

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SESSION

Official Records


**712th
PLENARY MEETING**

 Tuesday, 29 October 1957,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 69:

 Complaint about threats to the security of Syria and
to international peace (continued) 415

President: Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).

AGENDA ITEM 69

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

1. Mr. ALI KHAN (Pakistan): It is with great regret that my delegation has heard during the past few weeks the reports of tension and misunderstandings with regard to the relations between Turkey and Syria. For quite some time now the Middle East has provided cause for great concern to the world at large, which has still not completely succeeded in wiping out the horrors of the last two wars from its memory.

2. From the speeches of the representatives of Syria and Turkey and the reports we have heard from various quarters we find that the mistrust between the two neighbours has become more serious. Syria accuses Turkey of troop concentrations on its border, of subversive action to overthrow its government, of permitting United States military footholds in Turkish territory and, generally, of acting as an agent of certain powerful Western nations. Turkey, on the other hand, has been seriously alarmed by reports of stockpiling of arms in Syria, of the importation of heavy mechanized equipment in quantities far in excess of Syria's needs, of the building of naval bases when Syria has no navy and, generally, of Syria's becoming an instrument of Soviet policies, which have been traditionally antagonistic to Turkey.

3. The world is aware that the United States has been in special treaty relationships with Turkey for the past many years. No new situation has, therefore, arisen in this regard.

4. The Syrian representative has stated in this Assembly [708th meeting] that Turkish troop movements on the border between Turkey and Syria have been taking place since 1955, and he has also referred to other military exercises since then.

5. We have seriously looked for the cause of the present sudden crisis because if, as Syria itself has stated, all the elements giving rise to this crisis have been in existence since Turkey entered into alliances with the Western Powers, it is difficult to see what new feature has entered into the situation to cause special alarm to Syria.

6. The whole world knows that a fundamental principle of Turkish foreign policy since the days of

Kemal Ataturk has been to maintain the most cordial relations with the Arab world and to have no territorial ambition in that area. That policy has been scrupulously pursued by successive Turkish governments ever since.

7. Pakistan's relations with Turkey and Syria, and indeed with all the countries of the Middle East, have all along been based on close cultural and religious ties. The fact that the people of Pakistan entertain feelings of strong affection for all the peoples of the Moslem world is well known. The tension which has recently marked the relations between Turkey and Syria therefore greatly worries us. If this tension becomes more acute, it may endanger peace in the Middle East and, as it is difficult to localize any breach of the peace, it may lead to a much broader conflict.

8. Syria and Turkey have lived side by side in peace for many years. We are now, unfortunately, witnessing an atmosphere of tension and discord. We find it difficult to attribute this to any real cause there is no reason why either of the parties should entertain feelings of hostility against the other. The situation which has now arisen is, in our view, based on pure misunderstanding. This misunderstanding may create further suspicions, which, in their turn, may bring about serious complications.

9. In the interests of peace in the Middle East and in the interests of peace in the world, my delegation is anxious that the strains and tension between Syria and Turkey be relieved as quickly as possible and that an atmosphere of amity and friendliness be restored without delay.

10. My delegation has made a careful study of all the reports which have reached us from various quarters. It is our understanding that the reports of troop concentrations on the Turkish-Syrian border are highly exaggerated. Reports of stockpiling of arms in Syria would naturally lead to disquiet in the neighbouring countries. It therefore seems understandable that Turkey, as one of Syria's neighbours, should be perturbed, although it must be said, to the credit of Turkey, that it has acted throughout the present situation with most remarkable calm and equanimity. Whatever military movements have taken place in Turkey have clearly been of a purely defensive nature.

11. If reports of stockpiling of arms and similar activities of an unusual character in Syria are incorrect, then an assurance to this effect should be given by Syria.

12. It is so easy to create misunderstandings, and it is so difficult to dispel them. Nevertheless, every effort must be made to remove these misapprehensions as speedily as possible. It is a matter of great satisfaction to my delegation that the leaders of Turkey

at home and its representatives in this Assembly have given categorical assurances that Turkey has no aggressive designs against Syria. We see no reason why these assurances should not be accepted.

13. Pakistan is an ally of Turkey and is bound to it by ties of special and close relationship. We greatly value this relationship, which is intended to maintain and preserve the cause of peace. In this cause, Pakistan is ready to extend its full support to Turkey. At the same time, the people of Pakistan have made it clear beyond doubt where their sympathies lie in the struggle of the Arab people for the full enjoyment of their independence and sovereignty, the preservation of their territorial integrity and the fulfilment of their aspirations to unity. Support for the Arab people in the struggle for achievement of these aims has been, and continues to be, a corner-stone of the foreign policy of the Government of Pakistan.

14. It is our earnest desire that everything should be done to end the differences that have arisen between the two countries.

15. The delegation of Pakistan learned with much relief, a few days ago, that His Majesty King Saud had offered to mediate in this situation. The reports of this offer were followed by the news that the Turkish Minister of State had promptly visited Riyadh to hold conversations in this connexion. The manner in which Turkey responded to this offer impressed us all very greatly, as His Majesty King Saud is a great monarch and enjoys a position of the highest eminence in the Arab world. In the circumstances, the outlook for a speedy solution could not have been more promising. We regret, however, that this offer has not so far been taken advantage of by Syria. We are glad to hear that the offer is still open.

16. We cannot help feeling that, although the United Nations was established for the furtherance of world peace, the debates which have taken place here on momentous issues in times of crisis have not always produced a constructive atmosphere. This, unfortunately, has been true so far of this debate, but there is no reason why a discussion of this issue in the General Assembly should not be productive of profitable result. My delegation is anxious only that whatever means are available to resolve the present situation amicably should be explored and exploited to the full.

17. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): The discussion of Syria's complaint about the threat to its security which, with interruptions, had been under way for some time, has vividly demonstrated that Syria's appeal to the United Nations was justified and well-founded. No one could have been or was convinced by the attempts of representatives belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to prove that it was not proper for the General Assembly to consider the Syrian complaint. The very fact that the Assembly is discussing this question gives the lie to all those who attempted to cast doubt upon the appropriateness of such a discussion. When the prevention of war is at stake, hair-splitting is a dangerous pastime.

18. One is first of all struck by a significant fact. Neither the United States representative nor the Turkish representative, to say nothing of other NATO representatives, has been able to refute any of the

evidence here submitted that a conspiracy exists and that armed aggression is being prepared against Syria. The more Mr. Lodge, the United States representative, has engaged in his customary verbal effusions in giving his opinions of other States and their policy, with particular reference to the Soviet Union, the clearer it has become that action must be taken without delay, lest certain circles in the United States should plunge the world into the abyss of another war.

19. The United States representative has chosen the not very original tactic of focusing attention on events and facts which he thinks best calculated to rouse anti-Soviet feelings still dormant here and there, and to divert attention from the political machinations of the United States in the Syrian area. He evidently felt that a string of lies would have a more blinding effect in this hall if, as proof of the wicked designs of the Soviet Union, he cited Saigon, where a few bombs have been thrown by terrorists. One might with equal validity hold the Soviet Union responsible for the sensational events at Little Rock.

20. We are, however, discussing the Syrian complaint, not events totally removed from what is going on in the Near East. It is the Syrian complaint which has prompted the anxiety of the United Nations. The General Assembly will do well not to allow itself to be hoodwinked by the unsupported denials of the United States and Turkish representatives and to adopt without delay measures to investigate the situation on the spot, as Syria has proposed. This is particularly necessary since the situation has not grown any less tense and there is no reason to believe that the Turkish and United States organizers and planners of the anti-Syrian conspiracy have renounced their aggressive designs.

21. The aggressive encroachments of the United States ruling circles on the freedom and independence of peace-loving Syria are obvious. It is becoming increasingly difficult for the United States propaganda machine to dupe people by alleging that Syria's complaint of threats to its security and to international peace is merely an exaggeration of the facts or a "cold war" propaganda manoeuvre. The truth is, as Sabri el-Assali, the Prime Minister of Syria, has stated, that this complaint relates to terror, threats and aggressive intentions. By its very essence, he continued, it is a genuine expression of mankind's struggle against the spirit of evil and aggression, and affects not only Syria's interests, but the interests of all peoples who are striving for freedom, peace and equity.

22. What self-respecting government, failing to see, or having no evidence of, any real threat to its security from a neighbouring State, would appeal to the United Nations? Any government that did so would be sure to find itself in difficulties with its own people. The Government of Syria, which enjoys incontestable authority, has informed the United Nations that the security and independence of Syria are being endangered and that the present situation has indeed reached the point where measures by the United Nations, in fulfilment of its Charter, are necessary.

23. Let us refer to the documents presented to the General Assembly, in particular to the explanatory memorandum by the Syrian Foreign Minister. It states:

"At present there exists an actual military threat to Syria, resulting from the heavy, unprecedented and unwarranted concentration of Turkish troops, up to several divisions, in close proximity to the Syrian-Turkish border. These troops are being constantly reinforced. They are now massed mainly in a small sector, and have taken a disposition which presages imminent attack." [A/3699, para.2.]

24. Have Turkey, and its backer, the United States, refuted this accusation? Of course not. Their representatives in the United Nations have, it is true, been spreading the rumour that it is not Turkey which threatens Syria, but Syria which threatens Turkey. We are, moreover, told that Turkey is now surrounded. By whom? Apparently by Syria, whose armed forces, according to Press reports, are less than one-tenth the size of the Turkish army. What is this—the product of a sick imagination or political trickery by the colonizers who have selected Syria as the latest victim of their insatiable appetites? Without fear of error one may speak, not of an imaginary encirclement of Turkey, but of certain Turkish statesmen's heads being turned by listening to Mr. Dulles' bellicose speeches.

25. Syria is a small Arab State. It adheres to a policy of positive neutrality and is of course interested in strengthening its armed forces with one purpose in mind—to ensure its security. The United States and Turkey are members of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc. They are in collusion against Syria just as the United Kingdom, France and Israel were in collusion last year when they attacked Egypt. Ships of the United States Sixth Fleet, equipped with so-called "tactical" atomic weapons, plough Mediterranean waters. Its aircraft are daily violating Syrian air space. We must be extremely wary of statements made by NATO members who, by assuring Turkey that they will support it, are encouraging it to take a fatal step.

26. One is struck by the fact that in the many statements made by the State Department and its official representatives on the Near Eastern situation, the United States Government has not availed itself of the opportunity to say openly and clearly that it does not intend to violate the peace in that area. Instead, there is the repeated assertion that the United States will support Turkey. Coming at a time when no one is planning to attack Turkey, such statements are nothing but an incitement to Turkey to commit aggression against Syria.

27. The plans to attack Syria have now become common knowledge, and those who have inspired the aggressive machinations in the Near East face the rising indignation of world public opinion. How else are we to interpret the backstage political activity designed to prevent further exposure of the United States' and Turkey's aggressive intentions against Syria and to thwart an international investigation of the situation? One has the impression that an attempt is being made to submerge the General Assembly in a flood of speeches about mediation in some form or other.

28. In the past few days, we have all witnessed a manoeuvre to shelve, in the interests of the United States and Turkey, the request of a Member of the United Nations—Syria—for the establishment of a United Nations commission to investigate the situation on the Syrian-Turkish frontier. How surprising is the

sudden indifference to an impartial international investigation on the part of those whose initiative and support have led to the establishment of many a United Nations commission in the past! If we compare the speeches in support of the international commissions now functioning with today's speeches in opposition to Syria's request, we will have a kind of compendium of political hypocrisy.

29. As a result of the notorious Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine, the situation in the Syrian area continues to be extremely tense. The ominous shadow of this doctrine has fallen over the entire Near and Middle East. By intrigues and provocations it is seeking, like a boa constrictor, to take the Arab peoples into its cold embrace. The economic substance of this "doctrine" is determined by the interests of the oil monopolies which are making enormous profits on the exploitation of the natural resources of the Near and Middle East. Is the United States interested in having the countries in this part of the world exploit their oil resources by themselves and for their own benefit? Certainly not. The political aim and tendency of the "doctrine" are equally clear—to assure United States domination. This goal is to be attained through the suppression of the national liberation movement of the peoples fighting for their independence against colonialism.

30. It is no wonder, therefore, that countries which have rejected the Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine, including Syria, are the object of intrigue and provocations on the part of the United States. The author of an article in the January issue of *Fortune*, deploring the fact that the United States was obliged to re-examine the principle of self-determination of peoples, connects such a revision with the need for "proclaiming large objectives" and attaining them, and for exerting political influence. This means, he says, "supporting those leaders whose aims are compatible with ours [meaning the United States] and opposing those leaders who are openly hostile to them."

31. The same idea was expressed with even greater candour by the British periodical *The New Statesman*, which declared that, if the United States wanted its system—that is, the Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine—to work, it must sooner or later get rid of the Syrian Government.

32. This is the political mechanism of the Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine which the United States is foisting upon the countries of the Near and Middle East. What is happening in the Syrian area is the result of the over-all United States foreign policy of bringing the world periodically to the "brink of war". Chester Bowles, in his book *The New Dimensions of Peace*, obviously had in mind those who, heedless of the consequences, were balancing on the brink of war, when he wrote that they intended to use every possible pretext for unleashing war, were trying to make small incidents into major ones and deliberately set out to create a situation in which a world war would be inevitable.

33. Are not the statements of the United States, which have followed close upon one another in recent days, and the subsequent joint statement of the United States and the United Kingdom about NATO's readiness to extend military support to Turkey, which is threatened by no one and which has concentrated its own troops

for an attack on Syria—are not these a dangerous prelude to the outbreak of war on the soil of the hard-working people of Syria?

34. In assuring Turkey of its support and in calling upon other NATO members to do the same, the United States has referred to its obligations to Turkey under the North Atlantic Treaty. What then is the worth of the repeated statements that NATO is merely a defensive alliance with no aggressive aims? Syria has no plans of attacking anyone, yet Turkey, which is engaged in preparing aggression, is assured in advance of the support of the North Atlantic bloc.

35. Such encouragement by NATO of a potential aggressor leaves no further doubt that this military bloc is directed not only against the Soviet Union and the socialist countries but also against all those who have thrown off or are engaged in throwing off the fetters of colonialism, against all who are endeavouring to pursue an independent policy aimed at preserving the peace and satisfying the national aspirations of their peoples. NATO is again emerging as a bloc of colonial Powers opposed to the freedom and independence of peoples.

36. That is how the United States is attempting to fill the "moral and military vacuum" in the Near East. Is it not time for the United States Government, as the representative of Egypt so aptly and vividly put it [699th meeting], to cease behaving as though the Near East were a club or an election district in its own country?

37. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that aggression against Syria would undoubtedly threaten the peace not only in the Near East but elsewhere. It would be hard to localize the war. Everyone knows that if a house is on fire the neighbours cannot stand idly by watching until fire-brands begin to fall on their own roofs. The best way to keep a fire from spreading to other houses is to make sure it does not break out in any house.

38. Naturally the Syrian people will not stand alone in the defence of their homeland. We know that Egypt and other Arab States have announced their full support for the just cause of the Syrian people. The clear and definite position taken by the Soviet Union, whose borders are located in the immediate proximity of the threatened area, is wholly understandable. It has been repeatedly stated that the USSR Government stands firmly for the preservation of peace and the prevention of war in the Near and Middle East and, guided by the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations, is prepared to take steps to curb the aggressor.

39. The Soviet Union has repeatedly proposed to the great Western Powers that they should make a joint statement condemning the use of force as a means of settling disputes and renouncing interference in the domestic affairs of the countries of the Near and Middle East. The repudiation of this proposal by the Western Powers in no way releases them or the Near Eastern States which follow their lead from the responsibility which will be theirs should they unleash aggression against Syria.

40. The peoples of the entire world are vitally interested in preventing this aggression. Syria has loyal friends in all peace-loving countries, in particular, the Soviet Union. It is our common good fortune, the

good fortune of all mankind, that there are countries like the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries which are in a position to defend the cause of peace worthily. I repeat that it is our great good fortune that there is the Soviet Union, there is the Chinese People's Republic, there is the entire family of socialist and other peace-loving countries which sincerely defend the cause of peace and foil the machinations of the lovers of "small" and "big" wars, of those who would carve up the world at the behest of the big businessmen and oil magnates of the United States.

41. The threat of conflict in the Syrian area cannot fail to alarm the Government and people of the Ukrainian SSR. The Ukrainian delegation therefore supports the Syrian proposal that the General Assembly should establish a commission to investigate the situation on the Syrian-Turkish frontier and submit a report to the General Assembly so that there may be an impartial investigation of the threat to Syrian security which most seriously affects the interests of peace and the security of the peoples.

42. Mr. BITAR (Syria) (translated from French): Long weeks have passed since the Syrian delegation requested the General Assembly to give urgent consideration to the dangerous situation created by the massive concentrations of Turkish troops near Syria's northern frontier.

43. The Syrian delegation expressed its very legitimate anxiety in view of this threat to its country's security and to international peace, and requested the Assembly to establish a commission of inquiry to verify the facts concerning these concentrations along the Syrian-Turkish frontier. It thought that such an inquiry would expedite the withdrawal of the troops and so contribute to the restoration of the normal conditions which should characterize relations between the two neighbouring States.

44. I should like first of all to repeat something I had stressed earlier, namely that we did not submit our complaint to the United Nations until after we had exhausted all other measures which should have prompted our neighbour Turkey to restore, by withdrawing its troops, that *détente* which we desire. Diplomatic negotiations, followed by official memoranda, did not unfortunately produce any results. The only reply received was the one we have all heard the Turkish representative repeat here several times, which is that the Turkish Government has no intention of attacking Syria.

45. In his latest statement before this Assembly [711th meeting], the Turkish representative set forth his Government's point of view. Instead of focusing attention on the northern frontier of Syria—where the real problem lies—he purported to relate the problem to the "cold war". The Secretary of State of the United States and the permanent representative of the United States followed a similar line in their statements here and elsewhere. Yesterday the representatives of the United Kingdom and France followed the same Turkish-American line. This game is of course a very subtle one, but it is a game none the less. An anti-Arab, anti-Syrian policy can always be represented as an anti-communist policy. It is directed none the less against the historic evolution of the Arab countries towards independence, unity and progress.

46. It is true that the "cold war" is troubling a great many countries. It is no less true, however, that the Middle East in particular is characterized by a continuous struggle against the Powers opposing the liberation and unity of the Arab countries. It is this struggle, and not the "cold war", which is at the origin of the present situation.

47. What exactly did the representative of Turkey say when he spoke of Syria? He said [708th meeting] that Soviet ships had transported arms, ammunition and a variety of military equipment to Latakia, and he referred to the construction of installations and airfields which he regarded as out of proportion to the needs of the Syrian army. He also spoke of the hurried construction of submarine bases. After stating that these facts had led Turkey to the conclusion that Syria was being changed into an arsenal, the representative of Turkey quoted the following words of the Turkish Prime Minister:

"We view with concern the situation in Syria, which is assuming a character threatening the peace and security of the Near East... The present very dangerous situation in Syria has been brought about in the past two years by the subversive activities of the Soviet Union... Turkey is a country surrounded with dangers... Subversive activities in Syria have reached the maximum limit."

48. These allegations, however, cannot bear scrutiny. First of all, it occurs to us to ask the representative of Turkey to specify the names and locations of these imaginary airfields, depots and submarine bases. Furthermore, for some time we have been witnessing a skilfully prepared and conducted campaign of slander against Syria, whose policy of independence and neutrality is displeasing to certain foreign Powers.

49. Newspapers and news agencies would have us believe that an airfield, a base or an arsenal is sprouting in Syria every day. The representative of Turkey seems to share that belief. Political figures have accused Syria of becoming a threat not only to Turkey but to the Middle East and even to the entire free world. This is assuredly part of the same reasoning, but the reasoning is based on a policy of deliberately sustained tension, which may lead to deep involvement in a most dangerous course.

50. Last year, Israel had said more or less the same thing about Egypt. Egypt, said Israel, represented a danger to the security of the country. We know what happened. It is true that the Turkish Government gave, and is still giving, official assurances; but the head of the Israel Government, too, made similar declarations even while preparing to attack Egypt.

51. It is also true that the representative of the United States, according to his statements, does not believe in Turkish aggression. However, I would ask him whether he believed in the Israel aggression before it happened. It may be that the United States, a great Power concerned with its world military and political strategy, is less concerned over the prevention of certain small aggressions. But for Syria, a small country, these small aggressions are truly very great ones. We cannot help being concerned over them and thinking of them constantly in order to prevent them. Everything is relative in this world. Hence it may be that Mr. Lodge's words the other day [708th

meeting] reflected this American policy when he said that yesterday it was Hungary; today it was Syria.

52. We, an Arab people, who have suffered and continue to suffer from a colonial-Zionist policy, cannot think as Mr. Lodge, who has not lived through the same bitter experiences as we, would have us think; we can think only in terms of living realities in our country. Mr. Lodge may not believe us, but he cannot misunderstand our views on the events in the Middle East when we interpret them by saying: "Yesterday it was the tripartite aggression against the Arabs in Egypt; today it is Turkey."

53. Furthermore, if Turkey regards its logic as based on fact; if, in other words, Turkey thinks Syria consists of nothing but Soviet bases (purely imaginary, I might add) and depots of arms for the use of a third party; if it sees in Syria only a government carrying out the orders of international communism; if Turkey, therefore, feels that it is encircled with dangers, as the Turkish Prime Minister stated, why not grasp the opportunity to bombard these bases and arms depots? Why not attack Syria, overthrow the Syrian Government and so put an end to these subversive activities? In truth, the concentrations of Turkish troops reflect that line of thought.

54. Syria, I assure you, has legitimate reason to be concerned. Its purpose in submitting this dangerous situation to the Assembly for investigation is to expose it and so to prevent a repetition of the heinous aggression of last year.

55. Furthermore, Syria is well aware of the military preparations which are being made in Turkey. It knows of the large quantities of jet planes, tanks and cannon which have been delivered to Turkey and the numerous airfields and military and naval bases which have been established on Turkish soil. Syria knows all that, I say, and has never questioned Turkey's right to provide for its own defence or to pursue whatever policy it deems fitting. Turkey, on the other hand, questions the right of Syria to purchase arms, to strengthen its defences, to provide for its own security and, what is more, to pursue a national and independent policy.

56. All this can be called by only one name: interference by Turkey in Syria's affairs. Nor is this a novel attitude on Turkey's part. Two and a half years ago, in February 1955—and I wish to be precise about this for the benefit of the representative of Cuba in particular—Syria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia laid the foundations of a tripartite Arab pact. In an official note handed to our Minister Plenipotentiary at Ankara, Mr. Menderes himself, the head of the Turkish Government, asserted in strong and somewhat unusual language that the development of the situation in Syria was a threat to Turkish security. This was followed by concentrations of Turkish troops on our frontiers, exactly as in the present instance.

57. It is true that the United States representative, who also persists in stating [710th meeting] that Syria has acquired large quantities of weapons, does not challenge any country's right to acquire arms; but, he adds, it is legitimate to inquire regarding the motives behind the sending of such large quantities of arms into a potentially explosive area at a particularly tense moment.

58. What is actually the value of this recognition in principle of the right to acquire arms when the United States concludes that Syria must be prevented from acquiring arms intended for its own defence? Why is it that the small quantities of weapons acquired by Syria are supposed to aggravate tension in the Middle East? Why is it that the large quantities of arms acquired by Israel and Turkey are not expected to have the same strange and inexplicable effect? It should be obvious to everyone that Syria, a small country which has 4 million inhabitants and is not a member of any foreign military bloc, cannot constitute a threat to Turkey, a country which is armed to the teeth and is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. What is more, Syria has no troops concentrated along its frontier with Turkey. It cannot, therefore, interpret the massive concentration of Turkish troops as a simple internal security measure, as the representative of Turkey claims.

59. I had said, in my previous statement in the Assembly [708th meeting], that these Turkish concentrations were part of a plan of pressure and intimidation directed against the neutralist, essentially national and independent policy of Syria. This country, like all newly liberated countries, wishes to build up its national life in every respect. It would like to pursue a national and international policy based on its own aims and interests and in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

60. Certain Powers, which wish to keep the Arab countries under the yoke of colonial dependence, oppose that policy. In accusing Syria as they are doing, they hope to simplify the problem while at the same time justifying their own hostile actions. The most strenuous efforts cannot conceal the true meaning of the struggle which the Arabs are waging at this time to safeguard their complete independence. World public opinion will not indefinitely be deluded by the stratagem of representing this struggle as merely a manifestation of the antagonism between East and West. Mr. Lodge presented the problem in terms of that antagonism when he spoke of the American "plot" to overthrow the Syrian Government. It is obvious that when generalizations are pushed too far they can frequently be very misleading.

61. I do not wish to dwell too much on this point. We did not ask that this complaint should be placed on the agenda merely so that we could engage in polemics. Let me only emphasize here that the great error of United States policy consists in thinking that there is a vacuum in the Middle East and that that vacuum will inevitably attract communism if it is not filled by British, French, Zionist or United States domination or influence. We do not hesitate to affirm that this, and not the "cold war", is the primary cause of the tension in the Middle East. This is the real background against which the crisis now unfolding before us has developed. This erroneous notion should not be the basis of a United States policy in the Middle East, which claims to be a policy as between equals.

62. In his statement yesterday, the Turkish representative said:

"In the evening of 8 October 1957, the Syrian Government addressed a letter to the Secretary-General^{1/} claiming, for the first time, that Turkey had

massed troops on the Turkish-Syrian border... Earlier in the same day, the same Syrian Government had presented a note to the Turkish Legation in Damascus in which it expressed satisfaction over affirmations made by the Turkish Prime Minister to the effect that Turkey had no aggressive intentions against Syria." [711th meeting, para.57]

63. The Turkish representative thus seems to be saying that the present Syrian complaint is groundless and that the Syrian position is consequently somewhat inconsistent. But the text of the Syrian Government's note of 8 October to which the Turkish representative referred clearly indicates that the Turkish military concentrations have assumed abnormal proportions and are such as to be incompatible with the Turkish Government's assertions that those concentrations are merely part of the Turkish army's autumn manoeuvres. The Syrian Government's note of 8 October concluded with a protest against the provocative acts committed by the Turkish authorities, stating that those acts were contrary to the spirit and the letter of the Charter.

64. The Syrian complaint was submitted to this Assembly in complete good faith. It is based on the existence of a very real danger which cannot be minimized by assurances to the contrary. It has its origin in the enormous concentrations of Turkish troops on our frontiers, something which neither the Turkish representative nor the Turkish Government have denied. Recourse to the General Assembly in such circumstances is in conformity with the provisions of the Charter. It does not diminish in any way the urgency and gravity of the Syrian complaint. Furthermore, the Syrian proposal for the appointment of a commission of inquiry is a proposal which the General Assembly is competent to consider. There is nothing in the Charter to prevent the Assembly from recommending the establishment of such commissions. Besides, an inquiry on the Syrian-Turkish frontier would be nothing more than a preliminary measure meant to elicit the facts in a controversial situation. Finally, one cannot, as some delegations have vainly tried, accuse Syria of bad faith when it opposes manoeuvres the object of which is to prevent the General Assembly from dealing with the Syrian complaint.

65. The situation created by the presence of Turkish troops along our frontiers is a dangerous one which calls for serious consideration. In bringing this complaint before the General Assembly, Syria had no motive other than the desire to remove this threat to its security and at the same time to safeguard international peace.

66. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): First of all, the Soviet delegation would like to express satisfaction at the fact that those guilty of plotting aggression against Syria have not succeeded in thwarting the discussion of the question which the Syrian Government has brought before the General Assembly, although they made considerable efforts either to prevent any consideration of the question by the Assembly or to sidetrack the discussion as far as possible. Their lack of success shows that the majority of the States Members of the United Nations take a serious view of the matter; they have thereby helped to expose those who are to blame for the dangerous situation regarding Syria and to curb their activities. Of course,

^{1/} Circulated to delegations with a note verbale dated 9 October 1957.

this is not the only and not even the most important action that the United Nations must take to avert the threat to Syria's security and thus to avert the threat to peace and security in the Middle East and to world peace; but the very fact that many States—indeed, I believe, the majority of Member States—have understood the danger of the situation which has been created with regard to Syria is a definite step forward.

67. The General Assembly will only be carrying out its duty if, instead of stopping there, it takes definite decisions designed to prevent an armed attack against Syria. We have in mind both a decision to investigate the situation on the Syrian-Turkish frontier and a decision on the measures which Member States will be required to take in the event of an armed attack on Syria, with a view to preventing aggression and punishing those responsible for a breach of the peace, measures including, if necessary, the use of armed force.

68. The debate on the question raised by Syria has shown that those responsible for the tension around that country are using the time-worn and familiar method of distracting public attention from the crux of the matter and then confronting the world with a fait accompli. This makes it necessary for the United Nations to be on its guard and not to allow itself to be lulled by assurances that there is no immediate threat to Syria.

69. It is also noteworthy that neither Turkey, whose political leaders have apparently given little thought to where the path they have chosen for their country may lead, nor the United States actually denies that they have been and are taking military measures by concentrating Turkish troops on the Syrian frontier, as had been pointed out by Syria and also by the Soviet Union, which has lent its support to the just claims of the Syrian Government. They simply assert that Turkey is entitled to take any measures that it sees fit in its own territory. But there can be no doubt that the Hitlerites would have echoed such assertions, for in planning their aggression against peace-loving States they began by taking preparatory measures in German territory only.

70. The moving spirits and organizers of military preparations against Syria allege that all is well and that Syria has no cause for alarm. But this is rather like holding a revolver to someone's head and then urging him to be calm and even cheerful.

71. In yesterday's statements by the Turkish, United Kingdom and French delegations, we heard soothing remarks that the situation on the Syrian-Turkish frontier is not fraught with danger and that Turkey is full of loving-kindness and has no intention of attacking Syria. But did we not hear similar statements from official representatives of the United Kingdom, France and Israel literally two or three days before their armed forces attacked Egypt?

72. Is it surprising that in these circumstances Syria, whose security is at stake, is not satisfied by these reassurances? The Government of the USSR is not satisfied either.

73. May I repeat something that the Soviet delegation said in its statement here on 22 October [708th meeting]: general reassurances cannot eliminate the danger which threatens Syria and the whole cause of peace in the Near and Middle East. If the United States and

Turkey have really renounced their aggressive designs against Syria, they should prove it by deeds. For this, it is essential first of all to withdraw Turkish troops from the Syrian frontier and to stop the blackmail and threats against that country. Unfortunately, we have as yet no indication that the United States and Turkey are prepared to do this. Their representatives' statements in the General Assembly suggest the contrary.

74. We listened carefully to the statement which the United States representative made here on 25 October [710th meeting], being fully aware, of course, that United States diplomacy cannot do without a garnish of bluster, distortions and outright falsifications. Nevertheless, we did our best to strip the statement down to its essentials and to see whether it did not contain something constructive. Unfortunately, it was impossible to avoid the conclusion that an annoyingly familiar old record had been played over again for our benefit—a record which had, moreover, obviously been prepared for use in any eventuality, since the requirements of truth are foreign to United States diplomacy nowadays.

75. The United States statement scarcely referred to the question raised by Syria. No words, however strong and crude they may be—and it is not difficult for anyone to find such words—can conceal the fact that what the United States Government is afraid of most is an objective presentation of the circumstances surrounding the military preparations against Syria; in other words, it is afraid of the truth.

76. If those who determine the foreign policy of the United States and are primarily responsible for the tense atmosphere which has been created in the Near and Middle East as a result of the planning of aggression against Syria foster the hope that they will succeed in distracting attention from their activities by making absurd accusations against the USSR, they will be disappointed. It is a vain hope on the part of those who have been caught red-handed, who have brought the Syrian situation to a white heat and who are continuing to play with fire.

77. We have already stated, and we repeat, that the Soviet Union is making accusations, and has every reason to do so.

78. The Soviet Union accuses Turkey of planning a military attack on Syria and the United States of inciting Turkey and, by urging it to follow this dangerous course, driving it on towards a fatal step.

79. The Soviet Union accuses those who are flagrantly interfering in the domestic affairs of the States of the Near and Middle East and who are attempting, by means of pressure and blackmail, to draw one country of that region after another into military blocs for aggressive purposes, contrary to the interests of peace. An example of such blackmail and pressure is furnished by what the United States Sixth Fleet has been doing in the Mediterranean; it hardly has time to conclude one provocative action before it engages in another.

80. The Soviet Union accuses those who organize plots against the lawful Governments of the countries of the Near and Middle East and are carrying on subversive activities against other States Members of the United Nations, thus violating the principles of the Charter to which they have subscribed.

81. The Soviet Union vigorously accuses the moving spirits of the so-called Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine, the purpose of which, as anyone who does not wish to hide from the truth must now clearly see, is to provide a sanctimonious cover for expansionist and aggressive intentions towards the Near and Middle East. It is as a result of their activities that the Near and Middle East has been turned into a region threatened by sudden explosions.

82. Are there any grounds for making these accusations? Yes, there are, with the sole reservation that this enumeration of activities, primarily by the United States, directed against peace and against the independence of the Arab States, could be considerably extended.

83. Only a short time ago, government officials of the United States asserted that the "invention" of this doctrine would at last alter the whole situation and that the doctrine would shower blessings on the countries of the Near and Middle East. But what happened? It created a direct threat to the security of the countries of the region, an imminent threat of aggression against a State Member of the United Nations, a threat to world peace. Is that in itself not enough to show the real nature and intent of the policy which is masked by that doctrine?

84. The Soviet Union is in favour of the independent development of the countries of the Near and Middle East and of an end to foreign interference in their domestic affairs, since this would serve not only the vital national interests of the countries concerned, but the cause of peace. The United States, on the contrary, has made it a policy to interfere in the affairs of the countries of the Near and Middle East, even to the extent of organizing conspiracies to overthrow their Governments.

85. The Soviet Union is against the countries of the Near and Middle East being forced to join military blocs. The United States is constantly making them join such blocs, trying to turn them into military bases and shamelessly bringing pressure to bear on the countries which offer any resistance.

86. The Soviet Union believes that all countries should engage in broad economic co-operation with the States of the Near and Middle East and lend them economic assistance with a view to strengthening their economic independence. Its position is that, in the interest of strengthening the independence of these States and maintaining peace in the area, economic co-operation should be founded on respect for the principles of equal rights and mutual advantage and should in no way impair the sovereign rights of these States. The question of their economic relations with other countries must be settled by the Near and Middle Eastern States themselves, and not by Washington.

87. The United States, on the other hand, is intent upon the economic enslavement of the countries of the Near and Middle East, on the assumption that when one of these countries has been bound hand and foot economically it will be easier to transform its territory into a military base of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Even now, while we are here examining the Syrian Government's appeal to the General Assembly, the question is being openly discussed in the United States of how pressure can best be brought to bear to disrupt the economic relations that have been

established between some Arab and socialist countries and to tie the economy of the Arab countries completely to that of the United States. Needless to say, the Soviet Union has never pursued and does not now pursue any such purposes as regards these countries' economic relations with the United States or with any other country.

88. The Soviet Union proposes that the use of force in the settlement of disputes relating to the Near and Middle East should be condemned. The United States has openly proclaimed that it favours the use of armed force against countries which do not wish to follow its policy blindly.

89. The Soviet Union has expressly and repeatedly declared that it not only wishes to maintain good relations with the countries of the Near and Middle East itself, but that it favours the development of equally good relations between those countries and the Western Powers, including the United States, since that would be in the interest of the maintenance of peace and international co-operation. The United States Government, on the other hand, declares that any country of the Near or Middle East which has established normal relations, including trade relations, with the Soviet Union is its enemy.

90. The allegation that these countries are under the threat of communism—precisely the allegation once made by the Nazis—will deceive no one. Having been duly rebuffed by many countries in that area, the United States is going so far as to threaten those of them which do not intend to obey its dictates and which are fully aware that they must maintain good relations with the Soviet Union in the interest of peace, for purely geographical reasons, and to protect their independence.

91. All this goes to show that the present Syrian situation is a consequence of the current United States policy with regard to the countries of the Near and Middle East. Everything the United States Government has said since the Syrian Government submitted the question we are discussing to the Assembly supports this conclusion; it is a conclusion we cannot escape if we are prepared to face the truth. It would seem, however, that no arguments can avail against those who are prepared in advance to join in the chorus led by certain circles in the United States. We can only regret that this should be so.

92. To judge by the statements of the United Kingdom representatives, their Government is ready to join in the dangerous game which certain United States groups are playing in the Near and Middle East. What is the reason for this attitude? Could it be that there are plans afoot in the United Kingdom to recoup the losses suffered last year, when the United Kingdom's attempt to preserve its colonial domination—or rather its colonial position—in the Near East by means of an aggressive war suffered a dismal failure because of the resistance of the Egyptian people, supported by the peace-loving elements of other countries? Is London thinking of bettering its position, this time by hitching its wagon to the star of the United States? That is a dangerous course.

93. It might not be out of place to recall that as far back as April of last year, and on many occasions since, the USSR Government has asked the Government of the United Kingdom why it was trying to precipitate

a war in the Near and Middle East. It was clear even then that no good would come of it where the United Kingdom was concerned. Would it not be better to choose another course, that of co-operation on equal terms with the countries of the Near and Middle East? Why must a State satisfy its economic needs, say for oil, by means of robbery? We are convinced that the United Kingdom's economic interests in the Near and Middle East could be far better safeguarded if it scrupulously respected the independence and sovereignty of the countries of the area, took their legitimate rights into account and gave up any thought of interfering in their domestic affairs.

94. We wanted to draw the United Kingdom delegation's attention to that point in connexion with its statement yesterday. Instead of competing with the United States in making rude remarks, the United Kingdom representatives would be well advised to analyse the situation soberly, as one should always do in considering questions on the settlement of which peace itself may depend.

95. What should the General Assembly's next move be in the matter under discussion? In the view of the USSR delegation, the next thing, and the least that can be done, is to decide to set up a commission, as proposed by the Syrian Government. In view of the situation in which Syria finds itself, who could oppose the establishment of a commission? Only those who are planning aggression and who have something to hide can object to such a step.

96. The overwhelming majority of States represented in the General Assembly reacted favourably to the proposal for setting up a commission. Those, however, who are guilty of preparing an attack on Syria have taken a different attitude. It is true that when the item proposed by Syria was discussed in the General Committee on 18 October [116th meeting], the United States went so far as to welcome the proposal for an investigation. However, its enthusiasm has gradually flagged, and for the last few days it has been busy trying to block a decision to set up a commission.

97. At first the United States tried to hide behind Turkey, but Turkey's back was not broad enough for the United States to hide behind, so that now both Turkey and the United States are endeavouring to prevent a General Assembly decision to establish a commission.

98. Even if no other facts were known regarding the preparations for an attack on Syria, this fact alone—the attitude of Turkey and the United States towards the setting up of a commission—would suffice to demolish the assertions of their representatives that nothing was taking place on the Syrian-Turkish frontier except regular manoeuvres by the Turkish army.

99. The manoeuvres are being executed not on the Turkish-Syrian frontier, but here in the hall and in the corridors of the General Assembly. These manoeuvres are being directed from Washington, which has suffered a definite setback in that the actions of those responsible for the present serious situation around Syria have been brought to light. In the circumstances, what could be more objective than the proposal for setting up a commission of investigation?

100. If a commission were established, sent to the area of the Syrian-Turkish frontier, and then submitted a report, the General Assembly and the Security

Council would have a fuller picture of the situation which had arisen there. What is wrong with this proposal? We are deeply convinced that there can be no objection to it on the part of any Government which wants to know the truth and whose concern for peace is genuine and not simulated.

101. The Governments of some Member States may not be entirely convinced that the situation on the Syrian-Turkish frontier is really serious. It is naturally for each Government to draw its own conclusions. But no Government which wants to form an impartial opinion on the situation in regard to Syria can fail to support, and indeed insist on, an investigation. For the United Nations to follow the lead of those who are attempting to camouflage their preparations for an attack upon Syria and to lull people into a false sense of security, for it to accept at face value their assurances that the concentration of Turkish troops on the Syrian frontier is prompted by good intentions, would be to connive in their activities and to neglect its own duty to protect the peace.

102. Those who, now or later, object to the setting up of a commission assume a heavy responsibility, since consciously or unconsciously they are playing into the hands of the enemies of peace.

103. We have a question to put to those representatives who have opposed the creation of a commission: how would any one of them feel if his country were to find itself in Syria's position, and was threatened with armed invasion by another State, which openly declared that it did not like its internal régime? In our opinion, there can be only one answer: they would certainly insist that the United Nations should take effective action. In other words, they would react very much as the Syrians are reacting now, when they express alarm over their country's security.

104. It is true that many delegations, considering the proposal to set up a commission, may follow another line of reasoning, and may look on the matter one way if their own country is concerned and in quite a different way if other countries are concerned. The point is, however, that inaction and inertia on the part of the United Nations might result in a State—especially if it is a small and weak State—becoming a victim of aggression; in that case, it might be too late to send a commission, since events might take a different and very dangerous turn.

105. These are the additional comments which the USSR delegation wished to make on the matter under discussion. There is no need to repeat all that was said by the USSR delegation in its statement of 22 October in the General Assembly.

106. Mr. TSIANG (China): The Soviet Union is about to celebrate its fourtieth birthday. In the forty years of its existence, it has taught the world many harsh lessons. One of them is this: international communism thrives on crises. If no crisis exists, international communism does not hesitate to create one. The Soviet Union believes that in the atmosphere of perpetual crises and tension it can best achieve its objective of world domination.

107. The Middle East is a region which Russia's rulers, from the czars down to the present, have always tried to dominate. Sometimes using force, sometimes posing as the only and great friend of the peoples of the region, the Soviet Union has continued

to seek the destiny of empire from the Caucasus to the Persian Gulf. Post-war efforts to dominate Iran, Greece and Turkey, through military occupation and subversion, have so far failed. Now the Soviet Union exploits Arab nationalism to attain what it could not get by direct military action. Soviet propaganda constantly reminds the Arabs of their grievances against Western imperialism, whispers suspicions about their neighbours and emphasizes and exaggerates the shortcomings of those Arab leaders or régimes not to Soviet liking.

108. Soviet propaganda represents the Western Powers, particularly the United States, as having designs on every Arab land, as planning to make each a colony. It represents the Soviet Union as the only friend of the oppressed nations of the region. It identifies the Soviet Union with every Arab nationalist aspiration. The speaker who preceded me gave the Assembly a complete example of that type of Soviet propaganda.

109. The Soviet line of policy today in the Middle East is not new. It is the same line which the Soviets have pursued in the Far East since the days of Joffe and Karahan who, thirty-five years ago, rang out in China the great friendship of the Soviet Union for China.

110. The so-called crisis on the Turkish-Syrian border is a typical example of this type of trumped-up crisis calculated to forward the Soviet cause. The Soviets have artificially created a war scare and want us to believe that Syria is in imminent danger of Turkish military invasion. Turkey, situated as it is close to the Soviet Union, on one side, and close to the region which happens now to be the centre of Soviet activity, on the other side, is naturally apprehensive. But we know, through the character and record of modern Turkey, that the leaders and people of that country are profoundly peace-loving and do not have any designs against any of its neighbours. The complaint of a Turkish threat of aggression against Syria is obviously false. It is put forward for a sinister purpose.

111. Not satisfied with smearing Turkey, the Soviet Union has attacked the United States as having prodded Turkey to take aggressive action. Again, the character and post-war record of the Government of the United States furnish a complete refutation of that charge.

112. In the midst of this turmoil we are heartened by the mediation offer by His Majesty King Saud of Saudi Arabia. Turkey has accepted. This acceptance is one additional proof of Turkey's good faith. We hope that the leaders of Syria will yet accept this mediation offer. In the opinion of my delegation, mediation by His Majesty King Saud would be more constructive than anything else that the Assembly could do.

113. We in China sympathize with the people of Syria in their desire to achieve national independence and complete sovereignty over their own affairs. We hope the Syrian people will realize that Soviet domination is worse than all other forms of overlordship the world has ever known. I speak with some authority on this subject. We in China have learned that so-called Soviet friendship is but the first step towards eventual domination.

114. My Government maintains friendly relations with many Arab countries. We wish the Arab people well. We do not want to see the Arab people repeat the mis-

takes which we have made in our country and from the consequences of which we are still suffering.

115. Mr. PICCIONI (Italy) (translated from French): For more than ten days we have been obliged to consider a question with regard to the substance of which many delegations have, I believe, the most serious grounds for doubt. The terms of this question are indeed obscure when viewed in the light of the Charter. The reasons governing the choice of the procedure for bringing the question before the Assembly are fictitious, and we do not even know whether this is a question which really concerns the relations between Syria and Turkey—we rather fear the contrary.

116. I think that we are all convinced that Turkey has no designs against Syria and never has had. This is proved very clearly by the specific statements and the firm assurances of the representative of Turkey. It is also proved by the attachment and devotion that Turkey has always shown to the cause of the security and independence of Syria and of all the Arab countries in general.

117. We are faced with an artificial problem which has been artificially raised, a problem which is not founded on facts and which, in reality, has been inflated and exacerbated by the USSR for reasons which have obviously nothing to do with the security of Syria or the interests of the Syrian people.

118. In the course of the debate, an artificial element which no one can fail to notice has been revealed. On the one hand, there was the statement that the situation on the Turkish-Syrian border was so threatening that it required the immediate attention of the United Nations in the interests of the security of Syria and of international peace; on the other hand, the procedure chosen was not that provided in the Charter for questions of a character requiring immediate action.

119. It is inconceivable that a State which feels that it is the object of such a serious threat as that complained of by Syria should not have recourse to the emergency measures which can be applied only by the Security Council, and should choose the procedure of a debate in the General Assembly. It is even more inconceivable that a great Power like the USSR, which, as a permanent member of the Security Council, has, under the Charter, definite responsibilities with regard to the maintenance of peace and international security, should encourage and urge on a debate which would already have been concluded had it taken place in the Security Council.

120. Anyone with common sense can see, from the method chosen, that what the USSR wanted was not to safeguard the security of Syria, but to bring about, with much clamour, a general debate which had nothing whatever to do with the situation on the Turkish-Syrian border but which was likely to intensify the "cold war". That this is so was demonstrated by the USSR representative himself only a few days ago [708th meeting], when he made a long speech in which he referred to many questions and expressed himself violently on many problems, but entirely neglected to prove that there was any basis for the considerations which had led him to insist so urgently on having this debate.

121. The representative of the USSR did not bring forward a single solid fact, a single proof or a single

indication which could substantiate the charges against Turkey. His speech amounted to a statement which had nothing whatever to do with the security of Syria, and a threat which was obviously intended to aggravate the situation. He said:

"If an attack was committed upon Syria and war was thereby started close to the southern frontiers of the Soviet Union, the interests of Soviet security would be vitally affected. Consequently, in the event of an attack upon Syria, the Soviet Union, guided by... the interests of its own security, will take all steps necessary." [708th meeting, para. 151.]

There could be no clearer proof of a deliberate intention to create and spread alarm and to increase international tension.

122. I represent a country which has a vital interest in the maintenance of peace and of close and sincere co-operation among all the Mediterranean peoples, which cannot therefore but feel apprehensive of any attempt to stir up mistrust and discord among them. The security of the Mediterranean peoples is also the security of Italy.

123. For this reason, we were very happy to hear the statement made yesterday by the representative of Turkey, which confirmed us in our conviction of that country's peaceful intentions. Furthermore, the whole policy followed by Ankara since the rebirth of the Turkish State thanks to Kemal Ataturk's unforgettable efforts is the best proof of its peaceful intentions.

124. Although deliberately misleading propaganda has succeeded in breeding suspicion of Turkish intentions and causing anxiety in leading circles at Damascus, we hope that a more realistic appraisal of the situation may prevail, so that these two countries, to one of which we are linked by an alliance and to the other by friendly relations, may achieve a relationship based on mutual trust and respect.

125. This aim may be achieved thanks to the high-minded initiative taken by King Ibn Saud, which is in keeping with the great prestige he enjoys in the Arab countries and is in full accordance with the letter and the spirit of the Charter.

126. What we have to do now is to restore calm, clear the atmosphere and dissipate fear and mistrust. If there is a problem to be solved, let us try to find a path which will lead us directly to a rapid solution. What is this path? There does not seem to be much

doubt about the answer: we must make use of a procedure which, far from the "cold war" atmosphere introduced by the bellicose Soviet statements, will allow of frank explanations and an objective appraisal of the different factors of the situation. The Italian delegation is ready to support any proposal based on such principles.

127. Mr. NISOT (Belgium) (translated from French): The Belgian delegation is loath to take part in this debate, the prolongation of which is highly prejudicial to the authority of the Assembly and which some people are still trying to turn into an instrument of propaganda.

128. I need hardly say that my delegation associates itself fully with the protests which have been made here from all sides against the charges levelled at Turkey. It has been abundantly proved that these charges come mainly from the USSR. They bear the stamp of the USSR, they have no relation to truth and are obviously intended to spread alarm and to sow and encourage discord.

129. But even to those who are blind to the realities of the situation one thing must be obvious: the Assembly would be remiss in its duty if it failed to exercise the discretion advocated by the Charter. The Charter places mediation and conciliation among the methods which should be first resorted to for the settlement of disputes. In so doing it shows wisdom, for no method of settlement is better adapted to the nature of States and their relations with each other. Where mediation can be envisaged, it should have priority. To prolong the debate at this stage would be to disregard this priority, to go against the Charter and to risk wrecking all chances of mediation.

130. These chances exist, as Turkey has proved by its actions. Syria too, when left to act according to its own judgement, seeks to achieve understanding and concord. The Belgian delegation has no doubt of that.

131. Among the Member States of the United Nations, the Arab States profess a great attachment to the cause of peace. This fact is worth mentioning for their influence is, in the present circumstances, an important factor. When appealed to to use persuasion, they understand, I am sure, that mediation, which respects the sovereignty and the independence of States more than any other method, is particularly suitable to the present situation.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.