction makes two points between which it seems to us worth-while to make a distinction. First, in prohibiting the "use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State", it seems clear to us that it is authorizing the use of such force, if the lawful Government requests it in order to defend its territorial integrity and its political sovereignty. Again, we would draw the Assembly's attention to the fact that when the Charter, in speaking of aggression, uses the words "or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations", it is referring to aggression other than direct armed aggression, which it also expressly prohibits in the first part of the injunction. This injunction has as its complement the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter, which recognizes the right of self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a State.

43. In the opinion of the Cuban delegation the injunction contained in Article 2 of the Charter recognizes the right of a Member State which is the victim of aggression to request aid from friendly Powers, or even from States which though not necessarily friendly are prepared to maintain the principles of the Charter and international good conduct, in order to defend its territorial integrity and political independence; at the same time the Article makes it obligatory for Member States to grant such aid to a State which is the victim of aggression in order to prevent it from losing its political independence and territorial integrity. As we believe that in the case of a State which is the victim of aggression, the request for aid is a right, any State wishing to renounce this right or not to avail itself of it, is legally entitled to act accordingly; there is no rule in the Charter to prevent it from so doing. As far as Cuba is concerned, our Government does not renounce any of the rights bestowed on it by the Charter of the United Nations, that of the Organization of American States, the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of Rio de Janeiro¹ and the Declaration of Caracas,² nor will it fail to carry out the duties which those international instruments impose on it. Still less would we allow any State or group of States, through dubious interpretations of those instruments, to disregard our rights without our express approval.

44. What happened in Lebanon? Nobody has questioned the legality of its Government, nor can President Camille Chamoun be accused of being a usurper. The only one who ventured to go so far was the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria, who of course represents a régime repeatedly denounced in the United Nations for failing to comply with its international obligations. Please note again—it is an interesting point—the States Members of the United Nations have maintained and are maintaining normal diplomatic relations with this legal Government in Lebanon. The legal Government of Lebanon was confronted simultaneously with both direct and indirect aggression of the worst kind. Direct, in that arms, munitions and men—the quantity is of no significance at this point—were being sent from a province or associated State of a foreign Power for the

¹ Signed on 2 September 1947.

² Final Act of the Tenth Inter-American Conference, held at Caracas, Venezuela, from 1 to 28 March 1954.

purpose of fomenting and supporting a revolution to overthrow the legal Government by illegal means. Indirect, in that the rebels were being urged through all the broadcasting stations of the State protecting the aggression, through its Press and the statements of its highest officials—as can be read in the world Press—to continue with their efforts; indeed, they were even incited to assassinate President Chamoun and the Prime Minister, and they attempted to do so several times. These are facts which cannot be denied.

45. The United States, acting in pursuance of the binding principles of the United Nations Charter and of the most elementary rules of international law when the Security Council failed to take action as a result of the Soviet veto, was under an obligation to come to the aid of the legal Government when—and this should be emphasized—it requested immediate assistance. In our opinion, the response of the United States to that request by immediately furnishing such assistance—far from deserving censure—should be fully approved by all non-aggressor Member States, particularly those weak in military power. To do otherwise, I say once again, would be to give official sanction to a kind of licence to modern pirate-States. In olden times, pirates used to seize ships and merchandise and imprison men and women; today there are States which seize other States and coolly claim that international public opinion endorses their depredations without a blush.

46. This was why the Government of Cuba, through its Prime Minister and Minister of State, Mr. Gonzalo Güell, publicly supported the measures taken by the United States Government to defend the territorial integrity and political independence of Lebanon. The Government of Cuba has maintained and will always continue to maintain the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States. It does so not only in virtue of the principles of the United Nations Charter, but under the Charter of the Organization of American States of which it has the honour to be a member. Cuba applies the principle of non-intervention to the letter and demands that all States should apply it. It reaffirms its full respect for the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of Rio de Janeiro and the Declaration of Caracas, which impose upon the American States obligations with which the Government of Cuba will comply at all times.

47. We note with pleasure that at about the same time that the Government of Cuba was taking its stand on the problem of Lebanon, the President of the Republic of Liberia, Mr. William V. S. Tubman, speaking in Monrovia on 24 July 1958, on the occasion of the commemoration of one hundred and ten years of Liberian independence, made a statement of which we should like to quote one of the most important paragraphs:

“The Government of Liberia regrets the conditions and circumstances in the Middle East which have made it necessary for the United States, in the interests of peace and stability, to land troops in Lebanon at the request of the Lebanese Government and for the purpose of protecting Lebanese sovereignty. We sympathize with that action because it is aimed at protecting small nations, and we note with great satisfaction that no act of violence has been committed by those troops.”

48. The entire Cuban Press, irrespective of political affiliation, gave its full support to the United States action in Lebanon. We should like to read to this

Assembly the last paragraph of the editorial which appeared in the Havana magazine *Bohemia* of 27 July 1958. It is a matter of public knowledge that this magazine, with a circulation throughout Latin America and in the United States, is not in sympathy with the Cuban Government. *Bohemia* states as follows:

“Nobody wants war. But nobody wants a weak and ignominious peace. That is why the whole world has now hailed the action taken by Washington. The stage of unlimited patience and boundless tolerance has passed. Washington will answer blow with blow wherever the occasion may arise, while at the same time it is prepared to do all that can and should be done honourably to ensure that all nations of the world may enjoy peaceful coexistence.”

49. What happened in Jordan? In that unfortunate case, Mr. President, there were not even United Nations observers on hand. Both direct and indirect aggression has been and is still being committed. Prisoners have been taken daily by the Jordanian authorities; aliens supplied with large quantities of arms, including the most modern weapons, have infiltrated into Jordanian territory for the purpose of overthrowing its legal Government. Many attempts on the life of the King of Jordan have been plotted from outside; the foreign radio has repeatedly called for the assassination of the King and plans have even been published for the total dismemberment of Jordan and its disappearance as a free and sovereign State. We would warn representatives here, particularly representatives of countries weak in military power, that we are speaking of a State which is a Member of the United Nations and entitled to its territorial integrity and political independence in accordance with the binding principles of the Charter. Can this Assembly remain impassive in the face of the desperate appeal made by the Government of Jordan, which is threatened on all sides?

50. In the opinion of the Cuban delegation, the United Kingdom has loyally carried out its duty under the Charter. It was chiefly to London that the Government of Jordan, with the unanimous support of its Parliament, appealed for help in order to maintain its territorial integrity and its political independence. We are sincerely convinced that without the effective assistance of the United Kingdom, Jordan, with no concern for the wishes of its people and its Government, would have been swallowed up by the single Arab nation to which the representative of Saudi Arabia referred in his speech. It would have happened, we repeat, without the slightest concern for the wishes of the people and of the legal Government.

51. The time has perhaps come to recall certain facts which appear in the records of our meetings. We must do so because the Soviet Union and its followers have established the practice of rewriting history without concern for the facts. Proof of this is provided by the Soviet Encyclopaedia, in which different editions print different and conflicting biographies of the same persons—Stalin, Beria, Molotov, etc.—we could give at least a hundred examples.

52. Why, unless the purpose is to confuse international public opinion, do they state that the partition of Palestine was carried out solely by the West? It can be shown that, as recorded in the official documents of the United Nations and we challenge anyone to deny this, the Soviet Union, Byelorussia, the Ukraine and the other satellite States then Members voted in favour of the partition of Palestine just as the United States

did. Cuba, incidentally, voted against partition on the grounds that it was not a wise measure. However, contrary to the practice of the Soviet Union—and this is what we are concerned with—Cuba accepted the decision of the great majority. We recognized the State of Israel and we maintain cordial diplomatic relations with it as with all the Arab States. Thus Cuba once again complied fully with a resolution of the General Assembly. We might add that our conduct in the Organization has been unwavering. We can never be accused of having flouted a resolution of the United Nations.

53. While in all the countries of Latin America, including Cuba, in the United States, in Canada, and in all the free countries of Europe, Asia, Africa and Oceania, Jews as well as Arabs enjoy full civil rights and ample guarantees to profess their faiths freely, in the Soviet Union and its satellite States they are persecuted like wild beasts. They are harassed; all their cultural media are destroyed; and they are prevented from professing their faith, as stated recently in an important document by the leading figures of Jewish life. In Cuba, by the way, large Jewish and Arab colonies live in peace, with all their rights safeguarded, and none of their members has ever made a complaint such as that which the Jews have made concerning the inhuman treatment they receive in the Soviet Union. The treatment received by the Arabs is no better.

54. We should also like to remind those with short memories that both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, we voted against the United Kingdom, France and Israel on the Suez Canal question. We did so in spite of our very close economic and cultural ties with France and the United Kingdom, because we considered it to be our duty. Under our Presidency and with our casting vote, the Security Council recognized the right of Egypt to take part in our debates. We recall receiving many expressions of appreciation from representatives of Arab States for our tenure of the Presidency of the Council.

55. We have always been concerned with the Palestine problem and we have backed up our concern with deeds. We have endeavoured to obtain a solution appropriate to this critical situation and in conformity with the resolutions of the General Assembly. For us, let me say again, the State of Israel is a legal fact; not because Cuba has so decided, but because the General Assembly so agreed by a large majority vote, which included not only the Soviet Union but also all its satellite States. This is contemporary history and cannot be denied. A further item of contemporary history is the statement made very recently by Mr. Nehru, Prime Minister of India, in which he declared that the Arab States must learn to live in peace with the State of Israel.

56. At the meeting of the Security Council on 28 March 1956 I made the following statement:

"It seems clear to us that the armistice cannot provide a permanent solution to the problem; but we have no doubt that strict observance of the armistice agreements and of the previous resolutions of the Security Council is an essential prerequisite of any attempt to find a way to bring about a state of peace and lasting tranquillity.

"It is possible—and I throw this idea into the discussion without any polemical intention, simply as a suggestion to the Secretary-General for his consideration and study—that it may be necessary for the

United Nations itself to guarantee the territorial integrity of the States involved in the dispute. Ways and means will also have to be found of solving the refugee problem, and we consider in this connexion that it would be helpful to obtain reliable data on the numbers of genuine refugees, those who wish to return to Israel and those who hope to settle elsewhere; we feel that this would provide a useful foundation for any type of negotiations."

"The ways of the world today defy every rule of logic. It does not seem logical to try to create a climate of peace by breeding hatred among peoples, or for certain nations to be prepared to fight for no better reason than that a certain Power stands to gain by the destruction of all other Powers. But we must face the facts as we find them, however illogical they seem, and any evasion of reality in an attempt to solve the problem is a grave mistake. We must not forget that the only possible use of force which can be sanctioned by our Charter, by the rules of international law and by morality is the use of force to preserve peace. This is a truth we cannot disregard, and we must shape our actions accordingly".³

57. The delegation of Cuba was most gratified to hear the President of the United States, in the magnificent speech he made recently to this General Assembly [733rd meeting], propose a plan which could serve as a basis for the attainment of a general settlement of the entire problem of the Middle and Near East.

58. In his recent statements, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union accused the United States seventy-five times of colonialism and asserted that its action in Lebanon was patently colonialist. This method of repeating the same falsehood over and over again must have been learned from Goebbels while Hitler Germany and the Soviet Union under Stalin were bound by the treaty of alliance known as the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. In parenthesis, let me say that without this pact the last war would never have taken place. Hitler would never have dared to launch his attack without first being assured of the complicity or the benevolent neutrality of the USSR Government. Let us expose this accusation, even if we do it once only, and tell the truth about this alleged American colonialism.

59. The United States, which was one of the victors in the last two world wars and saved the Soviet Union in the last war, giving it decisive assistance when it was invaded by the Nazi armies, did not take a single inch of foreign territory. In recent years, it has given the Philippines their independence and, by means of a free plebiscite, it has granted Puerto Rico the status of a free associated state, the President of the United States announcing at the time that whenever the majority of the Puerto Rican people wished for full independence, it would be granted. Less than a month ago, Alaska was admitted to the Union as a sovereign State.

60. Now let us see how the Soviet Union has behaved. Obviously, these facts are unwelcome because they are true, but we cannot refrain from comment on these accusations of colonialism levelled against other Powers by the arch-champion of colonialism in our times. The Baltic countries, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, were not only free and sovereign States with a splendid culture, but had solemn treaties of peace and friendship with the Soviet Union. Those States were occupied

³ Official Records of the Security Council, Eleventh Year, 718th meeting, paras. 11 to 13.

by the Soviet Union in defiance of every principle of right and justice; hundreds of thousands of their people were torn from their homes and their native land and forced to live in less inviting places in the Soviet Union. Today the Baltic States, which used to be a credit to the human race, are worse than colonies; not even tourists are allowed to visit their cities.

61. The USSR Government bound itself by solemn treaties to respect the political sovereignty and territorial integrity of Romania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Albania and martyred Hungary. All these States have been subjected to a pitiless colonialism, which is maintained by vast Russian armies. We could say the same of China which had signed a treaty of friendship—later violated—with the Soviet Union, of Outer Mongolia, the Ukraine, East Germany, North Korea and North Viet-Nam. Thousands of square miles have been conquered and colonized by the Soviet Union in recent years and the number of human beings now beneath its pitiless yoke runs into hundreds of millions.

62. It is outrageous that Mr. Gromyko should come before this Assembly, which is perfectly aware of the facts, and describe as "colonialist manoeuvre" the landing of American troops in Lebanon and of British troops in Jordan, though they have neither killed nor injured a single person; he must surely realize that all of us here are aware that more than two million Soviet soldiers are at present in the countries beneath the Soviet Union's colonial yoke. Let us add that it is idle to state, as the Soviet Union constantly does, that these Soviet troops are there because the Governments concerned have asked for them, and at the same time deny the legitimate Governments of Lebanon and Jordan the right to keep 12,000 and 4,000 men respectively on their territory, as a temporary measure, to defend their political independence and their territorial integrity against serious threats. And I repeat that these United States and United Kingdom soldiers have not killed or injured a single person in Lebanon or Jordan.

63. There are those who in good faith call it constructive work when the representatives of the Soviet Union and its satellite States are allowed to utter all sorts of falsehoods without having the truth thrown back at them whenever necessary. We do not agree with this attitude. We recognize without hesitation that the Soviet Union has the most efficient propaganda and subversion machine in the entire world. The great Western Powers have fallen into the tragic error of thinking that truth will always prevail unaided. They regard all peoples as having reached the same level of culture and political maturity and they are reluctant to believe that not all the peoples of the world are aware of such obvious facts and such diametrically opposed conduct, as for example, that of the Soviet Union and the United States respectively. The Western Powers are, of course, completely mistaken. If you send out a flood of propaganda by means of thousands of radio transmitters, periodicals, reviews, propaganda agents, fellow travellers, communists, communist sympathizers, etc., as the Soviet Union does, pouring it over peoples with little culture and a rudimentary political education, telling them that the Soviet Union is not colonialist but the Western Powers are; if you maintain that it is they who respect human rights, freedom of religion, freedom of the Press, etc. and the others who do not; if that propaganda is not counteracted by another, as strong or stronger, telling the truth and nothing but the truth, we run the risk of finding peoples who are

in doubt and who end by thinking that all States, particularly the great Powers, behave in the same way domestically and internationally.

64. When Mr. Gromyko delivers his first speech before this Assembly and makes this kind of statement, he is not talking for the benefit of this Assembly, which is composed of intelligent men conversant with the facts; he is not talking even for the benefit of the people of the Soviet Union, as the USSR Government has prevented his speech from coming to the knowledge of its citizens, just as it did with the speech of President Eisenhower. He is talking to the mass of intellectually poverty-stricken people, of whom there are many millions, who can be bamboozled by the statements of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union. No thinking person can believe Mr. Gromyko's statement that the landing—as a purely temporary measure—of a few United States and British troops in Lebanon and Jordan was for the purpose of seizing the oil in those countries, which, as everyone knows, have no oil. But there may be many people in this world who do not know this fact and, as a famous author said, if you throw enough mud, some always sticks.

65. A draft resolution [*A/3870 and Corr.1*] has been submitted, and the only action it seeks is the withdrawal of the United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan without delay, regardless of whether or not the Governments concerned approve. Although the situation remains unchanged, the action sought is nothing less than the withdrawal of these forces for the logical purpose of doing away with the independent States of Lebanon and Jordan, overthrowing their lawful Governments and assassinating their Chiefs of State. The draft resolution does not provide for any measure which would safeguard the security of these States. On the contrary, it is proposed that the United Nations should send observers to Jordan and strengthen the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon for the sole purpose of supervising the withdrawal of the United States and United Kingdom troops.

66. Who is the sponsor of such a singular draft resolution? The Soviet Union alone would be capable of an initiative of this kind, the Member State which until now has failed to comply with a single resolution of the General Assembly, let alone the Security Council, which it considers prejudicial to its interests. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the resolutions of the United Nations are a dead letter. It makes use of those from which it can derive some benefit, while with sovereign contempt it relegates to the wastepaper basket those which do not serve its interests. No one can deny that two types of Member States are to be found in the United Nations: those which comply with the resolutions of its competent organs and those that merely abide by the resolutions favourable to them. This state of affairs cannot be allowed to continue and we find it very strange that the peoples of the other great Powers have not urged their respective Governments to see to it that this distressing situation is changed. For our part, we shall continue to protest against the establishment in the United Nations of two categories with different rights and obligations. The Soviet Union has never complied with a single resolution on the Korean question. It has repeatedly refused to pay its share of the cost of maintaining the United Nations forces, as fixed by agreement of the General Assembly. While small, and far from wealthy States like ourselves, situated a long way from the area of conflict, have had

to face great economic sacrifices to make these payments, the Soviet Union, which boasts of being the richest State in the world, does not pay its share. Why is this? Surely not because, if it were forced to pay, it would threaten to wipe out the United Nations as it has recently threatened Turkey, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Lebanon, Jordan and even Switzerland, which has not been involved in a single international dispute.

67. At a time when we are discussing this grave problem and the Soviet Union presents a draft resolution calling for the withdrawal of troops requested by the lawful Governments concerned, we must point out that there are a number of outstanding resolutions, adopted by a large majority in the General Assembly, inviting and ordering the Soviet Union to withdraw its armies from Hungary. We can produce a sombre list of General Assembly resolutions which have been violated by the USSR Government. There is resolution 1004 (ES-II) adopted on 4 November 1956; 1005 (ES-II) of 9 November 1956; 1006 (ES-II), also adopted on 9 November 1956; 1007 (ES-II) also of 9 November 1956; 1127 (XI) of 21 November 1956; 1128 (XI) of 21 November 1956; 1129 (XI) of 21 November 1956; 1130 (XI) of 4 December 1956; 1131 (XI) of 12 December 1956; and 1132 (XI) of 10 January 1957. How can the Soviet Union ask for United Nations observers to be appointed when it closed its doors to the members of the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary, appointed by an overwhelming majority of the United Nations General Assembly, and prevented them from carrying on their investigation, even going so far as to refuse entry to Prince Wan Waithayakon of Thailand, the General Assembly's Special Representative on the Hungarian Problem and at the time President of the Assembly?

68. In the tragic case of Hungary, it grieves us to point out that, contrary to what has happened in Lebanon and Jordan, the lawful Government of that country asked the Soviet Union and the United Nations for the immediate withdrawal of the Russian troops. What did the Soviet Union do? It increased the number of troops, murdered more than 65,000 Hungarians, wounded more than 100,000, and forced into exile about 200,000 men, women and children for whom the free nations of the world had to provide shelter and assistance. Only recently, again, we witnessed the truly gruesome episode of the execution of Nagy and Maléter. The former had been granted diplomatic asylum in the Yugoslav Embassy at Budapest and the latter was taken prisoner after having been invited to take part in negotiations at the Headquarters of the Soviet Union's invading army. Considering, in the light of this, that the United States and United Kingdom troops in Lebanon and Jordan have not caused the slightest material or moral damage, any fair-minded person may well ask whether the Soviet Union, which has failed to comply with any of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations, has the moral authority to demand that the General Assembly adopt a resolution. Cuba will vote against the Soviet draft resolution and renews its protest against the situation obtaining in the United Nations, with a membership divided into a majority which complies with the precepts of the Charter and a minority that makes improper use of them for its own ends.

69. The Cuban delegation will give sympathetic consideration to any constructive action which has been

or may be taken and will vote in favour of such action; however, its approval should not be construed as a repudiation of the views we have expressed in this statement.

70. Just as I was coming to this rostrum, I was informed, more or less officially, that the delegations of the ten Arab States represented at this General Assembly had agreed in principle to submit a joint draft resolution containing a reaffirmation of the principles maintained by the League of Arab States in regard to non-interference, a request to the Secretary-General to make arrangements to make possible the early withdrawal of United States forces from Lebanon and British forces from Jordan—this is the Norwegian proposal with which the United States and the United Kingdom still agree; the draft would also contain an agreement to terminate inflammatory radio broadcasts from one country to another, an agreement on economic development following the general lines suggested by President Eisenhower, and an invitation to the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly on the Middle East question not later than 30 September 1958. Under this agreement, I am informed, the ten Arab countries would guarantee the frontiers of Lebanon and Jordan. If such an agreement has in fact been reached, we will give the resolution the most careful and favourable consideration.

71. Cuba cherishes peace. The people and Government of Cuba, a small State weak in military power and without any territorial ambitions whatsoever, seek to live on friendly terms with all States. It is and will always be ready to co-operate in seeking ways and means of bringing about a worthy and honourable understanding. However, Cuba will never support measures which, through an erroneous concept of momentary security, may doom our children and grandchildren to eternal slavery in a world-wide concentration camp.

72. Mr. CORREA (Ecuador) (*translated from Spanish*): During the past few years, the progress of the United Nations has been marked by two trends that stand out above all others: the increasingly representative character which the General Assembly, owing partly to its growing universality, is assuming as the principal authentic exponent of world public opinion; and the increasingly vigorous role which the Secretary-General, as the chief executive officer of the Organization, is assuming in political matters.

73. The first of these observations and the fact that the interdependence of nations makes problems of peace and security in any part of the world of vital interest to all have led me to participate in this debate, although I am aware that some of the general views which I may express have already been voiced in this Assembly.

74. The problems of the Middle East have been constantly on the agenda of the General Assembly; they have been discussed in one form or another at all the regular sessions. Four of the five special sessions of the General Assembly were convened precisely in order to deal with some crisis in the life of the Middle East.

75. At this emergency special session, we are called upon to consider the situation in the Middle East in a new light inasmuch as what may be termed the great world ideological conflict has moved to that area. This explains the exceptional interest and anxiety provoked throughout the world by the events that have brought on this emergency special session.

76. Men throughout the world are fully aware of the indescribable dimensions that an armed conflict would attain in this century of amazing scientific progress. Although they feel certain that Governments would not consciously bring about such a conflict, they fear that unless the spirit of conciliation prevails, the uncontrollable play of cause and effect might lead to a situation which no one desires.

77. Fortunately, statements have been made in this debate which show that conciliation is possible. We believe that in response to the general desire for peace and in the interests of the people whose problems are before us, every effort must be made both in this Assembly and outside it to prepare the ground for a form of coexistence which will help to lessen world tensions and enable the problems of the Middle East to be considered on their own merits. Of course, our appeal for a general understanding does not in any way alter the fact that the Government and people of Ecuador, which are staunchly pro-Western, democratic and Christian, condemn the use of violence and the illegitimate methods of subversion by which an attempt is being made to alter the existing order.

78. Amid the general complexity of the problems of the Middle East, one outstanding feature is the struggle of the peoples of that area to assert their right to decide their own future, free from all political and economic pressure. We, the Members of this Assembly, being all subject to the authority of the Charter, must fully recognize this right and solemnly accept it as a basic premise in our discussions. It would be blindness not to perceive the profound changes that have taken place since the beginning of this century and particularly since the Second World War. It would be absurd to underestimate the national aspirations of the peoples of the Middle East or to ignore their just desire to make use of their natural resources for their own benefit and thus raise their levels of living.

79. In our opinion, this debate has been very constructive in that respect and will, it is hoped, produce results by reason of having made the peoples of the Middle East feel that in all sectors of world public opinion they can count on a profound and general understanding of their aspirations and claims and that they can, without fear or mistrust, find in the United Nations and within the framework of mutual respect for the basic principles of the Charter, the international co-operation that will enable them to channel their aspirations towards constructive ends in the international community.

80. It would, however, be a mistake to consider that the problems of the Middle East have arisen solely because of disregard for the national aspirations of the peoples of that area. The problems of the Middle East have come to the General Assembly precisely because of complaints submitted by Lebanon and Jordan to the Security Council, complaints which reveal the critical state of relations between the Arab peoples themselves. Causes and responsibilities are not easy to determine, but there is no denying that the psychological conditions now prevailing in the Middle East will, if they continue unchanged, make it impossible for the peoples of the area to derive any positive benefit from their freedom and independence. Small States in the grip of fear are telling us that they are uncertain of their survival.

81. As a point of departure in dealing with this state of affairs, it would be well if, as the Secretary-General has suggested [732nd meeting], the States concerned

reaffirmed their adherence to the basic principles of international conduct: mutual respect for each other's political integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, and non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States.

82. In his brilliant statement to the General Assembly, [733rd meeting], the President of the United States, like the Secretary-General in his opening remarks, set the tone for conducting the discussion along constructive lines and drew our attention to the economic aspects of the problems of the Middle East. It would indeed be a mistake to underestimate the importance of economic development as a basis for political stability. The problems of general security are inseparable from the struggle against ignorance, disease and want. This is recognized by the Charter of the United Nations, which, in its Article 55, admirably sets out this balanced relationship.

83. The work of this Organization and of its specialized agencies in the fields of technical assistance and economic development affords clear evidence of the manner in which the less developed countries can receive non-political assistance for their economic development and their subsequent political advancement.

84. It is to be hoped that the Governments of the Middle East will react in a positive manner to any United Nations initiative for solving the economic and social problems of the area by means of international co-operation.

85. Having made these general remarks, I would like to make known the position of the Government of Ecuador regarding the role of the United Nations. The Charter of the United Nations constitutes the corner-stone of the foreign policy of the Government of Ecuador. We believe that the purposes and principles of the Charter constitute the basic norms of conduct in a world of peace, law and justice. We also believe that the United Nations has developed in accordance with the changing needs of the international community and that it affords to small States the most valuable and effective means of bringing international co-operation into play for the purpose of safeguarding their rights and interests and of protecting their very existence.

86. The manner in which the United Nations has faced unexpected problems and critical situations precisely in the region of the Middle East is evidence of its great potentialities and of its ability to adapt to the most unforeseen situations in a world which is rapidly changing and in which a static international organization would be doomed to failure. We accordingly believe that Governments should make use of the machinery of the United Nations, in the certainty that in the long run that machinery affords the best possible protection of their genuine interests, and they should avoid doing anything which might detract from the authority of the United Nations.

87. When the Government of Lebanon appealed to the Security Council in June 1958, the Council answered that appeal with laudable speed. Thanks to the ability and efficiency of the Secretary-General, an Observation Group was set up composed of three eminent citizens from different parts of the world and assisted by over one hundred officers placed at the disposal of the United Nations by numerous Governments. In less than one month, the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon set up observation posts all along the Lebanese frontier. More recent events created difficulties for the Group, but, with the support of the Secretary-General, it has continued its work in a manner deserving the gratitude of the Organization. A report dated 19 August 1958, shows that practically all the main frontier points are now covered

by the Observation Group and that observation is being carried on without interruption by day and night.

88. The delegation of Ecuador expresses the hope that the Observation Group will soon be able to exercise its authority in full and that the United Nations will assume responsibility for providing assistance to one of its Member States in safeguarding its territorial integrity.

89. At the beginning of my speech, I mentioned as one of the salient features in the development of the United Nations in recent years the ever-increasing political role of the Secretary-General as the chief executive officer of the Organization. The Suez incident, the establishment and operation of the United Nations Emergency Force and the position of Israel in regard to its neighbours have shown that the Secretary-General can be the most effective instrument of United Nations action in situations that call for an able interpretation of the political realities reflected in the General Assembly and for a combination of talents comprising capacity for conciliation, diplomatic ability and administrative efficiency. On the strength of these precedents, the General Assembly should once again entrust the Secretary-General with the task of reaffirming the authority of the United Nations in Lebanon and Jordan and of studying, in the light of the debates in this emergency special session of the General Assembly, what other measures may be able to lead to a radical treatment of the ills of the Middle East.

90. Such a decision would be keeping not only with the precedents I have just mentioned but also with the constitutional balance of the Organization, for whereas this vast Assembly can only constitute a great forum reflecting a sometimes contradictory political reality, the Secretary-General can be instrumental in finding a common denominator and acting upon it in the light of the provisions of the Charter.

91. The General Assembly has before it the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Liberia, Norway, Panama and Paraguay [A/3878]. The delegation of Ecuador supports this draft resolution because its operative part, which is its real marrow, is in agreement with the views that have been expounded in this statement.

92. Mr. CHAPMAN (Ghana): The issue which confronts the General Assembly, at its third emergency special session, is a very complicated though not an insoluble one. It is true, of course, that in its wider scope and long-term aspects no immediate clear-cut decisions are possible. However we believe that, given good will on all sides, it will not be impossible to devise a formula which should help to alleviate tension in the area in the immediate future and render the problem more tractable to a wider and more permanent solution.

93. The immediate and pressing problem is the presence of United States and United Kingdom forces in the Middle East, sent in at the request of the Governments of Lebanon and Jordan. In the case of Lebanon, United States troops were introduced at a time when the United Nations was already active in the area as a result of a decision of the Security Council [A/3866]. Our purpose at this emergency special session should not be to indulge in recriminations or to endorse courses of action which have been taken outside the framework of this Organization. We are faced with a concrete situation which, we believe, is fraught with some danger. Our duty, in the interests of international peace and security, is to take such steps as would enable the reduction of tension in the area.

94. It may, however, be helpful if my delegation makes its position clear at the outset with regard to certain principles which have been discussed at length during the course of this debate. We, of course, support the view that it is the legitimate right of any country, through its Government, to seek the help of a friendly country when it considers itself threatened by external aggression. This is in conformity with the Charter and also with accepted international practice. However, when such aggression or intervention is not proven conclusively, the introduction of foreign troops into another country could lead to much controversy, and may even heighten the tension which the Governments concerned, in all good faith, may have taken a certain course of action to eliminate.

95. But the issue becomes even more complicated and risky when foreign troops are requested under conditions where it is not quite clear that the intervention is designed for the preservation of the territorial integrity and independence of a State but may be construed as an attempt at the preservation of a Government not having the support of the majority of its people. In a situation like this the role of the United Nations becomes a very difficult one; for, owing to the very nature of our Organization and the extent of its mandate, it is difficult to see how it can be expected to guarantee the continued existence of any particular régime which has lost the confidence of its people. Furthermore, the unilateral introduction of troops into a country under conditions which admit of doubt as to the validity of such action may invite reaction within the area which may not be conducive to a speedy solution of the problem. Thus the presence of foreign troops may lead to instability instead of creating an atmosphere of calm which in the particular instances before us may have been the motive for the introduction of foreign troops.

96. Another problem posed by the introduction of foreign troops into an area is the threat which neighbouring States, rightly or wrongly, may see in such action. Owing to their past experience, the countries of the Middle East may be forgiven if they interpret such situations as a source of great anxiety to themselves. And such a concern would be warranted in any other part of the world. In other times other countries have felt themselves threatened by the uncomfortable proximity of foreign troops.

97. It is pertinent here to refer to the reports of the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon, a duly constituted body of the United Nations, which seems, unfortunately, to have been largely ignored in the course of the debate in the Assembly. This Group, in its three reports [S/4040, S/4051, S/4052], has not found any significant interference in the affairs of Lebanon from external sources, and it is the belief of many people that if this Group had been given the opportunity of pursuing its objectives untrammelled by newly created situations it might have succeeded in lessening tension in the area and enabled the people of Lebanon to solve their problems in their own way. However, because of new difficulties this has not been possible, so that we are now left to make an assessment of the situation on the basis of charges and denials by the States concerned. The general Assembly is in a most unenviable position, and I am sure that if we could put the clock back for just a month we would all have probably adopted different courses of action. However, this is not now possible.

98. It is the view of my delegation that the basis of the conflict in the Middle East is much wider than recent events in the area itself. We think that a powerful factor of instability in the Middle East is the strategic

interest of the great Powers in the area and their desire to control its oil resources. The other factor is the renascent Arab nationalism which is driving the people of the Middle East towards a wider unity and independence. To complicate matters, intense rivalry among the great Powers has always found expression in an attempt to manipulate the Governments of the area, so that there has been a great tendency to use the people of the area as pawns in the game of international power politics. And yet it is possible for the great Powers to pursue their legitimate interests—be they political or commercial—in the area and at same time find some equitable accommodation to Arab nationalism. But to do so it seems to us that the great Powers must first find a *modus vivendi* among themselves so that in their intercourse with the States of the Middle East the people of the area will not be drawn into conflicts which should properly not be their concern. Furthermore, the people of the area should be strengthened by all means in our power to enable them to resist successfully the dangers of involvement in conflicts which spring from external sources.

99. Another source of instability in the Middle East has been the arbitrary partitioning of the area during the period of colonial expansion and after, which has led to the fragmentation of the Middle East into a mosaic of States. This, of course, is a matter of history and it is irrelevant to pass judgement on it here. However, this fact should explain the present strivings of the Arabs for unity; and this fact also should inhibit those who would oppose this movement on the grounds of the preservation of their interests in the area. If this situation is overlooked and if the legitimate aspirations of the Arab people are frustrated, then there can be no hope of real stability in the Middle East.

100. There has to be a readjustment in the Middle East and we believe that it is the duty of all who wish to see the achievement of settled conditions in the area to further the desire of its homogeneous peoples who long for unity. We are, of course, sensible of the fact that under the conditions in which most of the Middle East finds itself there are vested interests which have a stake in preserving the *status quo*; but it must be recognized that it is for these interests to adapt themselves to the irresistible forward movement of peoples which is taking place in Asia and Africa.

101. The peoples of Africa suffer from the results of arbitrary divisions introduced by colonial Powers, and that is why we feed sympathy for the aspirations of people who desire to make the necessary adjustments. However, it is our firm belief that these aspirations are capable of peaceful achievement and that any attempt to make changes by force and without the consent of all concerned will be fraught with great danger. As a Member of the United Nations, Ghana has a vested interest in peace and security for all peoples, and peaceful intercourse among the nations. This is what has prompted our Prime Minister to speak on the issues of the Middle East and this is what prompts us to speak in this debate.

102. The Government of Ghana is most anxious that a solution of the present crisis in the Middle East should be found within the framework of the United Nations for the benefit of all the people of the area. After a political settlement has been consolidated, we will still be called upon to devise plans for economic and social development on the lines suggested by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the President of the United States, should the people of the area so desire.

103. It is difficult not to recall to mind in the present debate the factors that have helped this country, in which the Headquarters of our Organization is located, to achieve its unity out of a number of widely separated States and heterogeneous peoples and to develop its resources and build a new civilization in peace and tranquillity.

104. I am thinking of the insulation from great Power politics of the United States during its formative years by the wide moat of the Atlantic Ocean. I am also thinking particularly of the Monroe Doctrine which appears to have served so well not only the United States but also all the countries of the Western Hemisphere. Is it not possible for the great Powers of the world today to impose upon themselves a sort of Monroe Doctrine with regard to the Middle East? Would the people of the Middle East in their present travail not welcome a twentieth century Monroe Doctrine—a hands-off policy—which would ensure them of an era of fuller freedom and tranquillity to enable them to pursue their course, as best suits their genius, in peace and brotherhood?

105. It is our firm belief that no lasting or realistic solution to the problem of the Middle East is conceivable which does not enjoy the support of the majority of the Arabs. We in the United Nations cannot impose any solutions from the outside which are against the desires and aspirations of the people of the area who are most intimately concerned.

106. Mr. GARIN (Portugal): The reason for the gathering of this emergency special session of the General Assembly is again a new and unhappy sign of the dangerous trend which the affairs of mankind have been taking for so many years. Although by now, as everybody seems to agree, there are pending over the world disquieting threats which could lead to its very destruction, crisis after crisis continues to appear in an old-fashioned way. There are some that might have been inevitable but there are others which certainly have more or less been provoked and which have always been accompanied, again in an old-fashioned way, if not by a total lack of desire, at least by serious hesitations on the part of some to settle them in a spirit of indispensable accommodation.

107. I am not going to recapitulate the facts of the event that led us to this gathering. They are well known to all of us here. I wish only to point out that, if a greater spirit of accommodation had been shown in these recent weeks, the difficulties which we have been called upon to face in this Assembly would by now be well on their way towards settlement or disappearance.

108. We take part in this debate with a feeling of distress, on seeing as principal parties, in opposite camps, Arab sister nations or Western nations versus Arab nations, with all of whom my country maintains relations of special friendship and who, we believe, have more mutual interests to maintain and cultivate than reasons for differences to separate them. We sincerely hope that this Assembly working, as it is in duty bound to work, as a conciliatory body, may help them to overcome the difficulties, and we do not consider them more than mere difficulties which have arisen among those nations. When we say "mere difficulties", we are refusing to allow ourselves to be conquered by a certain war psychosis that some sectors, for their own badly-disguised purposes, have been trying to create. Portugal, in accordance with its inalterable policy, is always ready to continue serving and helping the cause of those who seek the establishment of an atmosphere of peace among all peoples. It is, there-

fore, with this uppermost in mind that my delegation will make some comments on certain questions which have been under discussion in our deliberations.

109. I should like to make clear the position of my delegation on a juridical issue which has also been raised by many other delegations. We are firmly convinced that international law and the spirit of the United Nations Charter permit any lawfully constituted Government the right to request assistance from friendly or allied Governments for the essential purpose of defending the independence and integrity of its territory. This is a right well established by practice in international law, resorted to again and again throughout the centuries, and one which has greatly helped to safeguard the existence of small countries. The Charter of the United Nations could never deny that right and the spirit of the Charter is certainly in agreement with it. How could it be otherwise when we all know that the Charter reflects, as it had to, well-established tenets and practices of international law so painfully acquired or exercised by mankind in the course of centuries? Indeed, it is a right which derives from and is, therefore, intrinsically connected with the fundamental and inherent right of self-defence, which the Charter explicitly acknowledges.

110. It follows by logical deduction that only the Governments concerned are entitled to be the judges of the gravity of the situation in which they deem it necessary to request assistance from friends or allies for the essential purpose of preserving the independence and integrity of their countries. It follows also, by logical deduction, that the Government or Governments to which such requests are presented have the right to respond if they consider the case meritorious. But—and this I wish to stress—the exercise of such a right can only have, in our opinion, one essential purpose and no other, namely, the preservation of the independence and integrity of a country which is threatened directly or indirectly from outside.

111. In the cases this Assembly has been considering, which had their special characteristics, we should bear in mind that the United States and the United Kingdom always acknowledged the assistance they rendered as provisional measures, and since the start of their action have tried their utmost—which so clearly proves their good faith—to have the United Nations take over, as soon as practicable, the justifiable responsibilities they had assumed. And, as we all know, this has not occurred thus far only because the Security Council was unable to reach a positive decision.

112. Where the Security Council failed, the General Assembly must not and cannot fail. Speedy decisions should now be taken by the Assembly in order that conditions may be created capable of making possible the withdrawal of United States forces from Lebanon and of United Kingdom forces from Jordan. After listening carefully to the debates and to the different points of view expressed, we believe that the draft resolution submitted by the seven Powers [A/3878] would ensure the attainment of the desirable aims in a positive and constructive manner. We consider it a well-balanced, objective and conciliatory document, capable of affording the essential ways and means necessary to obtain an early settlement of the difficulties which this emergency special session of the General Assembly was called upon to face. We are therefore prepared to give our support to that draft resolution, and wish to congratulate its authors and render a special homage to their laborious efforts.

113. The draft resolution notes what is certainly the most important aim of the Charter—that States should practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours. It also reaffirms principles covering the problems of direct and indirect aggression, the strict observation of which is indispensable for the existence of true peace, not only in the Middle East but in any part of the world. We feel very strongly that it is high time that such principles be observed and considered as sacred by all States of the world. Their disregard in the nuclear age in which we are living might very well lead to the annihilation of mankind, and to the darkness of complete destruction.

114. That is why my delegation was most interested in all that was said, in the course of our debates, about indirect aggression and one of its modern manifestations—inflammatory and subversive radio broadcasts. We do not feel ourselves to be in a position—for lack of sufficient data if for no other reason—to take sides in relation to the present accusations or denials of this later form of indirect aggression in the Middle East. We consider the problem, in any case, as being global and not one causing concern as regards only a special area. As I have said, we entertain the most serious anxiety about the great threats that such pernicious and, if I may say so, ugly practices represent for the peace of the world. My country, with many others, has not been immune to them. We therefore believe that studies on indirect aggression should be started soon by this Organization. We wish also to give our full support to the proposals made by President Eisenhower, in his noble and illuminating speech [733rd meeting] for an international control of subversive broadcasts.

115. If the Assembly adopts the seven-Power draft resolution, or one of similar disposition but reflecting still further attempts at conciliation, the Secretary-General will be called upon to discharge a very heavy and most delicate task. The great achievements already obtained by him in the cause of peace give us not only the hope but the confidence that once more he will succeed and that, within the period mentioned in the draft resolution, he will be able to make such practical arrangements as might best assist Lebanon and Jordan in the present circumstances.

116. I should now like to say a few words regarding the establishment of a stand-by United Nations peace force. Portugal is ready to support the creation of such a force, as we consider it would be a new and important safeguard for the preservation of the independence of small nations as well as a powerful deterrent against threats to peace in the world.

117. We are waiting with great interest for the announced studies of the Secretary-General on this question. But my delegation would hope that at an appropriate time, studies would also be undertaken to establish how the force could be employed in an emergency, without waiting for possible lengthy or inconclusive debates, either in the Security Council or in the General Assembly. It is a problem we consider of utmost importance, if the peace of the world is going to derive the full benefit of the force when it comes into existence, as we hope it will.

118. My delegation welcomes the suggestion made in our debates, and also contained in the seven-Power draft resolution, regarding the possible establishment of an Arab development institution designed to further economic growth in the Arab countries, provided, of

course, such an institution is acceptable to the Governments concerned. We understand that if it became a reality it would be financed not only by the Arab countries themselves but also by other countries in a position to contribute to it, as well as by private finance. The betterment of the economic conditions and general welfare of the peoples of the Arab countries—who are the direct heirs of a glorious civilization to which we ourselves are greatly and historically indebted—will always be a cause dear to the heart of the Portuguese nation.

119. Before concluding I should like to mention what I know is a most delicate point. I am referring to those fundamental problems that exist in the Middle East, and which are at the root of most of the unrest and tension in which that part of the world has been unhappily living for years. I do not need to indicate specifically which are these problems; all of us here are familiar with them. We know that they are most complex and intricate problems which will require extreme tolerance, great vision and statesmanship from all the parties concerned in order that a general settlement, acceptable to all, may one day be found. But we sincerely believe that such problems should not be allowed to become chronic, as that is contrary to the crying need for world peace.

120. May I therefore express the hope that, in the not too distant future, the countries concerned, in a spirit of human brotherhood, will try to find their way towards resolving their differences. We believe that all the great Powers, without exception, should always be ready to help the Middle East countries in such meritorious efforts, and our Organization could always offer them its machinery of conciliation. For our part we should sincerely like to say to all those countries here represented that our earnest wish is that soon will come the dawn of the day when they will find a firm and glorious road towards prosperity and peace, with freedom and justice.

121. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): My Government is keenly interested in a just, equitable and generally satisfactory solution being found as soon as possible to the problems which have for many years afflicted the nations of the Middle East and caused so much suffering to the peoples of that area.

122. My Government has always striven to reflect faithfully the aspirations of the Mexican people, a people whom the President of my country, Mr. Adolfo Ruiz Cortines, described in the following manner in his memorable interview with the President of the United States in October 1953:

“In the course of its history it has won political independence, put an end to the last imperialist adventure in the Western Hemisphere and carried through two great movements of political, economic and social reform. It is a nation which has distinguished itself by its vigorous rejection of foreign domination in any form; by its steadfast respect for the right of every free nation to decide for itself what system of government suits it best; by its innate sympathy for the weak and oppressed; by the complete absence of racial prejudice; by its congenital dislike for injustice of every kind; by its sincere devotion to the cause of peace; and, above all, by its deep-felt love of freedom”.

123. That is why Mexican activities in the international field and above all in the meetings of the General

Assembly have always been based on principles which are essentially in harmony with those of the United Nations, and these same principles have regulated and continue to regulate my country's foreign policy. Speaking from this rostrum in October 1957, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Mexico said:

“Mexico believes that peace should be based on a régime of liberty and justice, and it stands for the legal equality of States and scrupulous respect for their sovereignty. It considers fundamental the principle that, to use the words of the protocol signed by the American Republics in 1936, any intervention of a State ‘directly or indirectly, and for whatever reason, in the internal or external affairs’ of any other State is inadmissible. It repudiates unreservedly recourse to the threat or use of force in international relations, recognizes the obligation to settle disputes between States exclusively by peaceful means, and considers respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms as essential. It fully supports the right of all peoples freely to determine their own destiny, and it is convinced that prosperity, like peace, is indivisible, so that the economic development of all countries and the raising of the standard of living of their peoples constitutes an inescapable duty of the international community.” [699th meeting, par. 132.]

124. This is also why Mexico, convinced of the moderating and beneficent influence which the so-called small and medium-sized Powers can exercise in the serious disputes which unfortunately have frequently divided the great Powers, has endeavoured to win acceptance for conciliatory arrangements which, without impairing fundamental principles, facilitate constructive solutions based on mutual concessions. Suffice it to mention in this connexion that back in 1948 the Mexican delegation proposed, and had the satisfaction of seeing the Assembly unanimously approve in its resolution 190 (III), an “Appeal to the great Powers to renew their efforts to compose their differences and establish a lasting peace”. Similarly, in 1951, the head of my delegation, pursuant to a resolution of the First Committee,⁴ was called upon to preside over a sub-committee consisting of four of the great Powers, which, although its deliberations were private and lasted only about a week, produced results that were of considerable benefit in the then existing circumstances.

125. More recently, recalling that earlier experience, the representative of Mexico suggested in his statement in the general debate [699th meeting] that the same method should be tried in respect to disarmament, but that suggestion unfortunately could not be put into practice because, for reasons which are well known, the efforts to conciliate the opposing positions proved fruitless.

126. In conformity with this undeviating stand in favour of peaceful solutions and conciliation, my delegation wonders whether it would not be advisable in the present case to take advantage of the presence at United Nations Headquarters of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the great Powers and of several countries in the Middle East which undoubtedly are those most directly concerned with the question, to arrange, either through an invitation expressly issued by the Assembly itself or on the initiative of the Secretary-General—whose untiring efforts and noble aims are held in the greatest esteem by my delegation—for an informal meeting

⁴ Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Annexes, agenda items 66 and 16, document A/C.1/675.

at which impressions on the various aspects of this difficult question could be exchanged and an attempt be made to reach agreement on possible long-term solutions. We believe that nothing would be lost if such an attempt were made and that even the partial success of such informal conversations, no matter how modest it might be, would fully justify this further effort to arrive at a formula that might meet with general approval.

127. We must not lose sight of the fact that such a serious, delicate and complex question as the strengthening of peace in the Middle East is certainly not one that can be settled by voting; it must of necessity be the result of an agreement freely arrived at by the States involved. We are well aware that the aspects of the question on which some of the great Powers lay special emphasis differ fundamentally from those that are stressed by others of these Powers. We are none the less convinced that, given good will and reasonable concessions by all parties, there is at least some likelihood of achieving effective, even if somewhat incomplete, solutions, which would make no reference to points on which it proved impossible to reach agreement but would be confined to laying down procedures that appear to be indispensable to the accomplishment of those fundamental aims on which in substance the Assembly seems to agree, namely, the need to ensure due respect for the independence of Lebanon and Jordan and to secure the withdrawal of the foreign armed forces from the territories of both countries.

128. Moreover, the informal consultations to which I have referred might serve as a basis not only for seeking a solution to the crisis which has brought about this emergency special session and is actually nothing more than the most recent symptom of the serious illness from which the Middle East has been suffering for years, but also for exploring satisfactory means of effecting a radical cure.

129. The procedure which I venture to suggest would have the advantage of enabling all the States Members of this fully representative organ of the international community once again to bring to bear their moderating and constructive influence in a matter which concerns us all because it is capable of jeopardizing world peace. At the same time, however, and without in the least detracting from the responsibility of every Member State to do its utmost to ensure respect for the principles of the United Nations and fulfilment of its purposes, the General Assembly would place the primary responsibility for the solution of this problem on those Powers without whose active co-operation it would be extremely difficult to imagine a long and fruitful period of peace and progress in the Middle East.

130. I say this because we must, if we examine this problem realistically, admit that the basic causes of the unrest and frequent disturbances in the Middle East are to be found—even though other less important factors are also undoubtedly present—in the rivalry between the great Powers. That is why we do not believe that the problem of the Middle East can be settled by dealing solely with some of its effects and some of its symptoms. A frank and objective analysis of its basic causes ineluctably forces us to recognize the existence of that rivalry and the desire of the most powerful States to ensure their influence in specific areas of that part of the world.

131. The intensity of that political and diplomatic rivalry transforms the Middle East, to all intents and

purposes, into a battlefield of opposing forces, thus endangering peace and security. There is an urgent need to guarantee the territorial integrity and political independence of the States of the area and to safeguard fully their inalienable right freely to decide their own future.

132. This right of self-determination, solemnly established in the Charter, obviously connotes the right of those States to have governments chosen by the sovereign will of their peoples and not imposed upon them from outside by means of direct or indirect intervention. It also connotes the right of those States to maintain their separate political identity or to unite in a federation or confederation—as they choose without pressure in one direction or another by foreign interests.

133. The national resurgence of the peoples of the Middle East cannot and must not be ignored or repressed. It is therefore imperative, as a first step, that the principle of non-intervention should be fully respected not only by the States of the area in their relations among themselves, but also—and I might almost say, mainly—by the great Powers. But what we might call the “diplomatic withdrawal” of those Powers—a term used last year on this rostrum by a distinguished speaker—is not enough, for it is a purely negative step. It must be supplemented by positive assistance from the great Powers. With their wealth of financial, technical and industrial resources, and as due compensation for the upheavals brought about in the Middle East as a result of their past intervention, they should now feel obligated to make a positive contribution to the economic development of the peoples of the area.

134. Whatever development programmes may be worked out under United Nations auspices should of course be subject, first and foremost, to approval by the Middle East States so that they cannot become pretexts for further surreptitious intervention. The organ or organs which may eventually be called upon to give effect to such programmes should bear in mind the principles underlying resolution 626 (VII) by which the General Assembly recommended all Member States to “refrain from acts, direct or indirect, designed to impede the exercise of the sovereignty”—I would add “the full sovereignty”—“of any State over its natural resources”.

135. In this connexion, my delegation was especially pleased that President Eisenhower, in his forceful address to the Assembly on 14 August 1958 [733rd meeting] not only suggested the establishment of an Arab development institution on a regional basis and promised United States support for it if the States of the region agreed to its establishment, but also made absolutely clear that it should be governed by the Arab States themselves.

136. My delegation is confident that the withdrawal of the foreign troops now in Lebanon and Jordan will take place in the near future. This confidence is based both on the fact that no one questions the need to withdraw them and on the repeated assurances in this regard given by the authorized representatives of the two Powers to whom the troops belong. However, as I have already said, this will obviously be no more than a slight step towards a solution of the problem as a whole, in the same way that the present and future accomplishments of the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon, although extremely valuable and

praiseworthy, cannot be anything more than a partial programme.

137. My delegation is firmly convinced that the procedure which we have suggested represents the most appropriate and effective means for laying the foundation now that will enable a complete solution to be achieved in the future.

138. Without entering into the merits of the draft resolutions before the Assembly—although reserving the right to do so at a later stage if I consider it necessary—I should like to put forward the view that we should all support the Arab delegations in their efforts to agree on a draft which all members of the Assembly can accept without mental reservations or objections of any sort. It would be a shame to ask the Secretary-General to undertake so arduous and difficult a task as that of seeking a formula of agreement in the Middle East with no assurance that the parties directly concerned would go along with it or, what is worse, knowing in advance that we had aroused their opposition.

139. I should like to supplement these modest suggestions with another, of wider scope and broader perspective. We all know that although, at the moment, the Middle East is the problem which has done most to sharpen the differences between the great Powers, it is far from the only question dividing them and likely to endanger world peace.

140. Suffice it to mention, among many others still awaiting solution, the grave problem of disarmament, which can be said without exaggeration to be the one on which the future of mankind ultimately depends. Consequently, we believe that the Assembly, conscious of its responsibilities, might perhaps take advantage of

this opportunity—or, if this is not deemed to be an appropriate or favourable time, then its next regular session—to make another solemn appeal to the great Powers, similar to the one unanimously approved in 1948 [*resolution 190 (III)*], for a meeting of their representatives at the highest level in order to renew their efforts to reconcile their differences and establish a lasting peace. Such a meeting, held pursuant to the recommendation of the General Assembly, which would specifically require the participants to report to it on the results, would be wholly within the framework of the United Nations.

141. We hope that our idea may be favourably received by the representatives assembled here. We are also inclined to think that it may be welcomed by the great Powers which would be called upon to consult together, for not only has the clamour of all peoples for what has come to be known as “a summit meeting” been growing louder each day, as the representative of Ceylon so eloquently said [*742nd meeting*], but the Heads of State of the great Powers have all expressed themselves in favour of such a meeting, differing only with regard to the conditions in which it should be held. However, even if such a recommendation should not yield any immediate positive results, the General Assembly, by the mere fact of adopting it, would have the satisfaction of having made another attempt, and we are confident that the influence of that recommendation would sooner or later make itself felt so that the terrible threat hanging over all of us of a world conflagration that would mean, in the final analysis, mutual annihilation and destruction may be banished from the horizon.

The meeting rose at 11.35 p.m.