

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SESSION

Official Records



**710th
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 25 October 1957,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 69:

Complaint about threats to the security of Syria and
to international peace (*continued*) 379

President: Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).

AGENDA ITEM 69

Complaint about threats to the security of Syria and to international peace (*continued*)

1. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Once more the peace and security of the peoples of the Middle East are threatened. Once more the question of the situation in that part of the world is on the General Assembly's agenda, this time at the proposal of Syria. It was natural that the Syrian Government should seek United Nations support in view of the threat to its country represented by the concentration on its borders of foreign troops, whose presence is denied by no one.

2. Last year, our Organization, assisted by the peace-loving peoples of the whole world, contributed decisively to the cessation of another act of aggression in that region, the aggression against Egypt. The armed aggression against Egypt last year did not succeed in bringing that country to its knees. The Egyptian people rose as one man to defend their political independence, the integrity of their territory, peace in the Middle East and the cause of Arab independence.

3. At the time of the imperialist aggression against Egypt, carried on by two powers through a third country situated in that region, Israel, world public opinion condemned that aggression. That condemnation succeeded in bringing to an end the bellicose dreams of imperialist circles in the aggressor countries and saved peace in the Middle East.

4. These imperialist circles are now trying to organize a repetition of last autumn's attack, in order to regain the position they have lost in the Middle East. The factors underlying the new attempt to strike at the freedom and independence of the peoples of the Middle East are the same as those that inspired the aggression last year. Only the cast of players has changed.

5. Last year, the action was led by the United Kingdom and France, with the direct and active participation of Israel, a country which, because of its position in the Middle East, was used as a tool to start the aggression against Egypt. This time, it is the United States which is playing the active part in the campaign. This time the victim is Syria, a country which has

refused to take orders from the United States and to accept the Eisenhower doctrine, a country which does not wish to be incorporated in the aggressive blocs organized by the imperialist countries or to renounce its national independence, for which it has fought against imperialists and foreign invaders.

6. Having failed to persuade the neighbouring Arab countries to assume the unenviable role of the aggressor against Syria, the United States, according to reports in the Press as well as to information received from the Syrian Government itself, is now trying to confer this role on another country in the Middle East, on another neighbour of Syria, namely, Turkey.

7. This direct threat to Syria is but the culminating point in a whole series of manoeuvres designed to prepare the way for the United States to intervene in that country's domestic affairs and to impose on it a policy which would run counter to its interests and to its present policy.

8. The Syrian Government's decision to make certain changes in its administration in order to counter the threat of a *coup d'état* which the United States had long been preparing displeased American imperialist circles and aroused their anger. It provoked a violent reaction among the ruling circles in the United States. Accordingly, one of the chief specialists of the State Department was sent to the Middle East in order to study the situation and prepare the way for open intervention in Syria's domestic affairs, that is, for direct military intervention. During his pilgrimage to the Middle East, Mr. Henderson visited Syria's neighbours and had conversations with the statesmen in that area with a view to preparing the ground for the discussion of plans which had already been worked out.

9. After Mr. Henderson's return, the American Press gave his mission and the conversations which he had had with statesmen in the Middle East a great deal of publicity. At a Press conference, the United States Secretary of State went so far as to say that the question of the application of the Eisenhower doctrine to Syria was being examined, although that country had resolutely rejected that doctrine, which seeks to re-establish the colonial yoke over the peoples and countries of the Middle East.

10. Recently, a great deal of information has been published on the subversive activities of Mr. Henderson and of other representatives of the State Department sent to the Middle East, all directed towards the preparation of a war against Syria and its legitimate government and the replacement of the latter by a government of *émigré* traitors to the Syrian cause.

11. Meanwhile, the Arab leaders of neighbouring countries, realizing that the danger threatening Syria could easily extend to the whole Arab world, gathered

at Damascus in order to study the situation which had arisen and to consult on the steps to be taken in order to remedy it. After that visit, they made a number of statements in support of the Syrian cause. They emphasized in unequivocal terms that any aggression against Syria would be regarded as an aggression against all the Arab countries and the whole Arab world. They noted the slanderous inventions of the United States and other Western countries to the effect that Syria was a danger to its neighbours and had aggressive intentions against them because of communist infiltration. Those inventions were refuted quite categorically by the king of Saudi Arabia, who said that it was "ill-advised to express such thoughts", and added that he condemned any aggression against Syria and would fight beside his Syrian brothers and all Arabs if any aggression was directed against Syrian independence.

12. Clearly, the failure of the United States plan to involve the Arab countries in an attack on Syria has not been enough to cause it to renounce its intentions. It emerges from recent reports that the United States has gone on with its preparations for military intervention against Syria in order to eliminate those Syrian leaders which are not to its liking. It is now common knowledge that a large number of Turkish troops are concentrated on the Syrian frontier, from points all over Turkey. The concentration of these troops in itself has already created tension and constitutes a real danger of the outbreak of armed conflict. At the same time, units of the Sixth United States Fleet have arrived on so-called friendly visits to various Mediterranean or eastern ports, with the obvious purpose of being there on D-Day.

13. In the Syrian Government's special memorandum of 15 October [A/3699], concerning the preparation by foreign imperialists of the campaign against Syria, it is stated that the concentration of Turkish troops for purposes of an invasion has been going on for two weeks and that acts of provocation are being committed by military aircraft in Syrian air space and that skirmishing and armed incursions into Syrian territory are continually taking place. These concentrations of troops on the Syrian frontier are accompanied by a widespread and vigorous propaganda campaign designed to prepare world public opinion for the planned action by the United States against Syria. At the same time, warlike statements are being made in the United States to the effect that Turkey, if attacked by its neighbours, would be defended by the United States. The implication is that it would also be defended by all the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

14. It is difficult to imagine Turkey being attacked by a country like Syria, which is so much smaller and whose regular forces are only one-tenth as large as the Turkish armed forces according to information in the American Press itself. It would be interesting to know, moreover, if the United States had asked for and obtained the agreement of all the NATO countries to taking part in the campaign it has prepared against Syria and against the Middle East as a whole.

15. The fact that the United States plans for this action against Syria have been unmasked has caused a certain confusion among the planners. In a statement by the State Department and in statements made by officials responsible for the foreign policy of the

United States, it has been affirmed that the United States has no aggressive intentions against Syria but is ready to defend Turkey. Against whom are the United States armed forces supposed to defend Turkey, when little Syria is in no state to attack that country and has not even thought of doing so, being entirely taken up for the time being in dealing with the difficulties resulting from the attempts of foreign imperialist circles to interfere in its internal affairs?

16. It is obvious that the purpose of these statements is to create tension in the Middle East and to bring about a favourable climate for action to carry out the plans of the American monopolists.

17. Although nobody can imagine Turkey being attacked by Syria, the United States representative said, surely not by accident, in his statement in the general debate: "One consequence of this is that Turkey now faces growing military danger from the major buildup of Soviet arms in Syria on its southern border." [680th meeting. Para. 46]

There is an astonishing threat to Syria in that same speech.

18. However, there seems to have been some difficulty in satisfying the newspapers, even those most closely allied with the State Department, with the explanations given by United States official circles regarding the latest events in the Middle East. That is why they are continuing to shoot at last month's targets. For example, on 20 October, The New York Times had the following comments on United States activities in the Middle East: "The Western setback could be turned into victory"—you see, they are looking for victory—"if the pro-Soviet régime"—this is, the régime in Syria—"could somehow be dislodged."

Is this not a clear avowal of the intentions of the United States and its partners towards Syria?

19. In the same article, the unanimity of the Arab countries on American policy in the Middle East is presented in a way which displays that policy in a very unflattering light:

"Instead of being asked to intervene by the Syrian authorities and Government, the United States rushed arms to Syria's neighbours, including Jordan. The Arab world, however, interpreted this as a Western effort to get Arab to fight Arab. Accordingly, under the leadership of King Saud, the Arab world drew together under the banner of Arab unity and proclaimed its readiness to resist outside intrusion in Syria."

It is quite clear what intrusion is meant, since the article is concerned with American policy in the Middle East.

20. As regards the situation created along the Turkish-Syrian frontier, official Turkish representatives have stated that these troop movements are designed to safeguard Turkish national security, and that it is an internal question which outsiders are not entitled to comment on. No doubt. We freely concede that troop movements within its own territory are a domestic affair for any sovereign country. However, when these movements take the form of concentration of forces on the frontier of a peaceful country, particularly a small country, apprehensions must arise in the State on whose frontier that concentration is being

carried out, particularly when there are also skirmishes and violations of that State's air space.

21. When the situation so created is a serious threat to the peace, it is of concern to all neighbouring countries and not to the two neighbouring countries alone. Such a situation is also of concern to the United Nations, whose essential function it is to safeguard and strengthen peace and security. Furthermore, the representative of Turkey, in his statement to the United Nations, justified his country's troop concentration on the Turkish-Syrian border by his apprehensions concerning recent events in Syria. If that is the case, what weight have the arguments that such concentration of troops is of no concern to Syria.

22. The Turkish representative said, for example, that it was the duty of the United States to show the peoples of the Middle East that it was really interested in the Middle East—one might ask who would think that it was not—and that the only way to unite those peoples was to bring them into the Baghdad Pact. He went on to say that the participation of the United States in the Baghdad Pact would lead, first, to the accession of Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Lebanon to the pact and, secondly to the liquidation of the present pro-Soviet régime in Syria by anti-communist elements in that country.

23. A statement of that kind makes the aims of the American financial monopolies clear to even the least well informed persons. Those monopolies are seeking to force the States and peoples of the Middle East into aggressive pacts and blocs against their will and to overthrow the lawful governments of those countries. The explanations of the purpose of the preparations that have been made on the Syrian border are highly significant and calculated to enlighten even the most ignorant. We are obviously confronted with a threat to the peace and security of the countries of the Middle East—and to other countries besides. In the circumstances, the peoples have reason to view their future with alarm.

24. Events in the Middle East are of great interest and concern to my country. Today, unrest in any part of the world directly and rapidly affects all countries, particularly neighbouring countries. That is why the attention of the entire Bulgarian people is concentrated on the events recently provoked in the Middle East by the efforts of American imperialist circles to light the fires of war in that region.

25. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has expressed the concern with which public opinion in our country views the tense situation created on the Turkish-Syrian border. A few days ago, the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria said, referring to the joint statements recently issued by the Governments of Bulgaria and other countries:

"Our unanimous opinion is that a war in that part of the world cannot be isolated. It would create a real danger of the outbreak of a new world war. That is why we unanimously expressed our determination to use every effort to safeguard peace and security in the Balkans, and in the Near and Middle East, a matter of vital concern to us. That is why we fully approve the clear and categorical warning given by the Soviets to the Turkish Government with regard to the threats against Syria and the concentration of Turkish troops on the borders of peace-loving Syria.

The Turkish Government must heed that warning and not enter upon the path of aggression, which would inevitably lead Turkey itself to catastrophe."

26. The Bulgarian people are vitally interested in the maintenance and strengthening of peace in the Middle East. They are prepared to support any initiative to eliminate tension in that area and any measures to cool the passions aroused by the provocation of American imperialist circles. Bulgarian public opinion shares the uneasiness and concern expressed by the Government of the Soviet Union with regard to the dangerous situation which threatens peace in the Middle East.

27. That is quite natural. Any deterioration of the situation in that area would immediately and directly affect the entire Bulgarian people and would have repercussions on the internal life of our country. That is why Bulgaria resolutely and whole-heartedly opposes the attempts of those who are trying by means of trumped-up charges to disturb the peace and to bring the peoples of the Near and Middle East once more under their tutelage by restoring the former colonial domination of that region in a new guise.

28. The American imperialists are seeking to become the undisputed masters of the Middle East's enormous natural resources, to seize the positions from which the British and French colonizers were expelled—with the help, incidentally, of the United States—and to assume complete control over the destiny of the peoples of that area.

29. The great interest of the financial circles is obviously dictated by their ambition to obtain sole control of the production and distribution of the Middle East's oil resources which represent, it is said, 65 per cent of the world's known oil reserves. This ambition is readily understandable. The profits earned by the American oil companies through the exploitation of the Middle East oil fields are enormous. In 1955 alone, the American oil monopolies produced 150 million tons at a cost of only \$240 million, while the profits resulting from the sale of the oil are estimated at \$1,900 million.

30. That is the reason for the oil monopolies' great interest in the area; that is the reason for the aid so generously offered to the Middle Eastern countries by the United States in the form of military, technical or other assistance or under the new Eisenhower doctrine.

31. When it became clear, after the failure of the aggression against Egypt, that neither the British nor the French would be able to recover and keep their former positions in the Middle East, a great campaign was launched in the United States to prevent the creation of a so-called power vacuum in the Middle East following on the elimination of the influence of the former colonial Powers.

32. The heads of State representing the peoples in that part of the world declared that there was no "vacuum" in the Middle East and that if such a "vacuum" appeared in any country, the peoples of the area were capable of filling it themselves, since they had come of age. But those statements did not convince the monopolistic circles concerned or the ruling circles in the United States. They were unwilling to recognize that the peoples of the Middle East had come of age, that they had grown up in the struggle to destroy colonial domination and to win the liberty and

independence of their countries. The historical experience those peoples have acquired has taught them how to take their own decisions.

33. Thus the Eisenhower doctrine, which seeks to establish a new form of colonial domination in the Middle East and to reduce its peoples to complete economic and political dependence on the American monopolists, is contrary to the desires of the peoples concerned. In order to camouflage these attempts to subject the peoples of the Middle East to a new form of colonial domination, it is claimed that the peoples must be protected against "communist infiltration", a pretext which, although somewhat worn, still sounds impressive to some.

34. The method is an old one that has been used countless times in the struggle against the national liberation movement of the peoples in order to frustrate their efforts to throw off the chains of colonialism and consolidate their national independence. Everywhere the peoples' fight against the colonizers and colonial domination, the fight for freedom and the consolidation of national independence, is labelled a communist activity by the colonial Powers concerned. Any desire on the part of those peoples to obtain better living conditions, any struggle for national independence, is attributed to "communist infiltration".

35. The Arab peoples, like all the other peoples of the world, are well aware of this. That is why they refuse to be duped and resolutely oppose any manoeuvre of this sort. They realize that, on the pretext of combating an imaginary danger, the aggressive circles are seeking to restore colonial domination and to gain complete control of their countries. That is why all the recent attempts to set the Arab countries against one another under the notorious Eisenhower doctrine have come to nothing.

36. Moreover, many reports have appeared in the American Press concerning the failure of the "cold war" policy, which is again being lauded, and which some are attempting to revive by means of the Eisenhower doctrine. For example, on 18 October 1957, The New York Herald Tribune stated:

"The besetting weakness of American policy in the Middle East viewed at the scene of operation lies in the fact that it is moulded too much in terms of fighting the same old "cold war" with communism, instead of meeting the new challenge of understanding and accommodation with Arab nationalism. As a result, the conduct of American diplomacy and the carrying out of policy in the Middle East in the year since the Suez crisis has served mainly to defeat the ends we ought to be trying to achieve."

37. The criticisms of the Eisenhower doctrine in the United States do not mean, however, that the American monopolies have renounced the goals they had set themselves in the Middle East. On the contrary, the "doctrine" is criticized because it is not an effective means of reaching those goals. Consequently, criticism of the "doctrine" does not imply renunciation of the imperialist plans for the conquest of the Middle East and the establishment of military bases in the area. On the contrary, every effort is being directed towards those goals. The Eisenhower doctrine is criticized because it has not succeeded in reaching its planned goals. Now the problem is one of changing methods, of

finding more effective means of exerting American influence, attaining the desired goals and once again bringing the peoples concerned under the yoke of colonialism, with all the disastrous consequences that would entail for them.

38. All the Arab peoples and their leaders—even those who were originally induced to endorse the "doctrine," either openly or discreetly but firmly, are now opposed to its application and to its harmful effects in the Arab countries. That fact was clearly stated in the Egyptian newspaper, Gomhouriya which recently said "the Eisenhower doctrine represents a more sinister policy than that of British imperialism".

39. From the statements made and the positions taken by the leaders of the Arab countries, it is obvious that they have a very clear understanding of the imperialist attempts to transform the Middle East into a permanent hotbed of strife, into a powder keg. The aims of this policy—the incorporation of the Arab countries in aggressive blocs organized either under the influence or on the order of the American monopolies, the elimination, through plots or military pressures, of the leaders who defend the independence and freedom of the Arab peoples, complete control by the American monopolists of the natural resources of the Arab countries and the transformation of the Middle East into a military base against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies—all these aims are perfectly clear to the mass of the people in the area.

40. Attempts have been made here to label as propaganda the Soviet Union's accusations that the concentration of troops on the Syrian border is creating a danger of imminent war in the Middle East. Why? Is the legitimate concern of each State to see that peace is not broken close to its own borders propaganda? If it was propaganda, why did the United States, after originally acquiescing in the Syrian Government's legitimate request to send a fact-finding committee to the area, engage in a series of manoeuvres to delay the appointment and departure of the committee? Have they, the great advocates of fact-finding committees even where they are unnecessary—indeed, especially where they are unnecessary—become the adversaries of such committees in areas where they are really needed?

41. Why is so much effort being made to send mediators where they are not needed? The Syrian Government asks only that it should be ascertained that there are troop concentrations on its borders and that measures should be taken to ensure that the troops are withdrawn and cease to disturb peace in the area. Instead, efforts are being made to send mediators. But there is no problem requiring mediation. The Syrian Government has plainly stated this. If it is necessary to ask those who are threatening peace to refrain from doing so, the General Assembly is well qualified to do so itself, without mediation.

42. If pressure must be exerted on the Syrian Government to make it yield to the wishes of the United States, that is another matter. But if that is the case, it should be plainly stated and admitted that it is proposed to bring pressure to bear on the Syrian Government, the government of a sovereign and independent State.

43. If there is a real desire to maintain and strengthen peace in the Middle East, the peoples of the area, in particular the Arab peoples, must be allowed to settle

their own internal affairs, as well as any problems arising between them. That is the only way to establish conditions in which the threats of war created by American manoeuvres in the area can be eliminated.

44. The statements of the official directors of United States foreign policy that the Eisenhower doctrine is intended to maintain peace in the Middle East are wholly at variance with their deeds. If their real intention is to safeguard peace in the Middle East, if they sincerely desire to allow the peoples to settle their own affairs, why are they trying to implant American influence in that region? Is there any need to implant foreign influence there? Surely the influence of the Arab peoples and the culture of the Arab States, which are capable of regulating their own affairs, are enough.

45. If the aim of United States policy is to maintain peace in the Middle East and eliminate a breeding ground for war in that area, why do the ruling circles of the United States persist in their refusal to accept the Soviet proposal inviting the four great Powers to make a declaration of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of the Arab countries, abandon efforts to involve those countries in military blocs, halt the sending of arms to those countries and liquidate foreign military bases in their territories?

46. It is clear that the Soviet Union's proposals, which seek to put an end to all foreign influence and foreign meddling in the domestic affairs and relations of the Middle Eastern countries, are not to the liking of the foreign monopolies and of certain governmental circles in the Western countries. The implementation of these proposals would finally preclude any possibility of the restoration of their colonial domination in this area; it would eliminate the possibility of maintaining tension in the relations between the countries of the area; it would make it impossible for the region to be transformed into a base for imperialist aggression.

47. The question arises whether those who are attempting to provoke the peoples of the Middle East to mutual hostility and stir up conflict in the area in order to satisfy their own purely selfish interests do not realize that at the present stage of human development it is difficult, if not impossible, to limit local conflicts. It is surely obvious that a third world war would cause unheard-of suffering and immense physical destruction and cost the lives of millions of men and women. Surely it is obvious that such a war would spare no country, not even the countries and peoples some of whose ruling circles are now attempting to kindle the flames of war in the Middle East.

48. The Bulgarian people are aware that a new war in the Middle East would immediately spread to the nearby countries and become a new world war. Bulgaria, voicing its heartfelt aspirations and sacred desire, shared by all the peoples of the world, for the maintenance of peace, considers that it is high time to take immediate steps to end the subversive activities directed against the independence of the Arab nations and in particular against the national security and independence of Syria.

49. In these circumstances, it is natural that the Bulgarian delegation should warmly and resolutely support the Syrian Government's proposal that a United Nations commission should be appointed immediately to investigate the situation on the Turkish-Syrian border at first hand with a view to recommend-

ing the steps necessary to restore calm in the Middle East and on that border. The sooner and the more resolutely the United Nations takes measures to deal with this problem, the better will it preserve the peace and security of the peoples of that region and of the whole world.

50. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan): I wish to take this opportunity very briefly to clarify my delegation's position on this issue.

51. Syria is an independent and sovereign State and a Member of this great family of nations. Such membership entails, in the first place, fulfilling in good faith the objectives that Members have assumed under the Charter. Members are to settle their international disputes by peaceful means, and they are to refrain in their international relations from the threat of force and the use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. To that end, the United Nations is not to intervene in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.

52. It may be true that no serious action has yet taken place across the Syrian borders. Nevertheless, each State is under the obligation to see to it that in no circumstances are its territorial integrity and the safety of its people left to chance. It is commendable that a State should be vigilant and should act swiftly, before it is too late, in order to avert what appears beyond any reasonable doubt to be a situation fraught with imminent danger.

53. That, so far as I can see, is the way in which the Syrian Government views the situation. Those, I believe, are the considerations which have prompted the Syrian Government to take the peaceful steps it has taken to safeguard itself against eventualities. There is no doubt that, in bringing this complaint before the United Nations, the Syrian Government has acted in the most conciliatory way open to it in self-defence against the concentration of troops and troop movements along Syria's borders with Turkey—irrespective of the motives which have guided the Turkish Government in its action. The Syrian Government is deliberately trying to resort to pacific action in the face of what it believes to be a precarious and provocative situation, and it has made this quite clear in its memorandum [A/3699].

54. Furthermore, the Syrian action is in accordance with the familiar paragraph 4 of Article 2 of the Charter.

55. On the other hand, the action complained of is, on the face of it, the sole concern of the Government of Turkey. A sovereign State is free to exercise its exclusive jurisdiction within its own territory, to order troop movements within its own territorial limits as it likes, where it likes and when it likes. Also, a sovereign State has every right to refuse any limitations on such freedom, and there is already a presumption in the accepted rules of international law in favour of such freedom. We all understand that.

56. Nevertheless, we know by now that the absolute freedom of States is a thing of the past. We are willing to believe that we live in a liberal age compared with the state of affairs of days gone by, when the heads of States, not the States themselves, were the determining factor in international relationships. Therefore, if Syria is suspicious of troop concentrations along its

borders, it is the Syrian Government alone which may in fact be able to give a legitimate interpretation of whether such concentration of troops and such troop movements are hostile acts directed against the safety of Syria and its people. In fairness to all, the onus of proof must rest with Syria. That was why the Syrian Government asked for the setting up by the General Assembly of a commission to investigate and report to the Assembly on the situation prevailing along the Syrian-Turkish border.

57. We must be fair and just and give Syria at least the benefit of the doubt if we cannot go along with its complaint and accept it at its face value, for the Syrian Government's interpretation of the situation—and the peaceful way in which it wishes to solve the question—is in accordance with paragraph 4 of Article 2 of the Charter.

58. Of course it may be argued, and quite rightly that sovereign States are free to take up whatever measures they deem necessary in order not to impair the right of self-defence which is described in Article 51 of the Charter as an inherent right, yet such States may justify their action on the ground of self-defence only if they can show that there was an instant and overwhelming necessity for such action. And one may ponder here and ask the fair question: Is the safety of Turkey in any way in danger, taking into consideration, of course, that Syria is a small country and that its military potential cannot compete with that of Turkey? I believe that the answer is not difficult. Syria, in the present circumstances, is unable to constitute a threat to the Turkish Republic, and I cannot conceive of such a threat to the Turkish people by Syria in the present circumstances.

59. It may be said that an international situation fraught with explosive possibilities exists in the Middle East as a whole, but that is another matter. This, of course, cannot be denied, because the Middle East is rapidly becoming part of the area of the "cold war". This situation existed long before the United Nations. We must face the problem of the Middle East boldly. What the peoples of the Middle East need today is sympathy and understanding for the solution of the many basic problems with which they are faced. The peoples of the Middle East feel that their security may be threatened and that their independence may be undermined. Their economic and social progress may be retarded because of the unsettled situation which, owing to facts beyond their control, they are experiencing day in and day out.

60. The Sudan, being a small country and a member of the Arab League, is seriously perturbed about the tension that prevails in the area of the Middle East. Small nations such as ours are jealous lest the big Powers—through conflicting interests—actually transform the Middle East into an area of the "cold war", which would threaten their very existence.

61. For the reasons I have mentioned here, the Sudan delegation whole-heartedly supports the Syrian request for the setting up by the General Assembly of a commission to investigate the situation on the Syrian-Turkish border and then report to the General Assembly. We feel that the United Nations will not fail in one of its main functions, namely, that of lessening tension, wherever that tension may be, and of creating a favourable climate for the establishment and preservation of world peace.

62. Before concluding my brief remarks, I wish to make the following abundantly clear. Neither the delegation nor the people of the Sudan are in any way prompted by considerations of animosity, ill-will or hatred towards the Turkish people or Government. As a small country, we are anxious to cultivate the friendship of all peoples in all lands. My delegation also wishes to make it clear that the Sudanese people have followed the renaissance in modern Turkey and the efforts made by the Turkish people under the leadership of Kemal Ataturk, the founder of modern Turkey, and under the succeeding leadership, with great admiration. We are also mindful of the resourcefulness of the Turkish nation and the example it has shown in surmounting the great obstacles and the thorny problems that have been its lot as a legacy of the past. These great efforts have not gone unnoticed by the rest of the world, and especially not by the peoples of the Middle East.

63. We sincerely hope that Turkey and Syria will do everything in their power to remove the causes of tension and anxiety and to return to normal and friendly relations. I have no reason to doubt that this ultimately is the aim of Turkey and also of Syria.

64. Mr. MAURER (Romania) (translated from French): During the general debate, the Romanian delegation expressed the legitimate concern of the Government and people of Romania over the increasing tension in the Middle East and, in particular, over the campaign against Syria. Romania regards the countries of the Middle East, with which it is linked by traditional economic, political and cultural ties, not merely as close neighbours but as protagonists in an important historical drama which is having an undoubted influence on the entire evolution of international life: I refer to the emergence, consolidation and evolution of the independent Arab States. The Romanian people know very well that their national independence, won at the cost of heavy sacrifice and long struggle, is the basis of the progress and of the policy of peace of its socialist State. For that reason the Government of the Romanian People's Republic hails the advances made by the Arab States in defending and consolidating their independence. It welcomes those advances as an important contribution to the cause of peace and considers that any attempt to obstruct this historical process or to disregard it constitutes a blow against a fundamental principle of international co-operation that is bound to have serious consequences for the peace of all nations.

65. This view is in full accord with the Principles and Purposes of the Charter and is the only possible criterion for a truly responsible analysis of the problems of the Middle East. This explains clearly why we are uniting with all those who have stressed the importance and urgency of the problem that the Syrian Government has brought before the General Assembly. The mere fact that the Government of a Member State has complained to the United Nations that its security is threatened makes it obligatory upon the General Assembly to examine the complaint at once and to take the appropriate measures without delay, especially as the serious facts adduced by the Syrian Government in support of its request are obviously true.

66. After all, do we need any further proof beyond the statement made by the State Department on 7 September 1957, which gave the official signal for military action against Syria? Who could ask for additional proof of

the spectacular shipments of American arms to Turkey, Jordan and other countries of the Middle East, of the manoeuvres which the United States Sixth Fleet is pointedly carrying out near Syrian territory or of the repeated landings of United States troops on Turkish soil? Do we need further evidence of the concentration of Turkish troops along the Syrian border when the fact has not been contested by the Turkish representative himself, who, moreover, did not contradict the eloquent statement of Ismet Inonu? Are such mass concentrations of troops for defensive purposes only?

67. Does Syria really threaten any country? If it does, what explanation can there be for the repeated assertions by all the Arab States that Syria is not threatening anyone and that the arms purchases in which it is engaged are entirely its own affair? And if Turkey was seriously threatened, how is it that Mr. Dulles was the first to announce it, on 7 September 1957, and that it was only after two weeks that Turkey was heard to echo that statement, on 24 September, when Mr. Menderes for the first time officially took a stand on the Syrian question?

68. In his statement, the Turkish representative said nothing about the existence on Turkish territory of an operational base for Syrian emigrants who are plotting to overthrow the legitimate régime of Syria; indeed, it would not have been easy for him to do so when the Press of all countries, including that of the United States, has been publishing reports of the activities of those emigrants in Turkey. I need only refer to Walter Lippmann's report in the New York Herald Tribune of 17 October, which spoke of the existence on Turkish territory of a centre of intrigue composed of Syrian emigrants.

69. The General Assembly, which is bound to take action on a complaint brought by one of its Members, must not overlook any of these facts, which bear eloquent witness to the grave danger threatening Syria and to the need for prompt action by the United Nations.

70. The argument that the Turkish troop movements along the Syrian border are a matter exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of Turkey cannot stand. Indeed, the Turkish Government itself would not accept such an argument if another State were massing troops along the Turkish border.

71. The only data that the General Assembly still needs to dispel any doubts that might remain and to decide what sort of action is needed pertain to the exact extent of the military danger on the Syrian border. This is not the place where such information can be obtained; it can be obtained only through an investigation on the spot.

72. Various proposals have been made concerning the United Nations body that should be instructed to study and ascertain the actual situation and to report thereon to the General Assembly. The Romanian delegation does not think that any of those proposals can take the place of the action asked for by the Syrian Government: namely, the appointment by the United Nations of a commission composed of representatives of Member States.

73. There can be no doubt that a problem as complex and as important as the one before us calls for the establishment of an instrument which must of necessity have full authority. That can only be the case if the

commission is composed of representatives of Member States. Moreover, that method of setting up the commission is the only one that will ensure a wisely selected membership and will give the commission great and incontestable value.

74. If, however, the United States does not want a commission appointed by the General Assembly to deal with these problems, there can be only one conclusion: that the United States does not want the United Nations to be in a position to help settle the question. On the contrary, acting under the cover of the United Nations and in violation of the spirit of the Charter, the United States is pursuing its policy of contempt for the independence and the vital interests of the Arab countries so that at the right moment it can inflate the crisis to the full and turn it to its own advantage.

75. If we examine the attitude of the United States towards Syria in the context of its whole Middle Eastern policy, we shall see that this is so. The well-known Eisenhower doctrine, which has prompted the steps the United States is now taking in relation to Syria, is the expression of this policy. Ever since its inception, this "doctrine" has been formulated outside the United Nations and against it. In explaining the Eisenhower doctrine before a joint meeting of the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, Mr. Dulles said that it was designed to take care of "an aspect of the Middle Eastern situation with which the United Nations cannot adequately deal".

76. By its premises and objectives, the Eisenhower doctrine is undoubtedly contrary to the spirit and the letter of the Charter. It is based on the concept that the division of the world into military blocs is inevitable and it endeavours to bring the States of the Middle East into the military bloc of the Western Powers and to keep them there.

77. The relentlessness with which the United States has been pursuing Syria, merely because the latter is following an independent policy outside the military blocs and has therefore refused to accept the Eisenhower doctrine, is significant in that connexion.

78. Events in Syria have revealed the true nature of this "doctrine" to even the greatest sceptics. Things have gone so far that the United States authorities are taking the liberty of designating the countries with which the States of the Middle East may or may not have commercial or diplomatic relations and of deciding where those States may or may not purchase the arms required for their defence, who may or may not be in command of their armies and general staffs and, finally, who threatens or does not threaten their security.

79. Even more important, after failing in their attempts to overthrow the independent government of Syria through political and economic pressure and even through subversion, after failing in their attempts to shatter the solidarity of the Arab peoples and to incite certain Arab countries to war against Syria, the aggressive circles in the United States are now trying to push one of their allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization into an adventure which is particularly dangerous to the interests of the peoples of the area and to the interests of international peace and security.

80. In the circumstances, it is hardly surprising that the United States and Turkey should have sought and

should still be seeking, perhaps, to prevent any examination by the United Nations of their action against Syria, and that, on the contrary, they should be employing every means to oppose action by the United Nations, which has been asked to send a fact-finding commission to the Syrian-Turkish border as a first step in the prevention of further aggression in this area. The United States position clearly reveals its intention to prevent the examination of the problem by the United Nations, to prevent United Nations intervention and to prevent the application of the principles of the Charter to the Middle East.

81. In other words, it is clearly the intention of the United States to exempt its foreign policy in the area from compliance with any obligations deriving from the unanimously accepted norms of international life.

82. This, then, impels each of us to affirm the conviction that now, more than ever, each Member State, whether large or small, must contribute actively, as far as it is able, to the defence of the principles of the Charter and to their implementation.

83. In this spirit, the Romanian Government expresses satisfaction at the way in which the Soviet Union is steadfastly adhering to those principles in the Middle East problem. After repeatedly submitting practical proposals for eliminating the causes of the constant state of instability and war agitation in that area, after proving, in a constructive spirit, its desire to contribute with the other great Powers to the creation of the essential conditions for consolidating the national independence and sovereignty of the Arab States, the Soviet Union now supports with its full authority and prestige not only the just cause of Syria, whose security is at present directly threatened, but also the security and independence of all States.

84. The Soviet Government, firmly declaring its decision to watch over the maintenance of the peace and security of the States in that region, has said that, in the event of the violation of Syria's frontiers and the invasion of Syria by Turkish forces, the Soviet Union will take all the necessary steps to come to the aid of the victim of aggression. By taking this resolute stand and mercilessly revealing, beyond all doubt, the preparations for aggression that are proceeding at the Syrian border, the Soviet Union has already done much to frustrate the projected aggression, and to strengthen confidence in the ability of the United Nations to resolve the problems brought before it.

85. The General Assembly cannot but draw a certain parallel between the events preceding the British-French-Israel aggression against Egypt and the events of which Syria is today the victim. Then, as now, an independent Arab State was subjected to political and military pressure by certain NATO Powers; then, as now, the aggression was preceded by the unleashing of propaganda regarding the alleged danger of the delivery of Soviet arms, for defensive purposes and on a commercial basis, to certain Arab States; then, as now, those who intended to attack proceeded with their preparations under cover of solemn undertakings assumed at the rostrum of the United Nations.

86. We all know what happened next. On the one hand the failure of the United Nations to examine the complaint of Egypt promptly enabled the aggressors to launch the attack; on the other hand, by virtue of the resolute position adopted by certain Powers, in con-

formity with the spirit of the Charter, by virtue also of the measures decided upon by the General Assembly, the aggression was brought to an end and peace was restored. The positive role of the United Nations was clearly in evidence and it showed how effective its intervention would have been in preventing the attack if action had been taken without delay and in a spirit of true international vigilance.

87. This is what the Romanian delegation feels it its duty to point out today with regard to the problem involved in the complaint of the Syrian Government.

88. The Romanian delegation supports the proposal of the Syrian Government that the General Assembly should set up a commission to investigate the situation on the spot and to report to the General Assembly as soon as possible.

89. The Romanian delegation affirms its Government's determination to participate in any action organized in accordance with the United Nations Charter to avoid aggression and to aid the victim of any possible aggression.

90. In our view there can be no doubt that these measures would create an atmosphere favourable to the establishment of a sound policy based on respect for the right of the peoples of the area to a free, independent and prosperous life.

91. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Three days ago we heard a speech by the Soviet Union representative [708th meeting]. It was calumnious. It was provocative. It was totally contrary to the ideals of peaceful settlement, of truth, and of integrity to which this Assembly is devoted. In the few remarks which I made after his speech I tried briefly to give it the response which it deserved. I really thought I had said enough. But many Members have asked me to reply categorically to this speech, and out of respect for these requests I shall now take about twenty minutes, under the right of reply, which each Member here has, to refute these charges of the Soviet Union and to state very bluntly just exactly what the situation is as a result of this attempt of theirs to throw the world into submission.

92. I warn the Soviet Union now that it will not like what I am going to say, and I repeat now what I have told them many times in the four years I have been here—that, while I shall never begin an altercation with the Soviet Union—and I never have—I shall always reply when charges are made against the Government which I have the honour to represent. In this case, I shall do so not merely in a defensive spirit; but I shall go further and reveal the true motivation of the Soviet attack and then say what the United States stands for affirmatively and constructively in the Middle East. There is not a representative of a Government here in this hall—that is, of a free government—who would not feel the same obligation to reply, if his country were attacked as mine has been.

93. I therefore make this refutation partly out of respect for the opinions of the Members of the Assembly, but also because I believe that the challenge which we face has grown clear and that this is a moment when plain speaking—which possibly sometimes should be avoided in a diplomatic forum—will actually strengthen peace and promote the well-being, security and independence of the countries of this

vital region. That is what the United States wants, and that is the basic motive underlying what I am about to say.

94. Some time ago, the Soviet Union decided to carry on and inspire a campaign of vilification against the United States in relation to the Middle East. At Press conferences and in propaganda originating in Moscow, in a letter to the Secretary-General, in corridor conversations and in speeches in the United Nations, allegations were made that the United States, of all things, was seeking to promote war in the Middle East. All this was very carefully done in a way that did not require the Soviet Union to prove one of its charges—which, of course, it could not do.

95. You have all heard these charges. The United States, it is alleged, attempted to overthrow the present Government of Syria. Having failed in these efforts, according to Soviet spokesmen, the United States sought to persuade Turkey to launch an attack upon Syria late in October. There have, of course, been variations of this tale since it was spun by Mr. Gromyko on 10 September. The claim has even been made that Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon were to commit aggression, together with Turkey. You have heard that story. However, in all cases the story was essentially the same. This was an American "plot".

96. We have heard of American "plots" from Soviet representatives on previous occasions. There was the alleged plot against Hungary. There was the alleged plot against North Korea, which was used as a smoke-screen to cover the aggression against the Republic of Korea. The United States was even accused, believe it or not, of having plotted against the Soviet Union with the aid of the late and, I might say, unlamented head of the Soviet secret police, Lavrenti Beria. Only last winter the General Assembly rejected by an overwhelming majority the Soviet charge that the United States was subverting the Governments of the Soviet satellites.

97. Every one of these American "plots" was invented in Moscow, and usually just after the Soviet Union had been overwhelmingly rebuked and repudiated here in the United Nations.

98. What are the known facts in this case? Let me review the actions of various countries, beginning with Syria. On 12 August, the Syrian officials announced that they had uncovered still another American "plot", this time to overthrow the Syrian Government. This announcement was followed by political and command changes in Damascus which the Soviet Union has clearly revealed are pleasing to it.

99. The Soviet Government has been sending large quantities of arms to Syria, including jet aircraft, tanks, armoured vehicles, etc. There is no question whatever of challenging any country's right to acquire arms. Let me make that clear. But we are entitled to inquire regarding the motives behind sending such large quantities of arms into a potentially explosive area at a particularly tense moment, because such shipments in such circumstances inevitably heighten tensions. That is common sense.

100. In this connexion, I cannot refrain from pointing out the dangers involved in a policy of indiscriminate distribution of arms to non-military groups of the population of a country at a time when deliberate

efforts are being made to incite the people of that country to hostile acts against a neighbour. In such circumstances, no one can guarantee that an incident will not occur which could have grave consequences.

101. I come now to the steps taken by the United States Government. Mr. Loy Henderson, one of our most experienced diplomats, was asked to expedite a trip to the Middle East which had been planned some time before. He was asked to consult with United States and foreign officials and to obtain a first-hand impression of current developments. This was the substance of his instructions and this was the purpose of the trip. We are curious to know why the sensibilities of the Soviet Government should have been so injured by Mr. Henderson's trip. Could the Soviet Union have something to fear, something to hide?

102. The Turkish Government also took certain steps. It proceeded to strengthen its defences along the Syrian border in the light of these Soviet activities in Syria, in particular the possible establishment of a Soviet arms depot on Turkey's southern border. This Turkish action, I submit, was perfectly reasonable. In no manner has Syria been endangered. The Government of Turkey has repeatedly given its solemn assurances that this move was a purely defensive precaution and that it had absolutely no intention of attacking Syria or of intervening in Syria's domestic affairs.

103. Turkey has a distinguished record in the work of the United Nations. It has ably performed its duties on the Security Council and on the Economic and Social Council. It has done whatever was requested of it in supporting the United Nations in action. The United States bows to none in its admiration for the courageous services of the Turkish soldiers who fought under the Unified Command of the United Nations in repelling communist aggression in Korea. Turkey stood firmly with the overwhelming majority of the United Nations during the communist crushing of Hungary last year, despite the fact that it was the next-door neighbour of the Government which was committing this crime.

104. The United Nations can be proud of Turkey which has firmly supported it and which has complied with its Charter obligations and the resolutions of the United Nations. One need but ask, in passing, whether the record of its accusers is as good.

105. I would like to point out several additional facts in this connexion. The Soviet representative alleges that: "the Turkish General Staff, in conjunction with United States military advisers, have prepared detailed plans for an attack by Turkey on Syria". [708th meeting, para. 110.] I wonder whether he is aware that the four members of the Turkish Joint Chiefs of Staff recently resigned in order to be candidates for election to the Turkish Parliament. Certainly this could not happen in a country which was "vigorously preparing" a military attack. I can speak from experience to say that running for office takes all your time.

106. The Government of Turkey has also, as we know, accepted the offer of good offices extended by His Majesty King Saud. A country willing to seek an amicable settlement of differences is not a country bent on war.

107. Finally, I come to the heart of the matter, the behaviour of the Soviet Union, and particularly its war of nerves against Turkey. Along with its propaganda

charges of a Turkish plot against Syria, the Soviet Union has been openly threatening Turkey with annihilation and extinction. Mr. Gromyko, on 10 September, warned Turkey that it "may land in an abyss" and that "a great disaster awaits it". The Soviet Prime Minister, Mr. Bulganin, in his message of 11 September to the Prime Minister of Turkey, Mr. Menderes, warned indirectly of a Soviet attack and asserted that "great calamities" awaited Turkey if it did not heed these warnings. These statements were played up in the usual manner by the Soviet Press.

108. A remarkable fact is that these accusations against Turkey were first launched not in Damascus but in Moscow, even though Syria was supposed to be the intended victim of the imaginary conspiracy. There is significance in that.

109. On 7 October, Mr. Khrushchev continued this Soviet war of nerves in an interview with a New York Times correspondent. He said:

"If war breaks out in the Middle East, we are here and you"—meaning the United States—"are not. When the guns begin firing, the rockets can begin flying."

That, may I say, is a statement which is both offensive and, in so far as its insinuation of United States impotence is concerned, also untrue. Let us get that clear.

110. In another statement on the same day, Mr. Khrushchev cautioned Turkey that Turkey had few troops with which to defend its borders with the Soviet Union, and he again threatened to bombard Turkey with rocket missiles. These very same threats were repeated by Mr. Gromyko on 22 October [708th meeting].

111. Finally, the communist leaders of the Soviet Union actually went so far in their rather breathless eagerness as to send letters to political parties in other countries, which presented the Soviet propaganda line on developments in the Middle East and exhorted those parties to support Soviet policies in that region. In this the non-interference which Mr. Gromyko had in mind in the draft declaration on "peaceful coexistence" [A/3673] which he introduced on 20 September [681st meeting]?

112. Through all these manoeuvres, the Soviet Union set what it believed to be the proper stage for the charges it was engineering to bring before the United Nations. All these actions of the Soviet Union should be seen against the background of Soviet Middle East policies and actions during the past two decades.

113. Soviet ambitions in the Middle East entered into an active phase in 1939 when Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union formed an alliance in the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of unfragrant memory. The Soviet Union in 1940 sought to use this alliance to establish a sphere of influence in the Persian Gulf and the Black Sea regions, and proposed to Hitler's Foreign Minister, Mr. Ribbentrop, that this area be "recognized as the centre of the aspirations of the Soviet Union".

114. These ambitions came to nothing, but the Soviet Union nevertheless pressed forward towards the same goals after the Second World War. It sought a trusteeship over Libya. It demanded that Turkey cede to it the districts of Kars and Ardahan and grant the Soviet Union a naval base at the Dardanelles. This is what the Soviet Union demanded. It occupied northern

Iran in open violation of international agreements, and only the staunch stand taken by the United Nations and the will of free countries caused the Soviet forces to be withdrawn from that region.

115. The year 1955 was marked by renewed Soviet efforts. It seems clear that the Soviet Union then reached the decision to concentrate its attention on the Middle East and the free countries of Asia. Its tactics are clear. First it seeks to expand its influence by psychological exploitation of legitimate national aspirations, even if this requires the temporary repudiation of local communist parties. Then it resorts to subversion as gains are registered. And finally, it hopes to seize and consolidate power through indirect aggression.

116. Now, the Soviet Government pretends to believe that the United States is "prodding" Turkey to attack Syria. While it does not really believe this charge, it has spread it across the world and into this forum.

117. I therefore reaffirm to you all: The United States is pushing no country into war; we are steadfastly against aggression in any form and from any quarter. But we are entitled to ask what the real explanation is for the behaviour of the Soviet Union, because all the evidence shows what its true aims are.

118. First, by creating the appearance of a threat to Syria's security and then pretending to remove the threat, the Soviet Union wants to pose before the world as the saviour of the Arabs.

119. Secondly, the Soviet Union wants to bully Turkey with threats of extinction and frighten the rest of us, if you please, into doing nothing.

120. Thirdly, the Soviet Union evidently believes that its agents and sympathizers inside Syria will make political gains from the artificial threat of war which has been generated.

121. Fourthly, the Soviet Union wants to blacken the name of the United States and to destroy the friendship which has existed historically between the people of the Middle East and the United States.

122. Finally, by creating an artificial war scare, the Soviet Government hopes to further its expansionist purposes and, in accordance with its historic aim, to reduce the Middle East to the status of the captive nations of Eastern Europe.

123. So there are the facts, and the conclusions about Soviet intentions which flow inescapably from the facts and from what the Soviet leaders themselves have said, because none of this is my rhetoric, this is all taken from the record. It is this same Soviet Government, the author of this unlovely record, which now seeks to accuse the great peace-loving majority of non-communist nations in the world of being war-mongers. This is what is happening.

124. Here is a Government which has been condemned by the United Nations three times in the past year for its actions in Hungary; which has violated the expressed wishes of the United Nations more than thirty times in the past eight years; which has abused its United Nations veto power eighty-two times, accusing the overwhelming majority of the human race of wanting war.

125. Here is the Government most often defeated in the United Nations operating on the maxim of the old

political boss who said: "Claim everything; concede nothing; and if defeated, allege fraud."

126. Here is the chronic law-breaker, not only seeking to be regarded as a good citizen, but actually trying to sit in the judge's seat and sentence the whole law-abiding community to jail.

127. Here is the arsonist, trying his best to start another fire, and demanding the right to lead the fire brigade.

128. Here is the man in the parade who can never keep step, exclaiming, "Everybody is out of step but me!"

129. Remember that it was one year ago to this day that Soviet tanks were shooting down Hungarian freedom fighters in the streets of Budapest. Compare the Soviet defiance of the demands of this Assembly, that it desist from its butchery of Hungary, with the actions which many other Members of the United Nations, including my country, took a few years earlier when they shed their blood in defence of the principles of the Charter in Korea; shed their blood while the Soviet Union was actively directing and aiding the aggressor—as one speaker said here in the Assembly at that time, the Soviets were fighting to the last Chinese.

130. Remember, too, the complaints of Iran in 1946 and of Greece in 1947. Remember the so-called "charges" which the Soviet Union has brought before the General Assembly year after year and which have been dismissed by overwhelming votes, what we call here "the Soviet item". Remember the recent assassination by a communist fanatic of President Carlos Castillo Armas of Guatemala, a man who once addressed the Assembly from this very rostrum, and remember the terrorist communist bombing of Saigon only the other day. These acts remind us of the methods the Soviet Union is prepared to use.

131. What a tragedy it is that the Soviet Government pursues a policy so unworthy of the great creative abilities of its people! The distinguished achievements of Soviet scientists, which deserve and receive our hearty congratulations, prove how much the Soviet Union could contribute to humanity if the policies of its Government were truly directed towards peace and co-operation. Let us hope that we here in this room, within our lifetime, will see an advance in Soviet policies which will reflect the fundamental decency of the people in the Soviet Union.

132. The matters which we are discussing here today, while of concern to all those devoted to freedom, are of direct importance to the Arab States and to the Arab peoples. The Arab peoples aspire for closer relationships with one another. This aspiration for unity is accompanied by an equally strong desire for equality within the family of nations.

133. The United States, which was formed by the voluntary union of individual States, recognizes and respects the aspirations of the Arab nations. To Americans, there is a grandeur in freedom and in unity. We respect that nation that is truly free and independent. We respect those who, of their own free will, join together for their common good. In our relationship with other nations, we believe sincerely that our interests and their interests are best served when we meet as equals.

134. We want this for ourselves; we want it for all others. With the same fervour we shall stand with our Arab friends to oppose those who seek to rob them of their liberty and twist their hopes of progress to serve the aims of a new imperialism.

135. On 5 January 1957, President Eisenhower stated to the Congress of the United States:

"We have shown, so that none can doubt, our dedication to the principle that force shall not be used internationally for any aggressive purposes and that the integrity and independence of the nations of the Middle East should be inviolate... There is general recognition in the Middle East, as elsewhere, that the United States does not seek either political or economic domination over any other people. Our desire is a world environment of freedom, not servitude."

136. As I conclude, let me say this. The United States will not be stopped by threats or by defamation from continuing to offer our understanding and support to those nations of the Middle East which are being threatened by the Soviet Union and whose independence the Soviet Union seeks to destroy. Let there be no question about our capacity to offer this support. We are strong, and our allies are strong. And let us not forget here in this hall that the Charter of the United Nations is a most powerful grand alliance against aggression. It could well become the most powerful alliance that the world has ever seen.

137. The United Nations has played a big part in thwarting the many Soviet power grabs since the end of the Second World War. We should not be discouraged. We must be optimistic. Just look at what I refer to. I have in mind the failure of the Soviet Union to gain its demand that Turkey cede the districts of Kars and Ardahan to the Soviet Union. I have in mind the withdrawal of Soviet troops from northern Iran. I have in mind the ending of the communist encroachment on Greece. I have in mind the communist attempt to conquer Korea by force of arms. I have in mind the thwarting of the communist attempt to expand all through Central America, using Guatemala as a base.

138. Thus the true facts and the motives behind these charges are perfectly clear for all who wish to see. The United States welcomes examination by the Assembly of this situation. The United States is confident that such consideration will be most helpful in placing developments in their proper perspective and in reducing the tensions which the enemies of peace and tranquillity in the Middle East have sought to build up around this matter. We will uphold the Charter and have faith in God.

139. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland): There are several reasons which prompt the Polish delegation to speak on the problem submitted by the delegation of Syria. First of all, we are motivated by our deep concern lest the unrestrained development of events in the Middle East aggravate the dangers to peace. We are also anxious that the situation which has arisen around Syria should not cause any further increase in international tension, that it should not hinder the process of strengthening peaceful, constructive coexistence, which alone, in our opinion, can secure for humanity a better future. Last, but not least, as a nation which has suffered so much and which has gone through such bitter experiences during its long history, Poland is vitally interested in

safeguarding for Syria; as well as for the other Arab nations, full freedom in their national development. We do think that the problem should be considered on a broader basis.

140. The complaint of Syria is an eloquent illustration of a no means isolated phenomenon which we have now been facing for some time in the Middle East, and not only in the Middle East. There are all kinds of threats exercised against nations which after years of colonial or other forms of dependence have either newly regained their sovereignty or have recently strengthened their independence from foreign influence and interests; attempts to submit these countries to new forms of economic and military dependence, with all the political consequences implied.

141. The complaint of Syria proves how detrimental and how dangerous to the peaceful coexistence of nations it is to oppose the great historical process of liberation of formerly dependent peoples and to deny them the opportunity of full freedom of political action in accordance with their rights as independent, sovereign nations. This process is one of the great historical changes of our times. Here, in the United Nations, we should be especially conscious of this, for the right of nations to self-determination is one of the corner-stones of our Charter; several of its chapters deal with different ways along which peoples still dependent today can move towards their national independence, with the assistance of the United Nations.

142. Indeed, the process is irrevocable. It cannot be stopped, let alone pushed backwards or retarded. The coming into existence—in the period after the Second World War—of so great a number of new States, is a proof that it is irreversible. It suffices to look around this hall to become fully aware of it. There are many representatives of nations which only yesterday were not enjoying equal rights; now they take an active part in shaping international life, consciously and seriously contributing to the work of the United Nations, to the implementation of its aims and purposes. Suffice it also to recall here the Bandung Conference, which has become such a convincing symbol of this process.

143. These great transformations have also embraced the Middle East. That is why, we submit, the recently advanced theory of the so-called "political vacuum" allegedly existing in that region is unacceptable. No political vacuum exists there at all. Colonial influence has died out, old forms of dependency are breaking down. The life of the Middle Eastern nations is now centred around their national aspirations and enriched by constructive work for their statehood. These are the reasons, in our opinion, why it is impossible, or at least very difficult, for those who would not reconcile themselves with the new realities to exert influence upon those countries by means of military pressure, foreign bases and alien interests.

144. Any attempt to oppose these transformations, therefore, amounts to nothing else but interference in the internal affairs of independent States, attempts to impede the achievements of the Middle East nations. May I be permitted to state here our Polish conviction that the peoples inhabiting the Middle East are conscious of their rights, determined to use them freely and have proved that they know how to fight for their liberty; that they are nations with a long and rich history, and with age-old cultural traditions.

145. We in Poland are not their immediate neighbours, but many historical and cultural traditions link us together. In this small world of ours anything which could seriously disturb peace in the Middle East would have grave repercussions everywhere, and Poland has suffered too much already from past dangers of war. The economic consequences of the Suez crisis, for instance, seriously affected us. And, after listening to the last speech, may I add that the Suez crisis did not originate in Eastern Europe.

146. Syria has embarked upon the road of peaceful co-operation with all countries, pronounced itself against participation in any military pacts and accepted as the basis of its foreign policy the principle of positive neutrality. But the developments of recent months are endangering the policy which Syria has chosen to follow. The Syrian memorandum [A/3699] and the Syrian representative's speeches [708th meeting] have informed us about considerable concentrations of Turkish troops near the Syrian border, about their constant strengthening and about their preparations for an armed attack. The letter from the Chairman of the Soviet delegation to the President of the Assembly [A/3700] also stresses the grave the grave tension prevailing on the Syrian-Turkish border and states that there are plans to carry out a lightning attack against Syria which would not leave the United Nations any possibility to counteract it.

147. We have heard the statement made by the representative of Turkey [708th meeting]. The assurances that Turkey has no ill intentions towards Syria cannot conceal the fact that it has not denied the information concerning the concentration of Turkish forces on the Syrian border, and they do not dispel what we consider to be justified anxieties concerning the political background of this action as well as its real purpose. We are bound to take into account the fact that Turkey is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and of the Baghdad Pact. Therefore, should a conflict break out on the Syrian-Turkish border, it could assume an incomparably broader character involving the use of the most modern types of weapons.

148. In these circumstances, and mindful of the past events in the Middle East, especially of last year, the United Nations should deem as a particularly important and urgent matter the taking of such steps as would bring about the relaxation of tension, and prevent any incidents which could lead to the outbreak and the broadening of conflict. This is the duty of our Organization, the main purpose of which, under Article 1 of the Charter, is to maintain international peace and security, to prevent threats to the peace and to bring about the adjustment or settlement of international disputes.

149. Syria has turned to us with full confidence in a situation which we cannot treat lightly, and of the seriousness of which we all should be fully aware. This was rightly stressed here by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, Mr. Fawzi, who will excuse me for quoting his words:

"What Syria is haunted by and is complaining of—what it sees with its own eyes and finds at its own border—is not a mere set of words which could be counteracted by another and casually or lightly cast aside and forgotten about as soon as

those who are complained against state that they have no bad intentions."

And Mr. Fawzi drew the right conclusion that:

"No responsible government could, in circumstances such as those we all know too well, take such statements for granted and merely go to sleep." [708th meeting, para. 78.]

We cannot do it either.

150. It does not sound convincing to argue that the matter is apparently not urgent since Syria has brought it to the attention not of the Security Council but of the General Assembly. True enough, the Charter has vested in the Security Council the "primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security"; however, nothing could prevent Syria from bringing the matter to the General Assembly. Article II, Paragraph 2, of the Charter gives to every Member of our Organization the right to bring before the General Assembly "any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security". Article 35, Paragraph 1, states clearly:

"Any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly."

Syria has made the choice in favour of the General Assembly, thus putting before this organ and all of us here the duty to remove the threat by which it feels it is endangered.

151. In this case we are concerned with preventive action which is, by its very nature, much more important than repressive action, for it should prevent possible bloodshed, destruction and human tragedy.

152. Syria has suggested in its memorandum the setting up of a commission which would examine the situation on the Syrian-Turkish border and report accordingly. We think that this is a proper proposal, and that is why we are giving the idea our support. It is our considered view that such a commission could be constituted with the least possible delay and could start as soon as possible to fulfil its mission, and we express the hope that the United Nations will do everything that is needed in order to prevent in time a situation similar to that which arose in Egypt a year ago and which we did not prevent in time, with all the well-known consequences.

153. But we are concerned here not only with emergency measures aimed at easing the tension in the Middle East. The point is at the same time to create an international atmosphere in which the proper understanding and deep conviction gain ground that similar dangers and conflicts can be permanently prevented only when the principle of the self-determination of nations is fully respected; when the right of independent States to shape their own destinies and their domestic and external policies in conformity with the aspirations of their people is universally recognized; when agreements are sought on the basis of these very principles. That is what Syria also expects. Let us hope that wisdom will not fail this General Assembly.

154. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): When the substance of the present item first came up for debate in the General Assembly on 22 October, the representative of Turkey repeated the assurances pre-

viously given by the Prime Minister of his country that Turkey had no aggressive designs on any of its neighbours and desired "the inviolability of the independence and the preservation of the territorial integrity of Syria, as well as its happiness and prosperity" [708th meeting, para. 161]. The representative of Turkey also informed us of the gracious offer made by His Majesty King Saud of Saudi Arabia to mediate between Turkey and Syria, and of the prompt acceptance of that offer by the Turkish Government.

155. At that same meeting, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union termed the reference to this offer a manoeuvre designed "to bypass the United Nations" and also "to delude public opinion" [*ibid.*, paras. 23 and 24]. If the verbatim record were not there to prove it, it would seem incredible that such a characterization could come from the mouth of a speaker who also professed that "the Soviet Union harbours no ill-will towards Turkey or its people" [*ibid.*, para. 117], and that "the Soviet Government stands firmly in favour of maintaining peace and preventing war in the Near and Middle East" [*ibid.*, para. 149].

156. The exercise of simple logic would lead us to expect that, if that last statement were true, the Soviet Union would have welcomed the proposal of King Saud rather than treated it with scorn and contempt. We can but conclude, therefore, that what impels the Soviet Union to the action which it is taking in this matter is not a concern for the peace, unity and prosperity of the region referred to, but a desire to increase the prevailing tension.

157. That this is indeed the case became evident from the fact that Mr. Gromyko saw fit to utter a number of wild and far-fetched accusations and to say that:

"Not content with urging Turkey into military adventures against Syria, the United States also wishes to involve the other States in the North Atlantic bloc in these adventures." [*Ibid.*, para. 122.]

158. As the representative of a country which is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, I wish to protest against these unwarranted charges and to state categorically that neither Turkey nor any other member of that purely defensive organization harbours any aggressive intentions against Syria or against any other country.

159. It is for that reason, and because of our strong desire for peace everywhere in the world, and especially along our borders and those of our allies, that we were grateful for the great and generous initiative taken by His Majesty King Saud. His Majesty is a sovereign not only highly respected but fully conversant with the character and the problems of both Syria and Turkey and animated by the utmost good will towards both of them. No more suitable means of eliminating the distrust which has taken hold of these two neighbour States could be imagined than mediation by this leader of the Arab world. We therefore hope that the Syrian Government will not allow itself to be persuaded in the end to reject this propitious offer.

160. Furthermore, we are of the opinion that for us to enter into the causes and the symptoms of the estrangement between Syria and Turkey at this stage would be out of place, especially now that the true facts have been so brilliantly stated this afternoon by the

representative of the United States, and that further insistence on the things which have happened in that region would not be conducive to the creation of the temper that is needed for the readiness of parties to a dispute to seek a solution in accordance with Article 33 of our Charter. I shall therefore refrain from any remarks on that score, believing as I do that they would be justified only if it should turn out, contrary to our earnest hope, that no efforts at mediation would in the end be acceptable to Syria.

161. That, in our view, should be the attitude of all those who are not directly concerned in the dispute and whose aim is not to make insulting and inflammatory speeches but to serve the cause of peace.

162. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): The Cuban delegation would like to explain its position on this question. In view of the late hour, I shall be very brief.

163. We listened with astonishment to the statement made two days ago [708th meeting] by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, and we thought that if he had used the words "Hungary" and "Soviet Union" instead of the words "Turkey" and "Syria", we should have agreed with everything he said; in other words, what he accused Turkey of planning to do in relation to Syria was exactly what the Soviet Union had done in regard to Hungary. This is an accusation for which there is not a vestige of proof; the events in Hungary are historical facts which the General Assembly recognized by an overwhelming majority and which were confirmed by a special committee of the United Nations.

164. We should not in any circumstances vote in favour of the establishment of a fact-finding commission, because we are of the opinion that there is not a single precedent or the slightest reason to justify such a step. This is not a case like that of Hungary, in which the aggression against the Hungarian people and nation was already in progress when we requested and secured the establishment of a committee of investigation. Of course, neither the Soviet Union nor Syria voted in favour of the establishment of the committee in that case.

165. There is all the less reason to establish a commission of inquiry because—the fact is undeniable—Turkey's conduct in the United Nations has been exemplary. No charge has ever been made against it in the Security Council or in the General Assembly, nor has it ever been accused of committing aggression. It has always adhered strictly to all the principles of the United Nations Charter, in the case of Korea as in voting on the Hungarian problem, and in our opinion these facts preclude there being any question, on the basis of a mere accusation, without proof of any kind, of appointing a fact-finding commission whose only purpose, as far as the Cuban delegation can see, would be to interfere with the elections which are shortly to be held in that country. Such action would be a dishonest manoeuvre to which the United Nations cannot lend itself.

166. Furthermore, the Cuban delegation is very much surprised that there is a proposal for the establishment of a commission to investigate the question of the troops which Turkey may have stationed on the Syrian-Turkish border, but that there is absolutely no question of looking into the matter of the troops which the Soviet Union may have stationed on the Soviet-Turkish fron-

tier, despite the fact that it has been announced that those troops even possess atomic weapons and despite the fact that the Soviet Union in daily broadcasts is threatening the Turkish people with destruction at any moment.

167. In our opinion, this would be a most unjust procedure. Moreover, we do not think that sufficient importance has been given here to the intervention of His Majesty King Saud of Saudi Arabia. In our view, he has in this problem abided strictly by the principles of the Charter. He has done the first thing required by the Charter, which is to endeavour to mediate in what might be called a dispute in order to clarify the situation fully. It has been suggested, in one way or another, that King Saud did not agree to perform such mediation. The discussion of this problem has proceeded with a kind of contempt for King Saud's generous offer to intervene; the Cuban delegation, which has diplomatic relations with Saudi Arabia, thinks that the offer should be examined with greater respect and with more attention and that we should not intervene unless this mediation proves a failure.

168. I have in my possession a communiqué which has just been issued by the international Press and which states:

"His Majesty King Saud I of Saudi Arabia received His Excellency Fatin Rustu Zorlu, the Turkish Minister of State, for the second time at 9 a.m. on 24 October 1957 and had a long conversation with him. Also present at this interview were His Excellency Djemal Husseyini, King Saud's personal adviser, and His Excellency Irfan Karasar, Minister of the Turkish Republic in Jedda.

"The subject of these conversations was the question which has arisen between Turkey and Syria and the offer made by His Majesty King Saud, which has been accepted by Turkey. Mr. Fatin Rustu Zorlu stressed the value which Turkey attached to the preservation of the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of Syria and at the same time reiterated, on behalf of his Government, the statement made by the Turkish Prime Minister on 24 September 1957, to the effect that Turkey was not pursuing an aggressive policy against any of its neighbours, including Syria.

"Despite its concern over the situation in Syria, Turkey, as a proof of its good will, has accepted with gratitude the offer of mediation made by His Majesty King Saud.

"Mr. Fatin Rustu Zorlu, the Turkish Minister of State, stated that Turkey was willing to work in close co-operation with His Majesty the King in the benevolent efforts which His Majesty was making to find a solution to the problems which had arisen between the two countries. His Majesty King Saud expressed the hope that the doubts and misgivings which had arisen between the two parties might be dispelled through the assistance and co-operation of the Governments of Turkey and Syria and the benevolent efforts which he was making."

169. I question whether it is useful or expedient for the United Nations to continue its discussion of this problem in complete disregard of the intervention of the King of Saudi Arabia, a State which is a Member of the United Nations, and when the King has neither

admitted failure nor given up the efforts to which he is committed by the principles of our Charter. Let us desist from propaganda; let us not attempt to interfere with the Turkish elections; let us not urge anyone to believe in the existence of aggression on the part of Turkey against Syria. There has been no such aggression and there is no reason for it; to tell the truth, no one here in the United Nations believes in such aggression, and the public does not believe in it either.

170. Let us try to resolve these differences—which may very well exist but which are a very different matter from imminent military aggression—through the good offices and kindly intervention of His Majesty

King Saud of Saudi Arabia; and if these efforts should fail, recourse could be had to other methods, which should not in any case entail interference in the internal affairs of a Member State, which Turkey is; Cuba would not vote in favour of any such action.

171. The PRESIDENT: Since there are no other names on the list of speakers, the Assembly will adjourn. I express the earnest hope that we may be able to use the intervening time in reflection on this problem; that we may be able to make it an opportunity for quiet diplomacy, for reducing tensions, for producing harmony.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.