

# **THE USSR AND THE MIDDLE EAST**

---

**PROBLEMS OF PEACE  
AND SECURITY  
1947-1971**

2137192  
12-

# THE USSR AND THE MIDDLE EAST

PROBLEMS OF PEACE  
AND SECURITY

[DOCUMENTS AND OTHER MATERIALS]

Novosti Press Agency Publishing House  
Moscow, 1972

## CONTENTS:

To the Reader . . . . .	7
Soviet Government's Notes to the Governments of France, Great Britain, the United States and China, June 1, 1945 . . . . .	33
From Speech by Soviet Representative A. A. Gromyko at UN Security Council on Presence of Armed Forces of UN Member-States on Territories of Other Countries, September 23, 1946 . . . . .	34
Speech by Soviet Representative A. A. Gromyko at UN Security Council on the Withdrawal of British Troops from Egypt and the Sudan, August 20, 1947 . . . . .	38
Speech by Soviet Representative A. A. Gromyko at Plenary Meeting of UN General Assembly, November 26, 1947 . . . . .	42
From Speech by Soviet Representative at Plenary Meeting of UN General Assembly on Palestine Question, December 11, 1948 . . . . .	51
Soviet Government's Notes to Governments of the United States, Great Britain, France and Turkey, November 24, 1951 . . . . .	53
On Resumption of Diplomatic Relations Between the Soviet Union and Israel, July 15, 1953 . . . . .	56
Statement by USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on Security in Middle East, April 16, 1955 . . . . .	58
TASS Statement on Egypt's Purchase of Arms, October 1, 1955 . . . . .	65
Statement by USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on Situation in Middle East, April 17, 1956 . . . . .	66
Soviet Government's Statement on Need for Peaceful Settlement of the Suez Question, September 15, 1956 . . . . .	71
Soviet Government's Statement on Armed Aggression Against Egypt, October 31, 1956 . . . . .	83
Speech by Soviet Representative A. A. Sobolev at Special Emergency Session of UN General Assembly on Aggression Against Egypt by Great Britain, France and Israel, November 1, 1956 . . . . .	86
USSR Foreign Minister's Appeal to Security Council President, November 5, 1956 . . . . .	88

Message from Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers to Prime Minister of Great Britain, November 5, 1956 . . . . .	90
Message from Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers to Chairman of the Council of Ministers of France, November 5, 1956 . . . . .	93
Message from Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers to Prime Minister of Israel, November 5, 1956 . . . . .	96
TASS Statement on Aggression Against Egypt by Great Britain, France and Israel, November 10, 1956 . . . . .	98
Message from Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers to Prime Minister of Israel, November 15, 1956 . . . . .	102
TASS Statement on the "Eisenhower Doctrine," January 13, 1957 . . . . .	103
Soviet Government's Notes to Governments of Britain, the United States and France, February 11, 1957 . . . . .	116
From Speech by Soviet Representative A. A. Sobolev at Plenary Meeting of 11th Session of UN General Assembly on Withdrawal of Israeli Troops from Egypt, February 26, 1957 . . . . .	123
TASS Statement on Preparations for New Aggression Against Egypt by Israel with Support of Western Powers, March 28, 1957 . . . . .	132
Statement by USSR Foreign Ministry on Imperialist Intrigues in Jordan, April 29, 1957 . . . . .	134
USSR Foreign Minister A. A. Gromyko's Replies to Correspondents' Questions on the Situation in Syria, Oman and the Yemen, September 10, 1957 . . . . .	140
Soviet Government's Statement on Events in Middle East, July 16, 1958 . . . . .	149
Soviet Government's Statement on United States and British Aggression in Middle East, July 18, 1958 . . . . .	154
Soviet Government's Note to Government of Israel, August 1, 1958 . . . . .	158
Statement by USSR Foreign Minister A. A. Gromyko at New York Press Conference, August 22, 1958 . . . . .	159
Soviet Government's Note to Government of Israel, September 5, 1958 . . . . .	166

From Joint Communiqué on Talks Between USSR and United Arab Republic, May 18, 1966	168
In the USSR Foreign Ministry, "Pravda," April 27, 1967	169
Soviet Government's Statement on Situation in Middle East, May 24, 1967	171
Soviet Government's Statement, June 5, 1967	174
Soviet Government's Statement to Israeli Government, June 7, 1967	176
From Statement by Central Committee of Communist and Workers' Parties and Governments of PRB, HPR, GDR, PPR, USSR, CSR and SFRY, June 9, 1967	177
Soviet Government's Note to Government of Israel, June 10, 1967	179
From Speech by A. N. Kosygin, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at Special Emergency Session of UN General Assembly, June 19, 1967	180
Statement by Plenary Meeting of CPSU Central Committee "On Soviet Union's Policy in Connection with Israel's Aggression in Middle East," June 21, 1967	198
Report on Meeting in Budapest of Leaders of Fraternal Parties and Governments of Socialist Countries, July 11-12, 1967	202
Letter to Security Council President from Soviet Foreign Minister A. A. Gromyko, July 18, 1967	204
Soviet Government's Statement, July 23, 1967	206
Communiqué on Meeting of Foreign Ministers of European Socialist Countries, December 19-21, 1967	210
Soviet Government's Statement, March 23, 1968	213
From Report by USSR Foreign Minister A. A. Gromyko "On the International Situation and the Soviet Union's Foreign Policy," Delivered to USSR Supreme Soviet, June 27, 1968	219
From Speech by L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU CC, at Luncheon in Honour of UAR President Nasser, July 5, 1968	221
From Joint Communiqué on Official Visit by President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the UAR to the Soviet Union, July 4 to 10, 1968	225
Y. Vasiliev. Just and Stable Peace in Middle	

East Is Urgent Need, "Pravda," January 25, 1969	228
From Report by Foreign Minister A. A. Gromyko to USSR Supreme Soviet Session, July 10, 1969	231
TASS Statement of August 30, 1969	234
Israel Must Observe UN Resolutions, "Pravda," October 4, 1969	235
TASS Statement of October 26, 1969	239
Statement on Situation in Middle East. USSR Foreign Ministry Press Conference, October 31, 1969	242
Statement by Central Committees of Communist and Workers' Parties and Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, the USSR and Czechoslovakia on Situation in Middle East, November 27, 1969	248
Message from the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and Soviet Government to the Arab Summit Conference, December 22, 1969	252
Peace Should Be Restored in Middle East, "Pravda", March 3, 1970	254
TASS Statement of May 30, 1970	258
Statement by USSR Supreme Soviet on Situation in Middle East, July 15, 1970	260
From Speech by L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU CC, at Meeting in Alma-Ata, August 28, 1970	264
From Speech by N. V. Podgorny, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at Luncheon in Honour of President Varahgiri Venkata Giri of India, September 23, 1970	266
Concerning Developments in Jordan, USSR Foreign Ministry Statement, September 24, 1970	267
From Speech by L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU CC, at Grand Rally in Baku, October 2, 1970	269
Y. Primakov. Way to Just Peace. On Soviet Proposals for a Political Settlement in Middle East, "Pravda," October 15, 1970	272
For a Stable Peace and Security in Middle East, December 2, 1970	277
From Speech by N. V. Podgorny, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at the Opening of the Aswan Hydropower Complex,	

January 15, 1971 . . . . .	280
From Speech by A. N. Kosygin, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at Kremlin Dinner in Honour of the Party and Government Dele- gation of the Syrian Arab Republic, February 1, 1971 . . . . .	282
Soviet Government's Statement of February 28, 1971 . . . . .	284
From Report by CPSU Central Committee to 24th Congress of CPSU Delivered by L. I. Brezh- nev, General Secretary of CPSU CC, on March 30, 1971 . . . . .	289
For a Just and Lasting Peace in Middle East. Statement by the 24th Congress of the CPSU, April 8, 1971 . . . . .	293

## To the Reader

This book contains documents and other materials telling of the Soviet Government's efforts to ensure peace and security in the Middle East after the Second World War.

The grave situation that has developed in this area during the last few years following Israel's aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan of June 1967 is closely followed by the world public. Interest is focused both on the positions of the parties directly involved in the conflict and on the attitude of the great powers who, as stipulated in the Charter of the United Nations Organisation, bear particular responsibility for the preservation of peace. Naturally there is bound to be keen interest in the Soviet Union's policy of active and consistent support for the Arab peoples in their just struggle to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression.

This book is intended to familiarise the reading public with the position taken by the Soviet Union since the end of the Second World War in the struggle to maintain peace and security in the Middle East. It is based on official government documents, statements by Soviet representatives at the United Nations and other materials. Many documents denote the Soviet Union's stand on elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression against the Arab countries of June 1967.

This publication is motivated by the fact that of late imperialist and Zionist quarters have intensified their attempts to falsify Soviet Government policy in the Middle East, to distort the real nature of the Soviet Union's relations with

the countries of that region. Even some American observers admit that it is impossible to obtain correct information as to recent history and current developments in the Middle East from the American mass media.

The falsifications and distortions of Soviet policy in the Middle East are much in line with the usual run of anti-Soviet and anti-communist propaganda. A favourite tactic of ideologists and propagandists of imperialism is to identify the anti-imperialist struggle with "Soviet influence." Therefore where the anti-imperialist forces and the national-liberation movement of the peoples are active and making headway—and in this they naturally have the support of the USSR and other socialist countries—a great fuss is raised about "Soviet influence" and a "Soviet threat."

The authors well-versed in anti-communism attempt to ascribe to the Soviet Union the methods and aims that for decades, and even centuries, the imperialist powers have employed with regard to the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. They assert, among other things, that the Soviet Government denies Israel's right to statehood, that it is not objective about Israel which is forced to "fight for existence" in a hostile Arab world, etc.

What do the documents and materials in this book show?

First of all, they show that ever since the end of the last world war the Soviet Union has consistently followed a policy for ensuring a stable peace in the Middle East, for ensuring the security of all the peoples and countries in this part of the world. All through the postwar years the Soviet Government has actively and persistently

sought to avert imminent military conflicts and to settle disputes that arise by peaceful political means. At the same time the Soviet Union has taken the position that attempts by the imperialist powers to use force and armed intervention to foist their military bases on the countries of this region and to involve them in aggressive blocs and alliances should be firmly rebuffed.

The gaining of national independence and consolidation of state sovereignty after the Second World War by former colonies and mandated territories, was a great step forward in ensuring peace and security in the Middle East. The Soviet Union fully appreciated and supported the efforts of the Arab peoples to establish and strengthen the state independence of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, the Lebanon, the Yemen, Jordan, Libia, the Sudan, Iraq, Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria, Kuwait and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

The Soviet Union rendered all-round assistance and support to the Arab peoples in their national-liberation struggle and their efforts to attain political independence and strengthen their national states. The Soviet Union has done much to defend the Arab countries and peoples from attempts by the imperialist powers to maintain by force or by threat of force their former privileges so as to be able to continue their economic plunder.

There are a number of documents concerning the Soviet stand on the Palestine problem. It is clear from these documents that when the question of terminating Britain's mandate in Palestine was being discussed at the United Nations in 1947, the Soviet representatives supported the

proposal to divide Palestine into two states, in the belief that this would accord with the interests of both the Arab and the Jewish populations of Palestine, and with the principle of national self-determination of the peoples. The Soviet Government has also consistently supported the UN resolution of December 11, 1948, as well as other UN decisions whereby the Palestine refugees, who had been evicted by Israeli authorities from their native country, were to be allowed to return to their homes and repossess their properties, or to be compensated for them should they not wish to return.

In 1947, during the discussion of the division of Palestine some Arab representatives tried to becloud the Soviet Union's position on that issue. In reply Soviet representative Andrei Gromyko stated in his speech at the plenary sitting of the General Assembly of November 26, 1947: "...we do not associate the poorly thought-out statements of some Arab representatives on Soviet policy concerning Palestine's future with the vital national interests of the Arabs. We distinguish between statements of this sort, made evidently on the spur of the moment, and the basic interests of the Arab people. The Soviet delegation is confident that the time will come when Arabs and the Arab countries will more than once look in the direction of Moscow, expecting assistance from the Soviet Union in their struggle for their legitimate interests, in their striving to free themselves from the remaining strings of foreign dependence."

There have been ample opportunities to verify the truth of these words during the more than twenty years that have passed since then.

Throughout the postwar period, both before and after the Israeli aggression of 1967, the Soviet Government has come out in support of the legitimate, inalienable rights of the Palestine Arabs. At the same time the Soviet Government was opposed to those forces that tried to use the Palestine problem to aggravate tension in the Middle East and split the Arab peoples in the face of hostile imperialist intrigues and Israeli aggression. The USSR Foreign Ministry Statement of April 17, 1956 said: "The Soviet Union considers that in the interests of strengthening international peace and security the matter must be handled in such a way as to lead to a lasting peaceful settlement of the Palestine issue on a mutually acceptable basis, taking due account of the just national interests of the parties concerned."

The Soviet Union supports the just national-liberation struggle by the Palestine organisations for the liberation of Israeli-occupied Arab lands. Speaking in Baku on October 2, 1970, General Secretary of the CPSU CC, Leonid Brezhnev, said that the Soviet Union is against the attempts "to exterminate the detachments of the Palestine resistance movement."

The documents in this book make it amply clear that in its relations with Israel and her people the Soviet Union has all through the postwar period pursued a consistent, principled policy, regardless of any considerations of the moment, in keeping with the Leninist nationalities policy.

In 1947-48 when the United Nations was discussing the question of terminating Britain's mandate on Palestine the Soviet Union advocated equal rights to national self-determination for

both the Arab and the Jewish populations of Palestine and the setting up of independent democratic states. Twenty years after that, on June 19, 1967, Soviet Prime Minister Alexei Kosygin said addressing the special emergency session of the UN General Assembly: "Every people enjoys the right to establish an independent national state of its own. This constitutes one of the fundamental principles of the policy of the Soviet Union. It was on this basis that we formulated our attitude to Israel as a state, when we voted in 1947 for the United Nations' decision to create two independent states, a Jewish one and an Arab one, on the territory of the former British colony of Palestine."

Accordingly, the Soviet Government established diplomatic relations with Israel and maintained them until 1967. As is common knowledge, these relations were only broken for a few months in 1953, when a bomb set by malefactors damaged the Soviet Legation in Tel Aviv on February 9, 1953, injuring an employee and several members of the families of Soviet employees. After the Israeli Government had assured the Government of the USSR that it would not participate in any alliance or treaty with aggressive intent against the Soviet Union, and that it would continue to search for the criminals responsible for the explosion, the Soviet Government decided to restore diplomatic relations. The letter from the USSR Foreign Minister to the Foreign Minister of Israel of July 15, 1953 said that "Taking into consideration these assurances of the Government of Israel and the fact that it has declared that it is anxious to establish relations of friendship with the Soviet Union, and adhering to its

policy of maintaining normal relations with other countries and promoting cooperation between nations, the Soviet Government, for its part, also declares its desire to maintain friendly relations with Israel and deems it possible to re-establish diplomatic relations with the Government of Israel."

However, after Israel's treacherous attack on the Arab countries on June 5, 1967 in violation of the elementary norms of international law and the resolutions of the UN Security Council, the Soviet Government was compelled to break off diplomatic relations with Israel.

The documents in this book go to show that the Soviet Government has never come out against Israel and her people. But it has resolutely and consistently opposed the annexationist policies pursued by the Israeli ruling quarters throughout almost the entire period of Israel's existence.

Such was the case in 1948-49 when Israel seized a good part of the territory, designated for the Arabs under the UN resolution of November 29, 1947, driving away some one million Palestinians. Such was the case in 1956 when Israel participated in the tripartite aggression against Egypt and subsequently committed repeated acts of aggression against the neighbouring Arab countries. The aggression of June 1967 was thus a direct continuation of the adventurous course that the extremist Israeli circles have been imposing on their country throughout its history.

It is this aggressive policy of the Israeli ruling circles that the Soviet Union has resolutely opposed and continues to oppose.

The Soviet Government believes that Israel can

and must develop as an independent state, as a peace-loving democratic state maintaining good-neighbourly relations with all the countries of the Middle East and not as a seat of war and aggression.

The documents also refute the argument extensively used by Zionist and Israeli propaganda, that Israel is forced to fight for national existence.

The falsehood of such arguments is all the more evident since Israel's leaders, had they really been concerned about ensuring the security of their state and people, would have known full well that the best way to do so would be to abide by the UN Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, which guaranteed peace, security and a right to an independent existence and development to all states of the area, Israel included. It is Israel that is impeding the implementation of this resolution, whereas the Arab countries, directly interested in eliminating the consequences of Israeli aggression, are prepared to do whatever the Security Council resolution requires of them for the establishment of peace in this part of the world.

As for the position of the Soviet Union, its legislative body—the USSR Supreme Soviet—again confirmed in its statement of July 15, 1970 that "...every state in the Middle East has the right to independent national existence and to independence and security." The Supreme Soviet then stated in the same document: "It is now particularly clear that Israel is fighting, not for her own existence, not for her own security, but with the aim of seizing other people's lands."

The Soviet Government had every reason to say, as it did in its Statement of June 5, 1967: "Yet if there is anything that can undermine most of all the foundations for the development and very existence of the state of Israel, it is the course of recklessness and adventurism in policy which has been chosen by the Israeli ruling circles today."

It would seem that Israel's very geographical position would drive home to its ruling circles that only by peace and the renunciation of aggressive policies with regard to the neighbouring Arab states can Israel ensure its future, its place among the nations of the world. Those who really care for the security and peaceful future of the state of Israel and her people cannot fail to realise that a policy of hostility and aggression towards the neighbouring Arab peoples, a policy of involving Israel in a prolonged, prospectless war against the Arab countries is far from promoting Israel's security.

The insincerity and falsity of claims that Israel is forced to fight for its existence is graphically illustrated by Israel's negative attitude to Soviet proposals regarding the implementation of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967. As the documents indicate, these proposals envisage an extensive programme of measures to ensure the security of all states of this region and their right to live in peace within recognised, secure boundaries. As to the guaranteed boundaries of all states of the Middle East, the Soviet proposals stipulate that the sides shall undertake concrete obligations to recognise, in accordance with the Security Council resolution, the impermissibility of acquiring territory by means of

war, to respect each other's sovereignty, territorial integrity, inviolability and political independence. It is also envisaged that demilitarised zones shall be established along both sides of the borders, that UN forces shall be moved into a number of points and that direct guarantees shall be given by the four powers, the permanent members of the Security Council (or by the Security Council).

But it is the Israeli leadership that is frustrating the adoption and implementation of the Soviet proposals, thus preventing the establishment of a stable and just peace in the Middle East area. Actually the Israeli Government is stubbornly seeking to annex a number of Arab territories under the pretext of establishing "secure boundaries." But today, modern weapons and modern means of their delivery being what they are, the real security of borders cannot be ensured by the seizure of a few score kilometres of land, but by the adoption of the above Soviet proposals, by guaranteeing, in accordance with the Security Council resolution, the borders of the states of this region, including Israel's borders, along the lines existing as of June 4, 1967.

\* \* \*

The documents are arranged in chronological sequence.

After the end of the Second World War the Arab countries began their struggle to rid themselves of foreign troops. In 1946 Syria and the Lebanon and in 1947 Egypt, raised the question

of the withdrawal of foreign troops in the UN Security Council. The peoples of Iraq and the Sudan also voiced their objection to the presence of foreign troops. The Soviet Government vigorously supported the Arab countries in their just demand.

In the 1950s the Soviet Government resolutely condemned the tripartite declaration (by the United States, Britain and France) of May 25, 1950, directed against the national-liberation movement of the Middle East people. In its Note to the governments of the United States, Great Britain, France and Turkey of November 24, 1951, the Soviet Government also opposed plans to set up a so-called Middle Eastern Command. These plans were designed to involve Middle East countries in the military activities of the aggressive NATO bloc and, particularly, to bring in foreign troops and set up military bases in these countries. The Soviet Government was also against the countries of this region being involved in the aggressive alliances of the Western powers and exposed the pressure being brought to bear on the Arab countries to involve them in such alliances.

A large part of the documents pertain to the Soviet Government's efforts to prevent and curb the tripartite aggression against Egypt and to eliminate its consequences.

Prior to the armed attack by Britain, France and Israel on Egypt the Soviet Government took a number of steps to avert the armed conflict. These included the USSR Foreign Ministry Statement on the situation in the Middle East of April 17, 1956, in which the Soviet Government urged the parties concerned to prevent the mount-

ing Arab-Israeli conflict from developing into a military clash, and also the Soviet Government's statement of September 15, 1956 on the need to achieve a peaceful solution of the Suez Canal question.

The aggression was vigorously condemned by the Soviet Government in its Statement of October 31, 1956 and in speeches by Soviet representatives at the United Nations. When the aggressors refused to comply with the decision of the UN General Assembly emergency session the Soviet Government issued a stern warning to the governments of Britain, France and Israel on November 5, 1956.

The heroic struggle by the freedom-loving Egyptian people, supported by the socialist countries and all progressive humanity, along with the resolute stand taken by the Soviet Government forced the aggressors to retreat.

A number of the documents strongly condemn the position taken by the Israeli Government which tried in every way to delay the withdrawal of its troops from Egyptian territory and threatened Egypt. In the November 15, 1956 message sent by the USSR Prime Minister to the Premier of Israel, the Soviet Government opposed Israel's plans for annexing the Gaza Strip, the Sinai Peninsula, the islands of Tiran and Sanafir in the Gulf of Aqaba, which had been openly proclaimed by the Israeli Government, and expressed the conviction that "Israel's current policy, intended to incite hostility to the Arabs and to suppress them, is really dangerous for the cause of universal peace and lethal for Israel."

By their aggression against Egypt in 1956, the imperialist powers and Israel hoped to defeat

Egypt, to demoralise other countries of the Arab East and Africa, and to restore colonial domination in these regions.

The defeat in Egypt did not make the imperialist powers and Israel give up their colonialist schemes with regard to the Middle East countries. In 1957-58 they engineered fresh acts of aggression against these countries, seeking to strengthen their influence at any cost. The United States of America became especially active in those years. January 1957 gave rise to the "Eisenhower Doctrine," which envisaged direct US interference in the affairs of the Arab countries, even going as far as military intervention. In seeking to cover up their aggressive policy towards the Middle East countries the US ruling quarters dragged out the well-worn invention about the Soviet threat to the Arab countries. The Soviet Government exposed the imperialist essence of that "doctrine" which constituted a serious threat to peace and security in that region.

That year there were numerous incidents of crude pressure and the use of force by the imperialist powers against Arab countries. In April 1957 Jordan became the target of imperialist intrigues. In September there was the threat of armed interference in Syrian affairs. Later that year British armed forces attacked Oman and bombed towns and localities in the Yemen. The Soviet Government exposed these imperialist acts against the Arab peoples.

In 1958 imperialist forces made another attempt to regain their positions in the Arab East. On the night of July 13 the monarchy was overthrown and a republic was proclaimed in Iraq.

The declaration on Iraq's withdrawal from the aggressive Baghdad pact was one of the Iraqi Republic's first foreign policy acts. The imperialist countries regarded the establishment of the Iraqi Republic and the withdrawal of the last Arab country from the aggressive bloc in the Middle East with open hostility. Their reaction was not long in coming. On July 15, 1958 the ships of the American Sixth Fleet entered Port Beirouth and landed marines on Lebanese territory. To justify this act of aggression it was hypocritically declared that the landing was intended to "demonstrate the concern of the United States for the Lebanon's integrity and independence."

Two days later, on July 17, British airborne units landed in the Jordanian capital, Amman.

The Soviet Government voiced strong opposition to that fresh act of concerted aggression by the United States and Britain, intended, among other things, to restore the reactionary regime which had been overthrown by the Iraqi people. On the Soviet Union's proposal, the UN General Assembly convened a special emergency session in August, 1958. Its resolutions sought to ensure the early withdrawal of foreign troops from the Lebanon and Jordan. The intervention against Iraq was averted and the British and American troops in the Lebanon and Jordan finally had to quit those countries.

The Soviet Government's documents concerning the Anglo-American intervention in the Lebanon and Jordan point out that the Government of Israel had placed its air space at the disposal of Britain and the United States thus becoming a direct party to their aggressive activities against the Arab countries.

The events of 1956-58 graphically illustrate that at that time the imperialist powers could no longer act high-handedly in the Arab countries and the Middle East peoples had true, and reliable allies in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

It is noteworthy that in keeping with its Middle East policy in those years the Soviet Government not only rendered all-round assistance to the Arab countries in defence of their interests from imperialist scheming, but also put forward a programme of action for consolidating peace and security and strengthening the sovereignty and independence of the countries of that area.

On February 11, 1957 the Soviet Government proposed to the governments of the United States, Britain and France that a joint declaration be issued on the question of peace and security in the Middle East and on non-interference in the domestic affairs of the countries of this region. The Soviet Government proposed that in their relations with the Middle East countries all governments should abide by the following major principles:

Preservation of peace by settling controversial issues by peaceful means, on the basis of negotiations;

Non-interference in the internal affairs of the countries of this region and respect for their sovereignty and independence;

Renunciation of any attempts to involve these countries in military blocs to which the great powers belong;

Dismantling of foreign bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of Middle East countries;

Mutual refusal to supply weapons to the countries of this region;

Promotion of economic development without any political, military or other stipulations incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of these countries.

However the imperialist powers, intent on pursuing their bankrupt policy, rejected the proposal of the Soviet Government.



Many documents in this book trace the Soviet Government's efforts to prevent Israeli aggression against the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria of June 5, 1967, to rectify its consequences and attain a peaceful political settlement of the Middle East crisis.

Israeli policies led to a grave deterioration of the situation in the Middle East in the first half of 1967. Seeking to prevent the dangerous development of events the Soviet Government published two statements even before the June aggression, warning the Israeli Government of the dangerous nature of its policy which jeopardised the cause of peace and security in the Middle East.

The April 26, 1967 Statement by the USSR Foreign Ministry condemned Israel's attack on Syria on April 7, in which aviation, tanks and artillery were involved. The Soviet Government cautioned Israel about the danger of adventurism in politics and expressed the hope that the Israeli Government would not follow in the wake of

circles who, displaying political shortsightedness, were prepared to reduce their country to what amounted to a toy in the hands of external forces, thereby threatening the vital interests and destiny of their people.

On May 24, 1967 the Soviet Government published another statement which said: "Let no one, however, have any doubts about the fact that should anyone try to unleash aggression in the Middle East he would be met not only by the united strength of the Arab countries but also by the strong opposition to aggression of the Soviet Union and all the peace-loving states."

But the Government of Israel paid no heed to the warning. On June 5, 1967 it unleashed a war of aggression against the peoples of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria, occupying considerable territory of these Arab countries.

In its statements published during the first few days of the aggression the Soviet Government sharply condemned the aggressor and demanded an immediate stop to the hostilities, and the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories.

The Government of Israel ignored the UN Security Council resolutions of June 6, 7, and 9 on an immediate stop to military operations. The larger part of the territory now occupied by Israel was seized after the Security Council had adopted its resolution on ceasing the hostilities, in violation of it. As a result the Soviet Government decided to break off diplomatic relations with Israel and on June 10, 1967 sent a note to the Government of Israel, stating that "it bears the full burden of responsibility for her perfidy and her glaring violation of the Security Council

decisions." It warned the Israeli Government that "unless Israel immediately halts her military actions, the Soviet Union, jointly with other peace-loving states, will adopt sanctions against Israel, with all the consequences flowing therefrom."

On the Soviet Government's initiative the UN General Assembly held a special emergency session in June 1967. It was addressed by USSR Prime Minister Alexei Kosygin who outlined the Soviet position on Israel's aggression. As noted in the Soviet Government's statement of June 23, 1967, that session marked an important stage in the struggle of the peace-loving states for speedy elimination of the consequences of the Israeli aggression.

Some documents outline the Soviet Government's principled political assessment of Israel's June aggression against the Arab countries.

The Soviet Government worked on the premise that the June aggression was not a local conflict, not a clash between some Middle East countries on a racial or national basis, but the result of collusion by the more reactionary forces of world imperialism, American imperialism above all, against the national-liberation movement of the Arab peoples. It was a direct attempt to compel Israel to be instrumental in getting rid of regimes in the Arab countries that are for socio-economic transformations in the interests of the working people and are following an anti-imperialist policy. At the same time the June 1967 aggression exposed international Zionism and the Zionist-chauvinist rulers of Israel in their mad plans to create "Great Israel", to expand Israeli territory at the expense of the neighbouring Arab countries.

The Soviet Union has consistently opposed the bellicose forces of imperialism and their policy of interference in the internal affairs of other countries, including the Middle East countries. It has followed a policy of all-round support for the Arab countries in their struggle for freedom, independence, territorial integrity and social progress. The Soviet Government considers it of paramount importance for the consequences of Israeli aggression to be liquidated as quickly as possible in order to prevent the aggressor from utilising the results of its treacherous actions and to bring about the speedy, unconditional withdrawal of the interventionist troops from all occupied Arab territories.

Other documents illustrate the joint stand of the fraternal parties and the governments of the socialist countries on Israeli aggression. On June 9, 1967 the leaders of the Communist and Workers' Parties and governments of seven socialist countries stated their complete solidarity with the peoples of the Arab East in their just struggle and emphasised that if the Government of Israel did not put a stop to its aggression and did not withdraw its troops to behind the truce line, the socialist countries would "do everything necessary to help the peoples of the Arab countries to administer a resolute rebuff to the aggressor, to protect their lawful rights, to extinguish the hotbed of war in the Middle East and to restore peace in that area."

On December 2, 1970 the leaders of all Warsaw Treaty countries again confirmed their readiness further to support the just struggle of the Arab peoples, including the Arabs of Palestine, against the imperialist policies of aggression in

the Middle East, for the liberation of the occupied Arab territories, for freedom and social progress.

In conjunction with all-round assistance to the Arab countries, particularly to those suffering from the Israeli aggression, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries took a number of important political, diplomatic and economic steps along with measures to build up the defence might of these countries.

The Soviet Union supported the UN Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, considering it a good and just basis for settling the Middle East crisis. As is well known, this resolution takes into account the two main demands of the Arab countries—withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab territories and solution of the problem of the Palestine refugees. At the same time the resolution obliges the Arab countries to recognise the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Israel and to ensure freedom of shipping along sea routes.

Addressing the July, 1969 session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko said that the Soviet Government believed that "the only reliable way would be to resolve the problem on the basis of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories, with simultaneous recognition of the right of all states in the Middle East, including Israel, to an independent national existence and the establishment of lasting peace in that important zone".

In its efforts to attain a peaceful adjustment in the Middle East the Soviet Union took an active part in the quadripartite consultative meetings of the governments of the USSR, the United States,

France and Britain—the permanent members of the Security Council.

The Soviet Government took the initiative in outlining detailed proposals to promote a political settlement of the conflict on the basis of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967.

These proposals envisaged in particular the following:

The two parties to the conflict should state directly and in no uncertain terms that they were prepared to carry out to the letter the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967;

The Arab countries and Israel should reach agreement through UN envoy Dr. Jarring on a final document which would stipulate how the coordinated withdrawal of Israeli troops and establishment of a stable peace in this region was to proceed.

The Soviet proposals stipulated the following sequence of important measures: the moment the final document, negotiated through Dr. Jarring, has been deposited with the United Nations, the parties are to refrain from any activity violating the state of cease-fire; the termination of the state of war is to be established juridically and the state of peace is to commence the moment the first stage of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the territories occupied in June 1967 is completed (they can be withdrawn in two stages);

through UN envoy Dr. Jarring, agreement is to be reached on carrying out the other stipulations in the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967.

The Soviet proposals assigned an important

role in the Middle East settlement to the United Nations. They envisaged, among other things, the participation of the United Nations and the Security Council in the solution or in giving guarantees regarding the solution of a number of specific questions pertaining to this settlement: supervision over the withdrawal of troops from the occupied Arab territories, establishment of the status of the demilitarised zones and guarantee of recognised and secure Arab-Israeli borders. The Soviet Government worked on the premise that it would be expedient to deposit with the United Nations the final document or documents, and also that complete agreement would entail the endorsement or sanction of the UN Security Council. The United Nations' active role in reaching and guaranteeing a Middle East settlement would inspire confidence that neither of the parties concerned would deliberately violate the settlement.

Such, basically, was the gist of the Soviet proposals. It is well known that the Arab countries displayed readiness to accept them. Had the Israeli administration not frustrated the implementation of that sound, detailed and feasible programme for an Arab-Israeli settlement, a just and stable peace would have been ensured in this part of the world.

On November 4, 1970 the UN General Assembly passed a resolution expressing regret over Israeli occupation of Arab territories and recommending that the parties concerned prolong the cease-fire term for three months and unconditionally resume the contacts with the UN Secretary-General's envoy, Dr. Jarring. This showed that Israel's obstructionist policy regarding a Middle

East settlement was being justly condemned by the world public.

At the beginning of 1971 the situation was better than ever for reaching a political settlement of the Middle East crisis on the basis of the UN Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967. Contacts between special envoy Dr. Jarring and the parties to the conflict were resumed as the result of efforts by the United Arab Republic and the other Arab countries. For the first time those contacts acquired the nature of discussion of concrete measures for a political settlement. Dr. Jarring appealed to both parties to the conflict to undertake concrete obligations concerning the two key questions of the settlement—the withdrawal of troops from the occupied territories and the peace terms to be established in the Middle East. The United Arab Republic responded to this appeal by stating its readiness to conclude a peace treaty with Israel if Israel pledged to withdraw her troops from all the occupied territories and comply with the UN resolutions concerning the Palestine refugees.

Apart from that, the United Arab Republic agreed to ensure, within the framework of the political settlement, free shipping along the Suez Canal in accordance with the Constantinople Convention of 1888, as well as free shipping in the Strait of Tiran in accordance with the standards of international law.

Finally the UAR agreed to the idea of setting up demilitarised zones on both sides of the border and stationing UN armed forces in some regions for the sake of maintaining peace.

The UAR Government also proposed that international navigation be resumed in the Suez

Canal provided that Israeli forces began to withdraw from the Sinai Peninsula.

In this way the position of the UAR Government created the kind of situation where all it needed was for Israel to declare its readiness to fulfil the obligations incumbent on her under the terms of the political settlement, the withdrawal of her troops included, in order to bring about a dramatic changeover to real settlement and peace in the Middle East. That prospect, however, did not materialise because of the Israeli Government's declaration on February 21, 1971 that Israel would not withdraw her troops from all the occupied territories and would not withdraw to behind the truce line established on June 4, 1967.

Several of the documents speak of the Soviet Government's high appraisal and active support of the constructive, bold and realistic steps taken by the UAR Government.

This book also contains the analysis of the situation in the Middle East made by the 24th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. The report of the CPSU Central Committee delivered by General Secretary of the Central Committee, Leonid Brezhnev, on March 30, 1971 pointed out that the position of the Arab side provided a real basis for solving the Middle East problem and that "the Israeli Government's rejection of all these (the UAR's-*Ed.*) proposals, and Tel Aviv's now openly brazen claims to Arab lands, clearly show who is blocking the way to peace in the Middle East, and who is to blame for the dangerous hotbed of war being maintained in that area. At the same time, the unseemly role of those who are instigating the Israeli extremists, the

role of US imperialism and of international Zionism as an instrument of the aggressive imperialist circles, is becoming ever more obvious".

The CC report to the 24th Congress also noted that the longer the attainment of political settlement in the Middle East is delayed, the greater the indignation of the world public and the hatred of the Arab peoples towards the aggressor and the aggressor's backers, the greater the damage inflicted by Israeli rulers on their people and their country.

The 24th Congress fully approved the Middle East policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Government and on April 8, 1971 adopted a special statement "For a Just and Lasting Peace in the Middle East". The statement points out that "the Soviet Union will continue to support the just cause of the Arab peoples who suffered from Israeli aggression, to support their efforts in regaining their violated rights, to secure a fair political settlement in the Middle East, and to protect the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine."

In this way the 24th Congress confirmed once more the Soviet Union's principled and consistent Middle East policy which it has pursued throughout the postwar period, a policy for establishing and strengthening a stable peace and security in that region.

During this postwar period the Arab nations have had ample opportunity to realise all the consequences of imperialist policies, particularly the policies of overseas imperialists, who, in collusion with international Zionism and Israeli Zionist-chauvinist quarters, are hoping for a possibility to begin a new military interference in

the affairs of the Arabs, so that it will be more convenient to strangle their liberation movement and plunder their national wealth. At the same time the Arab peoples see from their own, at times bitter, experience that in their struggle against imperialism and international Zionism the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community are their most reliable and loyal allies and friends. In vain are the imperialist and Zionist propaganda-makers attempting to arouse doubts as to the principled nature of the Soviet Government's Middle East policy, a policy of ensuring and consolidating peace and security for all countries of that area.

**Soviet Government's Notes to the Governments  
of France, Great Britain, the United States  
and China \***

June 1, 1945

Mr. Minister,

As instructed by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, I have the honour to inform you of the following:

According to reports on hand, hostilities are taking place on the territory of Syria and the Lebanon. The French troops stationed there, are clashing with the Syrians and the Lebanese, gunning and shelling the Syrian capital, Damascus. Damascus is being shelled from planes. There are also armed clashes in other towns in Syria and the Lebanon. The number of casualties keeps mounting day by day. To make matters worse three of the above-mentioned states—France, Sy-

---

\* This Note was forwarded to G. Bidault, Foreign Minister of France, by A. Y. Bogomolov, Soviet Ambassador to France. Notes of similar contents were sent to the governments of Great Britain, the United States and China.

ria and the Lebanon—are members of the United Nations, and are taking part in the current conference in San-Francisco.

The Soviet Government does not believe that the developments in Syria and the Lebanon accord with the spirit of the decisions adopted in Dumbarton Oaks and the goals of the UN Conference now meeting in San-Francisco to set up an organisation for ensuring the security of peoples. Therefore the Soviet Government holds that urgent measures must be taken to cut short the military operations in Syria and the Lebanon and to settle the conflict that has arisen in a peaceful way. The Soviet Government addresses this proposal to the Provisional Government of the French Republic and to the governments of Great Britain, the United States of America and China, who were the initiators of the postwar organisation of the world and international security.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, to accept the assurance of my high regard for you.

**BOGOMOLOV,**  
USSR Ambassador to France

(printed from archives)

**From Speech by Soviet Representative  
A. A. Gromyko at UN Security Council on  
Presence of Armed Forces of UN Member-  
States on Territories of Other Countries**

September 23, 1946

The question of the withdrawal of British troops from Egypt has been of keen interest to the

world public for quite some time.

I shall permit myself to mention just a few statements by Egyptian political and public leaders, demanding the withdrawal of British troops from that country. On being interviewed by *Akhbar al Yom* on May 18, 1946 Hafez Ramadan-pasha, leader of the nationalists, said: "Under the 1936 agreement Britain has the right to keep 10,000 men in Egypt. It takes only a few hours to evacuate them. If Britain has failed to demobilise her troops that arrived here during the war, we are not responsible. The fact that she did not demobilise these forces after the end of the war—over a year ago—indicates that she harbours no good intentions."

The Egyptian people demand the withdrawal of British troops from Egypt. There are frequent press reports of mass demonstrations in Egypt, in which tens of thousands of people take part, demanding the evacuation of British troops. According to the press, a crowd of about seventy thousand gathered in a Cairo square on February 21, shouting: "Get British troops out of Egypt! Get out immediately, or die!" According to unofficial information, ten demonstrators were killed and twenty injured in a clash beside the British barracks. The United Press reports that the demonstrators, carrying the blood-splattered bodies of those killed in the clash, went through the central streets of the city to the royal palace and delivered their demand for the withdrawal of British troops to King Farouk.

In all, some 100,000 to 150,000 people took part in the Cairo demonstration, including nearly 70,000 who assembled in front of the Abadan Palace, to demand the evacuation of British troops.

They declared: "You British, stop insulting us. You only irritate us when you publish such stupid communiques. Your so-called evacuation is nothing but a regular movement of troops from one town to another inside Egypt. We have not been impressed by your evacuation from the Cairo Citadel, nor have we been pleased with your last communique. We shall rejoice only when your last soldier leaves our country."

The Security Council, at the request of the governments of Syria and the Lebanon, has already considered the question of foreign troops stationed on the territories of these states. The appeal made by these states to the Security Council is a protest on the part of countries where foreign troops are still stationed without any legitimate grounds.

I shall cite a few facts denoting the situation in another country—Iraq—on whose territory British troops are stationed at present.

On August 9 the Baghdad radio reported that "the Iraqi people are demanding the withdrawal of British troops from Iraqi territory. However, instead of complying with the people's legitimate demand Britain has deemed it possible to introduce fresh troops into Iraq. How much longer shall our national sovereignty and public life be influenced by unjust foreign interests?"

The Iraqi *Sawt Al-Ahali* wrote on August 5, 1946:

"Britain regards Iraq as a military base which she can use when she pleases, and she sends as many troops there as she pleases, under any circumstances. . . The Iraqi people are protesting these acts by Britain as a violation of their rights and interests, sovereignty and independence,

and threat to their national aspirations and demands, contradicting the elementary norms of international law, practiced in relations among the nations."

I believe the members of the Security Council are aware of statements and utterances of Iranian political leaders, public organisations and press organs testifying to the alarm felt in Iran in connection with the presence and the increase in the strength of British troops on Iraqi territory, in Basra, for these movements can only be regarded as a threat to the country's independence.

These examples can be supplemented by others, referring both to the above countries and to many other countries and territories. The facts cited indicate the alarm felt by the peoples of those countries belonging to the United Nations, as well as of certain countries which did not participate in the war, but on whose territories troops of the Allied Powers are still stationed. Developments in these countries go to prove that the continued presence of Allied troops on their territories may not only further aggravate the domestic situation there but may also have an even more serious, detrimental effect on the international situation.

All these circumstances considered, is it possible to remain indifferent to the voice of the peoples of these countries, particularly at the present moment when the foundations are being laid for a stable and lasting peace? Is it possible to ignore their demands that an end be put to interference by foreign forces in their domestic affairs and that foreign troops be withdrawn from their territories? Finally, is it possible to ignore the

complications that arise in relations among the states, caused by the continued presence of foreign troops in the above-mentioned countries? The Security Council cannot evade considering the question raised in the Soviet statement. I should like to express the hope that it will examine this question in full earnest, and accept the proposal made in this statement.

(printed from archives)

**Speech by Soviet Representative A. A. Gromyko  
at UN Security Council on the Withdrawal of  
British Troops from Egypt and the Sudan \***

August 20, 1947

The question raised by the Egyptian Government belongs to the category of questions to which the Security Council, as the body chiefly responsible for the maintenance of international peace, cannot avoid giving serious attention.

We are concerned here with a dispute between two nations—Egypt and the United Kingdom—the continuation of which may constitute a threat to the maintenance of international peace. The Egyptian Government, in presenting its facts and arguments, is quite right in pointing this out.

The same conclusion is supported by statements already made in the Security Council by both parties. We are concerned with a dispute which clearly falls under Chapter 6 of the UN

---

\* This is a TASS summary.

Charter, which provides for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Irrespective of the position which some or other nation may maintain on the question posed by Egypt, it is necessary to admit that it deserves serious examination by the Security Council, which not only can but must adopt a corresponding decision.

I consider it necessary to bring up this matter because the representative of the United Kingdom has tried to prove to us that the Security Council cannot concern itself with this problem. It is impossible to agree with this viewpoint.

The Egyptian Government has actually placed two problems before the Security Council, which, although interlinked, have independent significance: (1) The withdrawal of British troops from the territory of Egypt and the Sudan; (2) The future of the Sudan.

The statements made by the Egyptian Prime Minister, Nokrashy Pasha, at the Security Council sessions of August 5 and 11, contain the justification of Egypt's position in connection with its appeal to the Council on both the above-mentioned questions. These statements also contain a detailed review of the historical conditions under which British troops were introduced into Egypt and the Sudan, as well as a review of Anglo-Egyptian relations, chiefly during the period from 1882, when British troops first entered Egyptian territory, up to the present day.

We all know that the present conditions have undergone fundamental changes. The Egyptian representative was right when he stressed this point. The development of the national consciousness of Eastern peoples has led to the forma-

tion of a number of independent states in the Middle East. Egypt is one of them.

Just as a number of other Middle East countries, Egypt has become an independent state and is now a member of UN. She is trying to free herself from everything that restricts her independence and is incompatible with her national sovereignty. As is evident from the statements of the Egyptian Government, this explains why Egypt has brought up the matter of the withdrawal of foreign troops from her territory.

The people of Egypt believe that the further presence of foreign troops on their territory is incompatible with their national interests as a sovereign state and with the principles of the United Nations, which should be respected by all countries that are members of this Organisation.

The Soviet Union has understanding and sympathy for the national aspirations of Egypt and her people towards independent existence on the basis of sovereign equality with other nations and peoples.

The legitimacy of the Egyptian demands cannot be disputed so long as we are guided by the high principles of the United Nations. To ignore such legitimate demands is tantamount to acting against those principles, which call for respect for and protection of national independence.

The meaning of this conclusion becomes even clearer if we take into consideration that there are still peoples in the world whose fight for independence meets with serious obstacles. Such obstacles are created first and foremost by nations which have a long history of domination over such peoples, and which stubbornly cling

to positions conquered scores of years, or even centuries, ago.

It is the duty of the United Nations Organisation to facilitate the possibilities for such nations to achieve independence and to secure their national existence on the basis of equality with other peoples and nations.

Egypt's demand cannot be reviewed apart from these aims, which have been placed before UN.

In reviewing this matter, it is further necessary to be guided by Article 103 of the UN Charter, in which it is stated that if obligations undertaken by members of this Organisation in accordance with the Charter should prove to be in contradiction to obligations undertaken under some other international treaty, then preference shall be given to the UN Charter.

There is reason to believe that the 1936 treaty concluded between the United Kingdom and Egypt, at least in its essential parts, stands in contradiction to the Charter. This has been pointed out by the Egyptian Government. It applies first of all to those provisions of the treaty which deal with the presence of British troops on the territory of Egypt and the Sudan.

The fact that this treaty was concluded before UN was set up, and consequently before its Charter was adopted, perhaps explains the existing contradiction. But it can under no circumstances serve as its justification, especially as regards that part of the treaty which deals with the presence of foreign troops on the territory of Egypt and the Sudan.

These considerations give further emphasis to the need for correcting the existing situation and

for bringing it into line with the basic principles of the United Nations.

The Egyptian demand also rests upon the General Assembly resolution of December 14, 1946, concerning the general regulation and reduction of armaments, which provides for the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops located on territories of UN member-states without their consent, as voluntarily and publicly expressed in treaties and agreements compatible with the UN Charter.

All this gives the Soviet delegation reason to conclude that Egypt's demand for the immediate withdrawal of British troops from the territory of Egypt and the Sudan is justified, and we therefore support that demand.

As regards the future of the Sudan, the Soviet delegation believes that it is difficult for the Security Council to take any decision on this matter at present. This problem is not quite clear. Without knowing what the people of the Sudan themselves wish to attain, it is difficult for the Council to adopt any decision on this matter.

*Izvestia*, August 22, 1947

**Speech by Soviet Representative A. A. Gromyko  
at Plenary Meeting of UN General Assembly,  
November 26, 1947**

It is common knowledge that the Soviet Union has no direct material or other interests in Palestine. It is concerned about the Palestine issue as a member of the United Nations Organisation and as a great power bearing along with the other great powers particular responsibility for

the maintenance of international peace. This determines the position taken by the Government of the Soviet Union on the question of Palestine.

A fairly detailed outline of the Soviet Union's position has already been given at the special session of the General Assembly early this year and during the discussion at this session of the Assembly.

When the future of Palestine was discussed at the special session the Soviet Government proposed two highly likely ways of settling this question. One variant was to create a single democratic Arab-Jewish state with equal rights for the Arabs and Jews. If this turned out to be unrealistic in the event that the Arabs and Jews declared they could not live together because of worsened relations between them, the Soviet Government, through its delegation at the Assembly, proposed an alternative: division of Palestine into two independent democratic states—Arab and Jewish.

As you know the special session of the Assembly had set up a committee to make a thorough study of the Palestine issue with a view to finding the most appropriate solution. When the committee had finished its work, we stated with satisfaction that the proposal it submitted, or to be more exact, the proposal backed by the majority of its members, coincided with one of the two ways outlined by the Soviet delegation at the special session, the proposal to divide Palestine into two independent democratic states, an Arab and a Jewish state.

Consequently, the Soviet Union's delegation was bound to support this recommendation by the special committee. It has now been found that

besides the special committee set up to study what should be done about Palestine, the overwhelming majority of the other delegations to the General Assembly also favoured the proposal on having two independent states. The overwhelming majority of the countries belonging to the United Nations arrived at the same conclusion as the Soviet Government, as a result of a thoroughgoing investigation of what the future Palestine should be.

The question arises: Why did the overwhelming majority of the delegations to the General Assembly favour this recommendation instead of some other one? The only answer to this is that all other proposals on the solution of the Palestine issue were unreal and unpractical. By that I also mean the proposal for creating a single independent Arab-Jewish state with equal rights for the Arabs and Jews. The study of the Palestine question, including the experience of the special committee, has proved that the Jews and Arabs in Palestine cannot or will not live together. Hence the logical conclusion: since these two peoples living in Palestine, both having deep-going historical roots in that country, cannot live together within the boundaries of one state, there is no alternative except to set up two states instead of one—an Arab state and a Jewish state. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation no other practical way can be found.

Those opposing the idea of Palestine's division into two independent democratic states usually claim this decision is directed against the Arabs, against the Arab population of Palestine and against the Arab states in general. For obvious reasons the delegations of the Arab countries are

especially vociferous about this. The Soviet delegation cannot agree with their view. The proposal to divide Palestine into two independent states, as well as the committee's resolution approving this proposal which we are now discussing, is not aimed against the Arabs. This resolution is not aimed at either of the two biggest peoples populating Palestine. On the contrary, the Soviet delegation believes that this resolution accords with the basic national interests of both these peoples, both the Jews and the Arabs.

The representatives of the Arab states stress that the division of Palestine is a historical injustice. But it is impossible to agree with this view even if only because the Jewish people have been associated with Palestine for a long historical period. Besides, we cannot ignore the position in which the Jewish people have found themselves as a result of the last world war, and the Soviet delegation has already pointed this out at the special session of the General Assembly. I shall not repeat what the Soviet delegation said on this point at the session. Nevertheless it will not be too much to recall now that as a result of the war forced on the world by Hitler Germany the Jews as a people suffered more than any other people. You know that not a single state in Western Europe was able to offer the Jewish people adequate protection from nazi high-tyranny and violence.

Touching on the proposal for the division of Palestine, the representatives of some countries spoke of the Soviet Union and tried to question its foreign policy. The Lebanon's representative was twice particularly eloquent on this subject. I have already emphasised that the proposals

concerning the division of Palestine into two independent states and the Soviet Union's position on this question, are not directed against the Arabs, and that it is our profound belief that such a solution would accord with the vital national interests of both the Jews and Arabs alike.

The peoples of the Soviet Union have always sympathised and continue to sympathise with the national aspirations of the peoples of the Arab East. The Soviet Union appreciates and sympathises with the attempts being made by these peoples to free themselves of the remaining shackles of colonial dependence. This is why we do not associate the poorly thought-out statements of some Arab representatives on Soviet policy concerning Palestine's future with the vital national interests of the Arabs. We distinguish between statements of this sort, made evidently on the spur of the moment, and the basic interests of the Arab people. The Soviet delegation is confident that the time will come when Arabs and the Arab countries will more than once look in the direction of Moscow, expecting assistance from the Soviet Union in their struggle for their legitimate interests, in their striving to free themselves from the remaining strings of foreign dependence.

The Soviet delegation also believes that the resolution on the division of Palestine accords with the lofty principles and goals of the United Nations. It accords with the principle of national self-determination of the peoples. The nationalities policy the Soviet Union has pursued since the inception of the Soviet state, is a policy of concord and self-determination of the peoples. It is precisely for that reason that all the peoples

of the Soviet Union constitute one united family, which was able to endure the grim trials of the war in the struggle against the strongest and most dangerous enemy ever faced by peace-loving peoples.

The solution of the Palestine question on the basis of this country's division into two independent states will be of great historical significance, since this solution will meet half-way the legitimate demands of the Jewish people, of whom, as you know, hundreds of thousands are still homeless, with no hearths of their own, who have found temporary shelter in the special camps in some West European countries.

The Assembly is working persistently to find the most just, most tangible, and at the same time, most radical solution to the question of Palestine's future. In this it proceeds on the basis of certain irrefutable facts which have given rise to the Palestine issue at the United Nations. They are as follows:

First: the mandate system has not justified itself. I shall even say more: the mandate system has proved bankrupt. We have heard declarations from the British representatives as well, that the system of administration of Palestine by mandate has not been justified. Statements to this effect were made at the special session and also at this session of the General Assembly. It is precisely because of the bankruptcy of the mandate system that the Government of Great Britain appealed to the United Nations for help. It requested the Assembly to work out an appropriate decision and thus take over the responsibility of determining Palestine's future.

Second: Having appealed to the United Nations Organisation, the Government of Great Britain stated that it could not assume responsibility for all the measures that it would have to be taken with regard to Palestine in line with the probable decision of the General Assembly. In this way the Government of Great Britain recognised, that by virtue of the rights and powers vested in it, the General Assembly could take the responsibility for settling the question of the future of Palestine.

However the Soviet delegation deems it useful to draw the Assembly's attention to the fact that it still does not feel that the support it had the right to expect from Great Britain has been forthcoming. On the one hand, the British Government has turned to the Assembly for assistance in solving the question of Palestine's future. On the other, it has made so many reservations during the discussion of the issue at the special session and at the current Assembly session, that one involuntarily wonders if Great Britain really wishes the question of Palestine to be settled through the United Nations Organisation.

The British representative at the special session declared his country's readiness to implement the United Nations resolutions on condition that Britain would not be solely responsible for the likely measures to be taken. By this statement the British delegation clearly made it understood to other states that it was ready to co-operate with the United Nations in the solution of this question.

Nevertheless, at the same special session the British representative declared that his government was prepared to implement the respective

General Assembly's resolutions only in the event that the Jews and the Arabs would agree on some solution of the question. It is clear to anyone that the first declaration contradicts the second. The first indicates Britain's readiness to co-operate with the United Nations Organisation on this question and the second serves to notice that the British Government may also ignore the Assembly's resolution.

The representative of Great Britain has made similar reservations at this session too. We have heard Mr. Cadogan on this question today.

He repeated, though in a somewhat modified form, the idea that Great Britain would agree to implement the Assembly's resolution provided the Jews and the Arabs were to agree. But we are all perfectly aware that the Arabs and Jews have not reached agreement between themselves. The discussion of the issue at this session proves that they cannot reach agreement. We see no prospect of agreement between them.

The view of the Soviet delegation is shared by all the delegations that have come to the conclusion that it is necessary to adopt a definite decision on this question even at the current Assembly session.

All these reservations on the part of the British delegation show that Great Britain has no real wish even today to co-operate fully with the United Nations in the solution of this question. At a time when the majority of the delegations at the General Assembly favour a definite settlement of Palestine's future even now—that it should be divided into two states—the Government of Great Britain declares that it will consider the Assembly's resolution only when the Jews and

Arabs reach agreement. I repeat that to make such a stipulation means to bury the resolution even before the Assembly adopts it. Is it proper for Great Britain to act this way on this matter, especially now when, after prolonged discussion, it has become clear to everybody, Britain included, that the overwhelming majority of states support the division of Palestine?

Whereas it was possible to at least understand the British delegation's reservations at the first session, when the question of a possible solution of the problem of Palestine's future was first brought up, to make such reservations at present, when the opinion of the majority of the UN members has become known, amounts to announcing beforehand that Britain does not consider herself bound by the possible resolution of the General Assembly. We have a right to expect Britain's co-operation in this matter. We have a right to expect that should the Assembly adopt such a recommendation, Britain will observe it, especially since the current regime in Palestine is hateful both to the Jews and the Arabs alike. You all know the feelings expressed about this regime, particularly by the Jews.

I consider it necessary to mention one more fact.

Ever since the discussion of this question a number of the delegations, mainly the delegations of the Arab countries, have tried to convince us that this question is not within the competence of the United Nations to decide. And, as was to be expected, they could not advance any weighty arguments, nothing but general and groundless declarations and utterances.

The General Assembly, just as the United Na-

tions Organisation as a whole, not only has the right to examine this question but, considering the situation that has arisen in Palestine, is duty-bound to make an appropriate decision. The Soviet delegation believes that the plan for the Palestinian settlement drawn up by the committee, whereby the Security Council should take measures in line with its implementation, fully accords with the interests of maintaining and consolidating international peace and with the interests of strengthening co-operation between states. It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet delegation supports the recommendation concerning the division of Palestine.

Unlike certain other delegations, the Soviet delegation has from the very beginning taken a precise and clear stand. It has persistently followed this line. It is not going to manoeuvre or manipulate with the votes in a certain way, a fact which unfortunately occurs at the Assembly in connection with the discussion on the Palestine question.

*Pravda*, November 30, 1947

**From Speech by Soviet Representative at Plenary Meeting of UN General Assembly on Palestine Question, December 11, 1948**

The Soviet Union takes a clear, consistent and principled position on the question of Palestine. It champions the freedom of the peoples, their right to self-determination, and the maintenance of peace and security. The Soviet Union's stand accords with the principles, tasks and goals of

the United Nations Organisation, as outlined in the Charter of our Organisation. It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet delegation still believes that a radical settlement of the Palestine problem can be achieved on the basis of the General Assembly's resolution of November 29, 1947, which grants the two peoples of Palestine the right to an independent existence, based on equality.

In the light of the above-mentioned, the Soviet delegation maintains, there is no point in introducing reservations such as those that have now been included in the so-called proposal of seven states, in Document 424, into the General Assembly's resolution of November 29.

We must see to it that this resolution is carried out, for it will fully accord with the interests of both the Jewish and the Arab population of Palestine, with enabling these peoples to implement their right to national self-determination, to set up independent, democratic states. The events in Palestine and the very development of these events have convincingly illustrated the correctness of the Soviet Union's stand on the Palestine issue, for this stand serves the common interests of all peace-loving peoples, and the whole of progressive humanity.

As to the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee, the Soviet delegation believes that it can only lead to negative results, precisely because of the considerations I have had the opportunity of mentioning in my speech. Moreover, the composition of the arbitration or conciliation commission proposed in the draft, as well as the failure of the draft to mention such a vitally important measure as the immediate

withdrawal of all foreign troops and military personnel from Palestine, a measure intended to achieve a peaceful settlement in Palestine, makes this draft resolution unacceptable for the Soviet delegation and it will have to vote against it.

The Soviet delegation feels that the interests of peace in Palestine require the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops and military personnel stationed on the territory of the Jewish and Arab states in Palestine—the creation of these states is stipulated in the General Assembly's resolution—and that the Security Council should take appropriate measures to prevent the resumption of hostilities in Palestine.

We must find a way to solve the Palestine problem. The resolution submitted by the majority of the First Committee for your consideration, does not provide the answer. Today it can only be found by observing the principles outlined in the resolution of the General Assembly of November 29, 1947.

*Izvestia*, December 15 and 16, 1948

**Soviet Government's Notes to Governments of  
the United States, Great Britain,  
France and Turkey \***

November 24, 1951

In connection with the address of the governments of the United States, Britain, France and

---

\* This is the Note to the Government of the United States. The Notes to the governments of Great Britain, France and Turkey were of analogous contents.

Turkey to the governments of Egypt, Syria, the Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, the Yemen, Israel and Transjordan, regarding the establishment of a so-called Allied Middle Eastern Command, the Soviet Government deems it necessary to state the following to the Government of the United States.

As can be seen from the proposals contained in the above address, as well as from the Declaration on this question published on November 10 by the four governments, and transmitted to the governments of the above countries of the Middle East, the governments of the United States, Britain, France and Turkey envisage:

The subordination of the armed forces of countries of the Middle East to a so-called Allied Command;

The stationing of foreign armed forces on territories of the Middle East countries;

The placing at the disposal of the above Command of military bases, communications, ports and other installations by the Middle East countries;

The establishment of liaison of this Command with the Atlantic bloc organisations.

The proposals and declaration of the four states show that the plans for the organisation of a so-called Middle Eastern Command represent nothing but an attempt to draw the countries of the Middle East into the war measures which are being carried out by the aggressive Atlantic bloc. Some of the four states—initiators of the setting up of a Middle Eastern Command—which maintain their troops and their military bases on the territories of a number of Middle East countries, are already now increasing their armed forces

stationed there.

Thus striving to draw the countries of the Middle East into the aggressive war measures of the Atlantic bloc, the Government of the United States as well as other initiators of the establishing of a Middle Eastern Command, sets itself the object of turning the countries of the Middle East into bridgeheads for the armed forces of the Atlantic bloc. It is only this way that one can appraise the demand of the four states, aimed to ensure the stay of foreign armed forces in the above countries and to expand there a network of the military bases of foreign states, contrary to the will of the peoples of these countries. It is not difficult to see that implementation of these measures, meaning in essence occupation of Middle East countries by troops of foreign states is designed to ensure these states an opportunity for constant intervention in the internal affairs of the countries of the Middle East, and their deprivation of national independence.

The Government of the United States, as well as the governments of Britain, France and Turkey, tries to justify the organisation of the Middle Eastern Command by references to some kind of allegedly existing threat to these countries, and to the need for the defence of the Middle East area. Such references, however, are absolutely groundless and they cannot be regarded otherwise than as an attempt to deceive public opinion and to divert its attention from the real aggressive plans of the four powers.

If one is to speak of a threat to the independence and sovereignty of these countries, such a threat emanates precisely from the countries-initiators of the plan for setting up a Middle East

tern Command—which still cannot reconcile themselves to the idea that the peoples of the Middle East, like other sovereign peoples, have the inalienable right to pursue their independent national policy, free from all outside pressure.

The Government of the USSR deems it necessary to draw the attention of the Government of the United States to the fact that it cannot overlook these new aggressive plans, expressed in the establishing of a Middle Eastern Command in an area located not far from the frontiers of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government deems it necessary also to state that the responsibility for the situation which may arise as a result of this will rest with the Government of the United States and the other initiators of the establishing of the above-mentioned Command.

*Izvestia*, November 25, 1951

### **On Resumption of Diplomatic Relations Between the Soviet Union and Israel**

On May 28, the Government of the state of Israel, through its Chargé d'Affaires in Bulgaria, asked the Soviet Ambassador in Bulgaria to bring to the notice of the Soviet Government the desire of the Government of Israel to resume diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Israel, which were discontinued by the Soviet Government of February 12 this year, in connection with the bomb explosion at the Soviet Legation in Israel.

As a result of the negotiations that ensued, M. Sharett, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel,

sent a letter to V. M. Molotov, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

On July 15, V. M. Molotov, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, sent the following reply to the letter of M. Sharett, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel:

"Mr. Minister,

"With reference to your letter of July 6, 1953, I inform you of the following:

"As is known, on February 9 a bomb was exploded by criminals on the premises of the Legation of the USSR in Israel, as a result of which a Legation employee and members of the families of some of the Legation employees were seriously injured, in view of which the Soviet Government recalled the Envoy of the Soviet Union and the staff of its Legation in Israel and discontinued diplomatic relations with the Government of Israel.

"On May 28, the Government of Israel addressed to the Soviet Government a proposal for the resumption of diplomatic relations between Israel and the Soviet Union.

"In considering this proposal, the Soviet Government took into account the fact that the Government of Israel had expressed its profound regret and apologies at the crime committed against the Soviet Legation in Tel Aviv, and that, although the search for the offenders had not yielded any positive results, the Government of Israel, according to its statement, is continuing the search for the offenders with the object of arresting them and committing them to trial.

"The Soviet Government has also taken note of the statement of the Government of Israel that it will not be a party to any alliance or pact aim-

ing at aggression against the Soviet Union.

"Taking into consideration these assurances of the Government of Israel and the fact that it has declared that it is anxious to establish relations of friendship with the Soviet Union, and adhering to its policy of maintaining normal relations with other countries and promoting co-operation between nations, the Soviet Government, for its part, also declares its desire to maintain friendly relations with Israel and deems it possible to re-establish diplomatic relations with the Government of Israel.

"I beg you, Mr. Minister, to accept assurances of my high consideration.

July 15, 1953"

(Signed) V. MOLOTOV

*Pravda*, July 21, 1953

### Statement by USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on Security in Middle East

April 16, 1955

The situation in the Middle East has recently become considerably more tense. The explanation of this is that certain Western powers have been making new attempts to draw the countries of the Middle East into the military groupings which are being set up as appendages to the aggressive North Atlantic bloc.

After the collapse, in 1951, of the plan for the establishment of a so-called Middle Eastern Command—a collapse due to the resistance this plan met in the countries of the Middle East—the

United States of America and Britain took steps to involve in a roundabout way, singly or in pairs the countries of the Middle East in certain groupings being set up under their domination. In this way, a Turkish-Pakistani pact was concluded in 1954, and a Turkish-Iraqi military alliance in February, 1955.

By setting up the Turkish-Iraqi military alliance, its organisers have succeeded in detaching Iraq from the other Arab countries and increasing tension in the relations among these countries, a situation which suits only aggressive forces which are trying to sow discord among the countries of this area, in their own military strategic interests.

Matters have gone so far that peremptory demands have recently been made of Syria that she should join the Turkish-Iraqi alliance—these demands being accompanied with threats calculated to intimidate the government and people of Syria and to compel Syria to amend her attitude of non-participation in aggressive military blocs. Such actions, and the role which the Western powers allocate Turkey in the establishing of military blocs in the Middle East, arouse legitimate fears in the Arab countries that Turkey is once again striving to dominate them, and that a direct threat to their national independence is being created.

Great pressure is also being brought to bear on Egypt, the demand being made that she change her opposition to the Turkish-Iraqi bloc and cease supporting Syria, who is resisting foreign pressure.

Similar demands are also being made of Saudi Arabia, who, with Egypt and Syria, opposes par-

ticipation in the military blocs which the Western powers are forcing on the Arab countries.

Increasing pressure has also recently been brought to bear on Iran, who is being pushed by the organisers of these blocs onto a dangerous road.

It is not difficult to see that, lying at the basis of the policy of setting up military groupings in the Middle East—just as in the establishment of the aggressive military grouping in South-East Asia (the so-called SEATO)—is the desire of certain Western powers for the colonial enslavement of these countries. The Western powers wish to carry on exploiting the peoples of the countries of the Middle East so as to enrich their big monopolies which are making greedy use of the natural wealth of these countries. Unable to establish and preserve their domination by the old methods, these powers are trying to involve the countries of the Middle East in aggressive blocs on the false pretext that this is in the interests of the defence of the countries of this area.

Military blocs in the Middle East are needed, not by the countries of that area, but by those aggressive American circles which are trying to establish domination there. They are also needed by those British circles which, by means of these blocs, are trying to retain and restore their shaken positions, in spite of the vital interests of the peoples of the Middle East who have taken the road of independent national development.

Nor, in actual fact, do the organisers of these military blocs conceal that they are pursuing their own particular military strategic aims. This can also be seen from the statements—made by official representatives of the United States and

Britain—that these Western powers consider these blocs as part of the plan to set up a so-called northern tier of their military system. This is also shown by Britain's adherence to the Turkish-Iraqi alliance, with the simultaneous conclusion of a new Anglo-Iraqi agreement for so-called mutual co-operation, which in a new form enslaves Iraq, ensures for Britain the preservation of her military bases in that country and subordinates the Iraqi army to British officers.

Plans for the setting up of aggressive blocs in the Middle East have nothing in common with the interests of the maintenance of peace and security, or with the real national interests of the countries in that area. These plans prove once more that, as in the past, the policy of the Western powers with regard to the countries of the Middle East is aimed at their political and economic subordination to the imperialist powers, who are once more trying to place the yoke of colonial oppression and exploitation on the peoples of these countries. They disregard, moreover, the fact that the days of colonial domination and the enslavement of the peoples of the East cannot be restored.

The countries of the Middle East are now faced with the danger of losing their independence and becoming involved in war for alien interests. It is therefore quite understandable that political circles in those countries are increasingly appreciating this danger. Understandable, too, is the growing resistance with which the peoples of the countries of the Middle East are meeting the attempts of foreign powers to force them to take part in aggressive military groupings. And if the ruling circles of certain Arab countries do sub-

missively follow the organisers of these groupings, this only goes to show how far they are from expressing the real national interests of their peoples.

As has frequently happened in the past, now, too, efforts are being made to cloak the aggressive nature of Middle East plans of the United States and Britain with ridiculous fabrications about a "Soviet menace" to the countries of that area. Such inventions have nothing in common with reality, for it is a matter of record that the underlying basis of the Soviet Union's foreign policy is an unalterable desire to ensure peace among the peoples, a peace founded on observance of the principles of equality, non-interference in domestic affairs, and respect for national independence and state sovereignty.

From the very first days of its existence, the Soviet state has decisively condemned the policy of imperialist usurpations and colonial oppression; and it annulled all the unequal treaties which the tsarist government had concluded with the countries of the East.

Regarding the national aspirations of the peoples of the East with full understanding and sympathy, the Soviet Government was the first to recognise the independence of Afghanistan and helped her to restore her state sovereignty.

The Soviet Government cancelled the tsarist government's unequal treaties with Iran, and transferred to her great material wealth which Russia owned in Iran.

During the years of Turkey's hard struggle for national independence, the Soviet Union stretched out the hand of friendship and gave her all-round assistance—a fact which played a decisive

part in the struggle of the Turkish people against the foreign interventionists.

The Soviet Government was the first to recognise Saudi Arabia as an independent state, and supported the struggle for state independence of the Yemen, Syria and the Lebanon, and Egypt's rightful demands for the withdrawal of foreign troops from her territory.

In international bodies, the Soviet Government always supports the legitimate demands of the countries of the Middle East aimed at strengthening their national independence and state sovereignty.

The Soviet Union has unswervingly pursued, and continues to pursue a policy of peace and the easing of international tension. Proof of this, in particular, can be seen in its proposal to end the arms drive; to prohibit atomic and hydrogen weapons; for an immediate and substantial reduction of armaments and, first and foremost, of the armaments of the five great powers; and for the establishment of a system of collective security in Europe.

It is quite plain that this policy of the Soviet Union, which meets with the profound approval and support of the peoples, is fully in accord with the fundamental national interests of the countries of the Middle East and with the interests of maintaining universal peace. A threat to the security of the countries of the Middle East does exist; it comes, however, not from the Soviet Union but from those powers which, under the pretext of "ensuring security," are setting up aggressive blocs in the Middle East, trying to reduce the countries of this region to the position of their military strategic springboards and, eco-

nomically speaking, to the status of colonies and dependent territories.

Of course, the Soviet Union cannot remain indifferent to the situation arising in the region of the Middle East, since the formation of these blocs and the establishment of foreign military bases on the territory of the countries of the Middle East have a direct bearing on the security of the USSR. This attitude of the Soviet Government should all the more be understandable since the USSR is situated very close to these countries—something which cannot be said of other foreign powers, for instance, of the United States, which is thousands of kilometres from this area.

The refusal of the countries of the Middle East to take part in aggressive military blocs would be an important prerequisite to the ensuring of their security, and the best guarantee of these countries not being drawn into dangerous military adventures.

Striving for the development of peaceful co-operation among all countries, the Soviet Government is prepared to support and develop co-operation with the countries of the Middle East, in the interests of strengthening peace in this area. In its Declaration of February 9, 1955, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declared that it considered it of exceedingly great importance that relations among countries, large and small, should be based on those international principles which would facilitate the development of friendly co-operation among the nations, in conditions of a peaceful and tranquil life.

The Soviet Union believes that relations among

states, and real security can be ensured on the basis of the practical application of the well-known principles enumerated in that declaration—namely: equality; non-interference in domestic affairs; non-aggression and the renunciation of encroachment on the territorial integrity of other states; and on respect for sovereignty and national independence.

The Government of the Soviet Union would support any steps by the countries of the Middle East towards putting these principles into practice in the relations between them and the Soviet Union, towards strengthening the national independence of these countries and consolidating peace and friendly co-operation among the peoples.

If the policy of pressure and threats with regard to the countries of the Middle East is continued, the question should be examined by the United Nations Organisation.

Upholding the cause of peace, the Soviet Government will defend the freedom and independence of the countries of the Middle East and will oppose interference in their domestic affairs.

*Izvestia*, April 17, 1955

### **TASS Statement on Egypt's Purchase of Arms**

October 1, 1955

From foreign press reports it has become known that strong pressure has recently been brought to bear on certain Middle Eastern countries (Egypt) in order that they should buy arms for their defence needs only from the Western

countries and on terms laid down by the Western countries.

From subsequent statements by the Egyptian Government in this connection, it has likewise been learned that it regards such pressure on Egypt as impermissible interference, detrimental to Egypt's national independence and the interests of her lawful defence.

For its part, the Soviet Government holds the view that every state has the lawful right to provide for its defence and to buy arms for its defence needs from other states on the usual commercial terms, and no foreign state has the right to interfere in this or to present any unilateral claims that would infringe the rights or interests of other states.

Since reports have appeared that negotiations have recently taken place between Egypt and Czechoslovakia on the sale of arms in exchange for cotton and rice, and in this connection groundless claims have been made on the USSR, the Soviet Government has informed the governments of Egypt and Czechoslovakia, and also the Governments of Britain and the United States which have made special statements on this question, of its attitude as stated above.

*Izvestia*, October 2, 1955

**Statement by USSR Ministry of Foreign  
Affairs on Situation in Middle East**

April 17, 1956

The situation now developing in the area of the Middle East merits the earnest attention of

all states and public circles concerned with the strengthening of universal peace and the thorough easing of international tension.

It has been repeatedly pointed out that the main cause for the aggravation of the international situation in the Middle East is the continuing attempts to knock together and extend military groupings which serve the aims of colonialism and are directed both against the independence of the peoples in this area and against the security of the peace-loving countries. The establishment of such groupings has become the source of international friction and conflicts in the area of Middle East and the cause for the deterioration of relations between the Arab states and Israel as well as Turkey, and between Pakistan and Afghanistan, and Pakistan and India.

Instead of taking measures to achieve peaceable and friendly relations between the independent states in this area on the basis of the principles of peaceful co-operation adopted at the Asian-African conference in Bandung, some countries are pitted against other countries, which has created a tense atmosphere in this area. The pressure brought to bear upon the independent Arab states by certain powers with the object of compelling them, contrary to their will, to join the afore-said groupings, such as the well-known Baghdad pact, constitutes a violation of the principles of the United Nations and is contrary to the interests of peace and international security.

At the present time, the aggravation of the Arab-Israeli conflict is one of the most dangerous elements of the situation in the Middle East. Regardless of how the causes of the outbreak of this conflict are appraised, one cannot fail to see

that certain circles of some states, not interested in strengthening international peace, are seeking to use the Arab-Israeli conflict for their own aggressive ends, going so far as to introduce foreign troops into the territory of the countries of this area and to create military complications. Intervention in the affairs of the Arab countries is aimed at restoring the positions of colonialism in the Middle East, in which certain oil monopolies are particularly interested. It is well known that the three-power agreement of 1950 is in line with these aspirations. All this is fraught with the danger of a breeding ground of war developing in that area, which must not be permitted.

The Government of the Soviet Union is resolutely upholding the interests of peace and peaceful co-operation among the nations. It is firmly and consistently carrying out measures aimed at easing international tension, which is in keeping with the wishes of the peoples of all countries, including the peoples of the Middle East.

The establishment, after the Second World War, of the national independence, and the consolidation of the state sovereignty of a number of states which until quite recently were in the position of colonial or mandated territories is a great achievement of the peoples in the cause of safeguarding peace and security in the area of the Middle East. The Soviet Union has regarded with sympathy and warmly supported the efforts of the countries of the Middle East aimed at establishing and consolidating the state independence of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, the Lebanon, the Yemen, Jordan, Libya, the Sudan, Iraq, Israel and others. In the same way, the Soviet Union appreciated the actions of Britain and France

which facilitated a solution of pressing Middle East problems on the basis of recognising the independence and sovereignty of the afore-mentioned states.

The principles of respect for national independence, sovereignty and non-interference in the domestic affairs of states, and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means are recorded in the United Nations Charter. Being a consistent supporter of these principles, the Soviet Union has sincerely and wholeheartedly supported, and continues to support, the striving of the Arab states to secure the further strengthening of their recently gained national independence and the advancement of their economic well-being.

In the establishment of the independence of the states of the Middle East and in their general advance the Soviet Union sees an important guarantee of peace and security in this area. That is precisely why the Soviet Government has readily responded to and has met the wishes of the governments of these states directed towards these aims. In so doing the Soviet Government has not sought special advantages for itself and has endeavoured to arrange its relations with the states in this area on the basis of the just principles proclaimed by the peoples of Asia and Africa at the Bandung Conference.

Desiring to secure the consolidation of peace and the development of international co-operation, and taking into account the just national interests of the peoples of all countries, the Soviet Government has invariably opposed the violation of peace in the Middle East and any actions which could entail the outbreak of armed con-

flicts or could be utilised as a pretext for precipitating such conflicts.

The Soviet Government considers that an armed conflict in the Middle East can and must be avoided and that it is in the interests of all the states of the Middle East not to allow themselves to be provoked into being involved in hostilities.

The Soviet Government at the same time regards as unlawful and impermissible, from the standpoint of maintaining universal peace, the attempts to make use of the Arab-Israeli conflict for intervention from outside in the domestic affairs of the independent Arab states or for introducing foreign troops into the territory of the Middle East.

In connection with the afore-said, the Soviet Government states:

1. The Soviet Union will render the necessary support to measures of the United Nations aimed at exploring ways and means for strengthening peace in the Palestine area and implementing corresponding decisions of the Security Council.

2. The Soviet Union considers that measures must be taken in the immediate future to ease the existing tension in the Palestine area without interference from outside which is contrary to the will of the states of the Middle East and the principles of the United Nations.

The Soviet Union urges the parties concerned to abstain from any actions which might aggravate the situation on the existing demarcation line established by the armistice agreements between the Arab countries and Israel and also to make the necessary efforts to improve the hard lot of the hundreds of thousands of Arab refugees dep-

rived of their shelter and means of livelihood.

3. The Soviet Union considers that in the interests of strengthening international peace and security the matter must be handled in such a way as to lead to a lasting peaceful settlement of the Palestine issue on a mutually acceptable basis, taking due account of the just national interests of the parties concerned.

The Soviet Government expresses its readiness to facilitate, together with other states, a peaceful settlement of questions outstanding.

*Izvestia*, April 18, 1956

### **Soviet Government's Statement on Need for Peaceful Settlement of the Suez Question**

September 15, 1956

The Soviet Government considers it necessary once again to make known its attitude regarding the situation that has arisen at the present time in connection with the Suez question.

As is well known, threats to use force against Egypt continue to be made by Britain and France, and an ever-increasing concentration of British and French armed forces and fleets is taking place in the immediate vicinity of Egypt. This, undoubtedly, leads to a still greater aggravation of the situation in connection with the Suez Canal, and creates a position that is dangerous to peace.

The Soviet Government has already, in its statement on the Suez Canal question of August 9, 1956, pointed out that the threats and military

preparations which the British and French governments have started to carry out against Egypt in connection with her nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company are incompatible with the principles of the United Nations. In that statement the Soviet Government set out its views regarding the legality of the Egyptian Government's action in nationalising the Suez Canal Company and regarding the safeguarding of freedom of navigation through the canal, and drew attention to the need for a peaceful settlement of the Suez question.

As a determined advocate of the easing of international tension, consistently pursuing a policy of peace and friendship among the peoples and endeavouring to give the utmost assistance in the peaceful settlement of international disputes, the Soviet Union accepted Britain's invitation to take part in the London conference, in spite of the fact that neither by its composition nor by its character could that conference be considered a representative international conference competent to take any decisions regarding the Suez Canal. In this connection the Soviet Union proceeded from the fact that, given the desire on the part of the interested states, even such a conference could help to find an approach for settling questions connected with the freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal which would facilitate a peaceful solution of the problem.

Guided by these considerations, the Soviet delegation set out at the London conference the Soviet Government's position on the Suez Canal question, which is that the Suez question should be settled by peaceful means, in strict conformity with the requirements of the United Nations

Charter and the indisputable sovereign rights of Egypt, as complete mistress, owner and controller of the canal, with a guarantee for the freedom of navigation along the canal at all times and for all countries using the waterway.

Proceeding from this, the Soviet delegation supported the proposal made by India on the Suez Canal question, based on the principle of a correct combination of the interests of Egypt, as a sovereign state, with the interests of all other users of the Suez Canal.

At the London conference the legality of the Egyptian Government's action in nationalising the Suez Canal Company was in fact admitted by the majority of those taking part. The representatives of a number of countries, in touching on ways for settling the Suez question, spoke quite definitely in favour of its settlement by peaceful means. A similar settlement of the question was also advocated by the governments of many countries which did not take part in the work of the conference but which are interested in navigation through the Suez Canal.

The attempts of certain states to force on Egypt, in the name of the London conference, the proposal to withdraw the Suez Canal from the control and sovereignty of Egypt, failed. The conference took only one decision—to convey to the Egyptian Government a complete verbatim report of the conference. The sponsors of the resolution in favour of international operation of the Suez Canal, however, decided to act separately, outside the framework of the conference, setting up for this purpose the so-called five-power committee. This committee was set up for the obvious purpose of trying to force on Egypt the so-

called "Dulles plan", which provides for transferring the Suez Canal to foreign control.

Simultaneously with the attempts to force the "Dulles plan" on Egypt, the governments of Britain and France, with a view to exerting pressure on Egypt and other Arab countries, took the path of carrying out military measures. They have concentrated naval, air and land forces at the approaches to the Suez Canal and are continuing to do so. In agreement with the British Government, the French high command has sent military units, including paratroops and air formations, to Cyprus. French planes, bringing paratroops from Madagascar, are arriving in the area of Djibouti (French Somaliland). Increasingly extensive measures for mobilisation are being carried out in Britain, and merchant ships are being requisitioned for the urgent transport of troops and ammunition to the Middle East. More and more military contingents are being sent from British and French ports to areas adjacent to the Suez Canal. Organs of the press, instigated by bellicose circles in Britain and France, are demanding the adoption of immediate and decisive military measures against Egypt.

Obviously with the same purpose of bringing pressure to bear on Egypt, an extraordinary session of the North Atlantic bloc (NATO) was recently called, at which the Suez Canal question was discussed. Not embarrassed by the fact that they continue to proclaim this bloc a "defensive" and "regional" organisation, Britain and France, with United States support, are attempting to use NATO against Egypt. Clearly, the organisers of the Atlantic bloc are trying to draw into these dangerous plans other members of the Atlantic

bloc who would like to remain aloof.

The reports on the recent London conference of the Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers of Britain and France, in which military representatives of the two countries took part, go to show that the governments of these countries are continuing their policy of military preparations against Egypt. At the emergency session of the British Parliament on September 12, the Prime Minister, Sir Anthony Eden, referring to agreement with the governments of the United States and France, made a statement about the immediate establishment of a so-called Canal Users' Association, to consist primarily of the afore-mentioned three governments, which, in the words of the British Prime Minister, is to undertake "co-ordination of traffic" through the Suez Canal, the engaging and employing of pilots and the levying of dues for the passage of ships through the canal. And it was stated that should the Egyptian Government refuse to collaborate with this organisation, Egypt would be regarded as being in breach of the 1888 Convention.

In broad international circles this plan of the three powers is justly regarded as a dangerous provocation, leading to still greater aggravation of the situation in connection with the Suez question and to the artificial creation of incidents which could be used as a pretext for the use of force against Egypt.

Connected with this plan, there is also such a measure—clearly designed to disrupt the normal working of the canal—as the Western powers' recall of foreign pilots working on the canal.

It is not difficult to realise that the whole of this plan is aimed at withdrawing the operation

of the canal from Egyptian hands and putting it under foreign control, though one cannot fail to see that realisation of such a plan is only possible by using force against Egypt. If the object of this plan is not the artificial aggravation of the situation and the creation of incidents, then one may ask what need there is for the establishment of some foreign association for the operation of an Egyptian canal, which is the property of the Egyptian state, of the Egyptian people. The British Government tries to justify military preparations against Egypt by alleging that Egypt, in nationalising the Suez Canal Company, employed force. This statement, however, is presumably intended for people who are very naive. In actual fact, the Egyptian nationalisation of the private Suez Canal Company, which is an internal affair of Egypt, was carried out in accordance with her lawful rights, and it would be absurd to justify attempts to use armed force against Egypt by reference to this nationalisation. Moreover, it is not Egypt who is sending her troops against Britain and France but, on the contrary, it is the troops of these powers that are being concentrated in the vicinity of Egypt.

In carrying out military measures directed against Egypt, the French Government alleges that it is doing this with a view to protecting French nationals living in Egypt. But who could take such assertions seriously when it is well known that no one has threatened or is threatening French nationals in Egypt? In this connection it would not be out of place to recall that this method has frequently been resorted to previously, as a pretext for seizing and enslaving countries of the East.

Nor is it possible to fail to note that although a great deal is being said in the United States about a peaceful settlement of the question, in actual fact the United States does not protest against the concentration of troops and the threats to employ them, which cannot but encourage advocates of the use of force against Egypt in Britain and France. Moreover, in his statement at the press conference on September 11, Mr. Eisenhower, the President of the United States, in actual fact allowed the permissibility of the use of armed force against Egypt by Britain and France, and a still clearer idea of the United States position is provided by the statement made by Secretary of State Dulles at a press conference on September 13, when, in the first place, he also allowed the permissibility of Britain and France using force against Egypt when their ships went through the canal and, in the second place, declared outright that the United States was sponsoring the establishment of the afore-mentioned "Canal Users' Association."

The Soviet Government considers it necessary to declare that the military preparations that are being carried out by Britain and France, with United States support, with a view to exerting pressure on Egypt over the Suez question, is in flagrant contradiction with the principles of the United Nations. The United Nations Organisation, however, was set up by the joint efforts of the states, and particularly the great powers, precisely for the purpose of ensuring a peaceful life for the nations. It is its direct duty to examine conflicts and friction that may arise in the relations between states and to prevent events from developing in such a way as might lead to a

breach of the peace.

The United Nations Charter expressly prohibits the use of force against any state, with the exception of cases of self-defence in the event of an armed attack on any particular state, or the threat of force, and makes it incumbent to seek peaceful means of settling disputes that may arise between states. The Charter, of course, also provides for the possibility of the use of force—sanctions, but only in those extreme cases in which it is necessary to rebuff an aggressor and ensure the maintenance or restoration of peace. But even in such circumstances, which do not apply in the present instance, the question of the use of force is to be decided, not at the discretion of this or that country or group of countries, guided by their own narrow considerations, but in accordance with the decisions of the Security Council, which has the appropriate authority for this, according to the United Nations Charter.

Consequently, the governments of Britain and France have no grounds whatsoever for resorting to the threat of force or the use of force against Egypt, who has carried out her lawful rights as a sovereign state with regard to the Suez Canal Company. The actions of Britain and France cannot be reconciled with their membership of the United Nations, especially if it be borne in mind that both countries are permanent members of the Security Council bearing particular responsibility for the preservation of peace. The military preparations being carried out by these powers against Egypt cannot be regarded as other than a manifestation of the intention of Britain and France to seize the Suez Canal, which runs through Egyptian territory and is under Egypti-

an sovereignty. Such actions cannot be assessed as other than an act of aggression against Egypt, in whatever way they attempt to present them to us.

Taking the path of military threats, Britain and France are not only creating a situation which is dangerous to the cause of peace, but are also running the risk of doing irreparable harm to themselves. There can hardly be any doubt that a military attack on Egypt and military actions in that region would lead to immense destruction on the Suez Canal and also in the oilfields situated in the countries of the Arab East and to the oil pipelines which cross the territories of those countries. There can be no doubt that such a development of events would also do considerable harm to other countries which have extensive economic ties with the countries of the East.

If a foreign invasion were undertaken against Egypt, it would undoubtedly, apart from the material consequences of such acts which have been mentioned above, arouse the profound indignation of the peoples of Asia and Africa against the governments of the countries that were embarking on the path of aggression. Those peoples are deeply aware that the historical development of mankind is leading to the complete liquidation of colonialism, and no forces can halt this process.

The campaign of military threats and the military measures being carried out by Britain and France show that in these countries there are certain circles which are engaged in incitement to the adoption of military action against Egypt. They are urging that a settlement of the Suez Canal question be imposed on Egypt by force of

arms. However, they forget that in our time, with the existence of the impetuous upsurge of the peoples of the East, who have set out on the path of independent development and national rebirth, and in an age when such destructive forms of weapons exist as atomic and hydrogen weapons, it is impossible to threaten and rattle the sabre, it is impossible to act as people once did in the period of colonial conquests.

The threats to use force in relation to Egypt are being decisively condemned by the public all over the world, including ever wider circles of the public in Britain and France. In this connection, one cannot but note the attitude of the British trade unions which, at their recent congress in Brighton, categorically declared themselves against the use of force or threats to use force in settling the Suez question, and also the position of the French General Confederation of Labour, which condemns these threatening measures and this sabre-rattling.

The Soviet Government considers it necessary again to declare that it supports the view that freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal should be ensured for all countries and that such a situation can, and should be brought about only by peaceful means, taking into account the inalienable sovereign rights of Egypt, as well as the interests of the states using the Suez Canal. There is no other way, if one does not want to provoke grave conflict and artificially aggravate the situation.

The Soviet Government takes into account the importance which the Suez Canal has for Britain and France as maritime states, and the part which it plays in their economic relations with the

countries of the East. The Soviet Union itself attaches great importance to the freedom of navigation and normal functioning of the Suez Canal, to which reference is made in the Soviet Government's statement of August 9 and the statement of the USSR delegation at the London conference.

The Government of the USSR, however, is deeply convinced that the Suez question can and must be settled by peaceful means, all the more so because the Egyptian Government expresses its complete readiness, for its part, to take an active part in such a settlement. It is well known that the Egyptian Government has more than once declared its readiness to observe the 1888 Convention on freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal, and has also expressed its agreement to take part, jointly with the interested states, in the work to prepare and conclude a new international convention which should accord with present-day conditions and with the spirit of the times, and replace the 1888 Convention. Moreover, as is well known, the Egyptian Government, desiring to ensure freedom of navigation through the canal, is taking steps necessary for the normal operation of the canal, which is functioning without interruption.

On September 10, 1956, the Egyptian Government sent to all states interested in the freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal, a Note in which it again affirmed its readiness for a peaceful settlement of the Suez question and proposed to convene, together with the other governments, which signed the Constantinople Convention of 1888, a conference to review that Convention and to discuss the conclusion of an agree-

ment confirming and guaranteeing freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal.

Wishing to assist in the peaceful settlement of the Suez question, the Soviet Government received this Note of the Egyptian Government with satisfaction and expressed its willingness to take part in the above-mentioned international conference. Moreover the Soviet Government expressed support for the view that all countries which signed the 1888 Convention should be represented at the conference, including the successor states of countries which signed the above-mentioned Convention, the Arab countries which are territorially situated in direct proximity to the canal and are vitally interested in the peaceful settlement of this question, and other countries using the Suez Canal.

On this basis and guided by the need for a peaceful settlement of the Suez question, the Soviet Government expresses its willingness to take part in the work of the body proposed by the Government of Egypt for conducting negotiations, in which the various viewpoints of the states using the canal would be represented with a view to seeking an acceptable basis for the settlement of the question of the Suez Canal.

The Soviet Union has taken a number of steps contributing to a just solution of the Suez question by means of negotiation. It is continuing, and will continue its efforts in this direction.

The Soviet Government expresses the hope that all to whom the interests of peace are dear and who, not in words but in deeds, desire to build their relations with other countries on the principles of equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, will take steps

so that the Suez question may be settled by peaceful means in accordance with the national interests and rights of Egypt and the interests of strengthening peace and international co-operation.

The USSR, as a great power, cannot stand aloof from the Suez question and cannot fail to display concern at the situation which has come about at the present time as a result of the actions of the Western powers. This is understandable, because any violation of peace in the region of the Middle East cannot but affect the interests of the security of the Soviet state.

The Soviet Government considers that the United Nations Organisation cannot but react to the situation which has been created by the threats to use force in relation to Egypt, to which certain states—members of that Organisation—are resorting. Such threats are in flagrant contradiction with the principles and Charter of the United Nations, which bind all members of that Organisation, in their international relations, to refrain from threats of force and the use of force, either against the territorial integrity or the political independence of any state, or in any other way that is incompatible with the noble aims and peaceful principles of the United Nations.

*Izvestia*, September 16, 1956

### **Soviet Government's Statement on Armed Aggression Against Egypt**

October 31, 1956

Egypt has fallen victim to aggression. Her territory has been invaded by Israeli forces and she

faces the danger of a landing by British and French forces.

The Israeli forces crossed the Egyptian frontier on the night of October 29 and opened an offensive along the Sinai Peninsula in the direction of the Suez Canal.

The action of the Israeli Government constitutes armed aggression and an open breach of the United Nations Charter. The facts indicate that the invasion by the Israeli forces has clearly been calculated to be used as an excuse for the Western powers, primarily Britain and France, to bring their troops into the territory of the Arab states, notably, into the Suez Canal zone. To cover up their aggressive actions, the Western powers are invoking the colonialist declaration of 1950 by the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France, which has been unanimously rejected by all the Arab states. The Government of Israel, operating as a tool of imperialist circles bent on restoring the regime of colonial oppression in the East, has challenged all the Arab peoples, all the peoples of the East fighting against colonialism. The course which the extremist ruling circles of Israel have taken is a criminal one and dangerous, above all to the state of Israel itself and to its future.

Following the armed attack by Israel, the Governments of the United Kingdom and France presented an ultimatum to Egypt on October 30, demanding key positions for their forces on Egyptian territory—in Suez, Port Said and Ismailia—for the alleged purpose of preventing hostilities between Israel and Egypt. In spite of the fact that the Government of Egypt, acting in defence of the country's sovereignty and territorial inte-

grity, has rejected this demand, Britain and France have dispatched their troops for landing on Egyptian territory. The governments of the United Kingdom and France have thus taken the course of armed intervention against Egypt, riding roughshod over the legitimate rights of the sovereign Egyptian state.

This line of action by the governments of the United Kingdom and France is incompatible with the principles and purposes of the United Nations, is a gross violation of the solemn commitments of the member-states of the United Nations, and constitutes an act of aggression against the Egyptian state.

The Government of the Soviet Union resolutely condemns the act of aggression against Egypt by the governments of Britain, France and Israel. The freedom-loving peoples of the world fervently sympathise with the Egyptian people waging a just struggle in defence of their national independence.

The Soviet Government considers that the Security Council of the United Nations must, for the sake of preserving peace and tranquillity in the Middle East, take prompt measures towards ending the aggressive actions of Britain, France and Israel against Egypt, and towards the immediate withdrawal of the interventionist forces from Egyptian territory.

The Soviet Government holds that all responsibility for the dangerous consequences of these aggressive actions against Egypt will rest entirely with the governments which have taken the line of disturbing peace and security, the line of aggression.

*Izvestia*, November 1, 1956

**Speech by Soviet Representative A. A. Sobolev  
at Special Emergency Session of UN General  
Assembly on Aggression Against Egypt by  
Great Britain, France and Israel \***

November 1, 1956

Everything bears out the fact, A. A. Sobolev said, that Israel's aggression, just as the aggression by Britain and France, against Egypt is being effected according to a single plan drawn up in advance by the British and French governments.

The Israeli Government having launched aggressive actions against Egypt has been a tool in the hands of the imperialist circles. These actions by the ruling extremist circles in Israel are criminal and dangerous, first and foremost for the Israeli state itself and for its future.

In launching aggressive actions against Egypt, Britain and France have taken a course incompatible with the principles and purposes of the United Nations. The British and French representatives have prevented the Security Council from taking the necessary measures to cut short the aggression against Egypt. At a time when the Security Council was discussing this matter, the British and French governments, circumventing the Security Council, resorted to threats and sent an ultimatum to Egypt, and launched open military actions against the Egyptian state.

It is patently obvious that the British and French statements on the protection of navigation through the Suez Canal is only a pretext to

---

\* This is a TASS summary.

cover up the aggressive actions taken by Britain and France against the Egyptian state.

The peoples of the Soviet Union, Sobolev concluded, are joining their voices to the demand of the peoples of the whole world, calling upon the United Nations to take resolute and effective measures to put an immediate end to the armed aggression against Egypt by Britain, France and Israel.

In its statement of October 31, the USSR Government resolutely condemned the act of aggression against Egypt by Britain, France and Israel. The USSR Government considers that for the sake of maintaining peace and tranquillity in the Middle East, the United Nations has to take urgent measures to put an end to the military actions launched by Britain, France and Israel against Egypt and to bring about the immediate withdrawal of the interventionists' armed forces from the territory of Egypt.

The USSR delegation urges the General Assembly:

(1) To condemn the armed attack on Egypt by Britain, France and Israel as an act of aggression incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations;

(2) To demand of Britain, France and Israel an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of their armed forces from the territory of Egypt and from Egyptian territorial waters;

(3) To appoint a United Nations commission to supervise the fulfilment of the recommendations of the special emergency session of the General Assembly.

*Izvestia*, November 3, 1956

## USSR Foreign Minister's Appeal to Security Council President

November 5, 1956

Egypt has fallen victim to aggression by Britain, France and Israel. Egyptian towns and inhabited localities are being savagely bombed by the Anglo-French air forces. Landing operations and direct invasion of Egyptian territory by the interventionist troops have begun. Casualties among civilians are increasing and material values are being destroyed. The aggressive war against Egypt is being intensified notwithstanding the decision taken on November 2 by the special emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly on a cease-fire and the withdrawal of all foreign troops that have invaded Egypt.

The situation which has developed makes imperative the adoption by the United Nations of immediate and effective measures to curb aggression. If at this crucial moment the United Nations is unable to curb the aggressors, this will undermine the confidence of the peoples of the whole world in it, and its lofty ideals and principles will be trampled underfoot.

As a champion of peace and the security of peoples, the Soviet Government requests that a meeting of the Security Council be called immediately to discuss the following question: "On the non-fulfilment by the United Kingdom, France and Israel of the decision taken by the General Assembly's special emergency session on November 2, and on the immediate measures to cut short the aggression by the afore-mentioned

states against Egypt."

With the object of taking swift and effective measures to put an end to the aggressive war against the Egyptian people, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics proposes the following draft resolution of the Security Council:

"The Security Council,

"Bearing in mind that the resolution adopted by the special emergency session of the General Assembly of November 2, 1956, and recommending the governments of the United Kingdom, France and Israel immediately to put an end to the military operations against Egypt and to withdraw their forces from Egyptian territory, has not been implemented by the afore-mentioned states and that the military operations against Egypt continue,

"Proceeding from the need of taking immediate measures to curb the aggression against Egypt unleashed by the United Kingdom, France and Israel,

"Proposes to the governments of the United Kingdom, France and Israel that they immediately, but not later than twelve hours after the adoption of this resolution, discontinue all military operations against Egypt and within three days withdraw the troops that have invaded Egyptian territory.

"The Security Council, in conformity with Article 42 of the United Nations Charter, considers it necessary that all the United Nations member-states, and primarily the United States and the USSR, as permanent members of the Security Council which have powerful air and naval forces, render armed and other assistance to the

victim of aggression, the Egyptian Republic, by dispatching naval and air forces, military units, volunteers, instructors, materiel and other aid if the United Kingdom, France and Israel do not comply with this resolution in the stated time."

The Soviet Government, on its part, declares its readiness to make its contribution to curbing the aggressors, to defending the victims of aggression and restoring peace, by dispatching to Egypt the necessary air and naval forces.

The Soviet Government expresses its confidence that the member-states of the United Nations will take the necessary measures to defend the sovereign rights of the Egyptian state and to restore peace.

I ask you, Mr. President, to circulate this statement of the Soviet Government to all the members of the Security Council and to all other member-states of the United Nations.

*Izvestia*, November 6, 1956

**Message from Chairman of the USSR Council  
of Ministers to Prime Minister of Great Britain**

November 5, 1956

Esteemed Mr. Prime Minister,

The Soviet Government considers it necessary to draw your attention to the fact that the aggressive war engineered by Britain and France against the Egyptian state, in which Israel played the role of an instigator, is fraught with very dangerous consequences for universal peace.

The special emergency session of the General

Assembly has adopted a decision on the immediate ending of hostilities and the withdrawal of foreign troops from Egyptian territory. Disregarding this, Britain, France and Israel are intensifying military operations, are continuing the barbarous bombing of Egyptian towns and villages, have landed troops on Egyptian territory, are reducing her inhabited localities to ruins and are killing civilians.

Thus, the Government of Britain, together with the governments of France and Israel, has embarked upon unprovoked aggression against Egypt.

The motives cited by the British Government in justifying the attack on Egypt are absolutely fallacious. First of all, the British Government stated that it was intervening in the conflict between Israel and Egypt in order to prevent the Suez Canal from becoming a zone of military operations. Following the British and French intervention, the Suez Canal area has become a zone of military operations and navigation through the canal has been disrupted, which harms the interests of nations using the canal.

Attempts to justify the aggression by reference to the interests of Britain and France in freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal are also fallacious. We understand your special interest in the canal. This, however, does not entitle you to conduct military operations against the Egyptian people. At the same time, the governments of Britain and France cannot assume the role of judges in the question of the means of securing freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal, since many other states that are denouncing the aggressive actions of Britain and France and de-

manding the maintenance of peace and tranquillity in the Middle East, have no less interest in it. Furthermore it is well known that freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal was fully ensured by Egypt.

The Suez Canal issue was only a pretext for British and French aggression, which has other and far-reaching aims. It cannot be concealed that in actual fact an aggressive predatory war is now unfolding against the Arab peoples with the object of destroying the national independence of the states of the Middle East and of re-establishing the regime of colonial slavery rejected by the peoples.

There is no justification for the fact that the armed forces of Britain and France, two great powers that are permanent members of the Security Council, have attacked a country which only recently acquired its national independence and which does not possess adequate means for self-defence.

In what situation would Britain find herself if she were attacked by stronger states, possessing all types of modern destructive weapons? And such countries could, at the present time, refrain from sending naval or air forces to the shores of Britain and use other means—for instance, rocket weapons. Were rocket weapons used against Britain and France, you would, most probably, call this a barbarous action. But how does the inhuman attack launched by the armed forces of Britain and France against a practically defenceless Egypt differ from this?

With deep anxiety over the developments in the Middle East, and guided by the interests of the maintenance of universal peace, we think

that the Government of Britain should listen to the voice of reason and put an end to the war in Egypt. We call upon you, upon Parliament, upon the Labour Party, the trade unions, upon the whole of the British people: Put an end to the armed aggression; stop the bloodshed. The war in Egypt can spread to other countries and turn into a third world war.

The Soviet Government has already addressed the United Nations and the President of the United States of America with the proposal to resort, jointly with other United Nations member-states, to the use of naval and air forces in order to end the war in Egypt and to curb aggression. We are fully determined to crush the aggressors by the use of force and to restore peace in the East.

We hope that at this critical moment you will show due common sense and draw the appropriate conclusions.

*Izvestia*, November 6, 1956

**Message from Chairman of the USSR Council of  
Ministers to Chairman of the Council  
of Ministers of France**

November 5, 1956

Esteemed Mr. President,

I regard it as my duty to address you on the question of the situation which is taking shape in connection with the Franco-British aggression being unfolded in Egypt.

I must tell you with all frankness that the war

launched by France and Britain, using Israel, against the Egyptian state is fraught with very dangerous consequences for universal peace.

The overwhelming majority of the United Nations member-states went on record at the emergency session of the General Assembly in favour of the immediate discontinuation of military operations and the withdrawal of the foreign troops from Egyptian territory. Nevertheless the military operations in Egypt are being extended more and more, Egyptian towns and villages are being barbarously bombed, French and British troops have landed on Egyptian territory, and the blood of completely innocent people is being shed.

Acting in this way the French Government, together with the governments of Britain and Israel, has embarked upon unprovoked aggression against the Egyptian state.

Though the French and British governments cover up the armed attack on Egypt by all kinds of references to their special interest in the normal functioning of the Suez Canal, it is now obvious that it is not a question of freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal, which was ensured by Egypt and which has now been disrupted by the armed actions of France and Britain, but a question of the desire of the colonialists to put again the yoke of colonial slavery on the peoples of the Arab East who are fighting for their national independence and freedom.

During our meeting in Moscow last May you said that socialist ideals inspired you in all your work. But what has socialism in common with the predatory armed attack on Egypt, which is an open colonial war? How can one reconcile the ideas of socialism with the treacherous attack by

France on a country which but recently achieved independence and which has not enough arms for its defence?

We are deeply convinced that the colonialist war against Egypt runs counter to the vital interests of the French people, who just as ardently as the peoples of Britain and the Soviet Union want the maintenance of peace and the development of economic and cultural co-operation with other peoples.

In what situation would France find herself were she attacked by other states that have modern formidable means of destruction?

Guided by the interests of the maintenance of peace, we urge the Government of France, as well as the Parliament and all the people of France to halt the aggression and to end the bloodshed. We call upon you, upon Parliament, the Socialist Party, the trade unions, upon all the French people to put an end to the armed aggression, to stop the bloodshed. One cannot fail to see that the war in Egypt can spread to other countries and turn into a third world war.

I consider it my duty to inform you that the Soviet Government has already addressed to the United Nations and to the President of the United States of America a proposal to use, jointly with other members of the United Nations, naval and air forces to end the war in Egypt and to curb aggression. The Soviet Government is fully determined to use force in order to smash the aggressors and restore peace in the East.

There is still time to show common sense, to halt, to prevent the bellicose forces from gaining the upper hand.

We hope that at this crucial moment the French Government will soberly assess the situation created and will draw the appropriate conclusions.

*Izvestia*, November 6, 1956

### Message from Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers to Prime Minister of Israel

November 5, 1956

Mr. Prime Minister,

The Soviet Government has already expressed its resolute condemnation of the armed aggression against Egypt by Israel, as well as by Britain and France, which was a direct and open violation of the Charter and principles of the United Nations.

The overwhelming majority of the countries of the world have also denounced, at the special emergency session of the General Assembly, the act of aggression perpetrated against the Egyptian state and have called upon the governments of Israel, Britain and France to cease military operations immediately and to withdraw the invading forces from Egyptian territory.

All peace-loving mankind is indignantly condemning the criminal actions of the aggressors who have encroached upon the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of the Egyptian state.

Disregarding this, the Government of Israel, acting as an instrument of outside imperialist forces, is continuing the reckless adventure, challenging all the peoples of the East who are fight-

ing against colonialism, for their freedom and independence, and all the peace-loving peoples of the world.

Such actions by the Government of Israel graphically show the worth of all the false assurances about Israel's love for peace and her desire for peaceful co-existence with the neighbouring Arab states. With these assurances the Israeli Government has in fact only tried to blunt the vigilance of the other peoples while preparing a traitorous attack against her neighbours.

Fulfilling the will of others, acting on instructions from abroad, the Israeli Government is criminally and irresponsibly playing with the fate of peace, with the fate of its own people. It is sowing a hatred for the state of Israel among the peoples of the East such as cannot but make itself felt with regard to the future of Israel and which puts in jeopardy the very existence of Israel as a state.

The Soviet Government, vitally interested in the maintenance of peace and the safeguarding of tranquillity in the Middle East, is at the present time taking measures in order to put an end to the war and curb the aggressors.

We expect that the Government of Israel will change its mind, while there is still time, and discontinue its military operations against Egypt. We call upon you, upon Parliament, upon the working people of the state of Israel, upon all the people of Israel: Put an end to the aggression, stop the bloodshed, and withdraw your troops from Egyptian territory.

Taking into account the situation that has arisen, the Soviet Government has decided to inst-

ruct its Ambassador in Tel Aviv to depart from Israel and leave immediately for Moscow.

We hope that the Government of Israel will properly understand and assess this warning of ours.

*Izvestia*, November 6, 1956

### **TASS Statement on Aggression Against Egypt by Great Britain, France and Israel**

November 10, 1956

TASS is authorised to state the following:

Satisfaction is expressed in the leading circles of the Soviet Union in connection with the statements made by the governments of Britain, France and Israel to the effect that they have discontinued military operations against Egypt. This decision of the governments of these states shows that at long last they have heeded the voice of common sense and yielded to the demands of the peoples, who have resolutely condemned the aggression against Egypt.

Only two or three days ago the situation in the Middle East was such that the military actions against Egypt could have spread to other areas. The reckless policy prompted by the narrow interests of certain circles of Britain, France and Israel created a menacing situation which could have entailed grave consequences for the peoples, for universal peace.

While the ending of hostilities against Egypt is noted as a positive fact, apprehension is ex-

pressed in the leading circles of the Soviet Union lest these moves by the circles which unleashed the aggressive war against Egypt should be a mere manoeuvre designed to gain time, to obtain a respite for an even greater accumulation of forces with a view to resuming the aggressive war against Egypt and other countries of the Middle East on an even greater scale.

The basis for this apprehension is provided primarily by the fact that even after the statements of the governments of Britain, France and Israel on a cease-fire, British and French forces subjected Port Said to savage bombing and landed new detachments in that area. More destruction and more casualties have been added to the destruction and heavy material losses and numerous casualties caused by the barbarous bombing of Egyptian towns and inhabited localities. Besides, it follows from official statements of the British and French governments that on various pretexts they are refusing at the present time to withdraw their troops stationed on the territory of Egypt.

All this obliges the peoples to be on the alert and vigilantly keep watch over the machinations of the aggressors.

The peoples of the Soviet Union are unanimous in condemning the initiators of the aggressive war against the Egyptian people, and fully support the resolute measures of the Soviet Government aimed at cutting short the aggression against Egypt.

The position of the Soviet Government has been expressed in the letters of N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the

USSR, to Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, Sir Anthony Eden, Prime Minister of Britain, M. Guy Mollet, Prime Minister of France, and Mr. Ben-Gurion, Prime Minister of Israel, dated November 5, and also in the appeal of the Soviet Government to the Security Council, and the Soviet Union is fully determined to carry into life the statements contained therein unless the aggression against Egypt is ended in compliance with the decisions of the special emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly.

The Soviet people are deeply concerned about the fate of peace and are fully aware of the consequences to which the extension of the armed conflict could lead if the aggressors in Egypt are not rebuffed. The Soviet people resolutely denounce all attempts to re-impose the yoke of colonial oppression on the Egyptian people by force of arms.

A graphic expression of the warm sympathy of the Soviet people for the Egyptian people, as well as for the other peoples of the East fighting for their national independence and freedom, is provided by numerous statements of Soviet citizens, among whom are many pilots, tankmen, artillerymen and officers of the reserve—participants in the Great Patriotic War—who ask to be allowed to go to Egypt as volunteers, in order to fight together with the Egyptian people to drive the aggressors from Egyptian soil.

The Soviet Union has always been, and remains, a consistent champion of friendship, cooperation and the peaceful co-existence of states, irrespective of their social systems. This policy

stems from the very nature of the Soviet state, from the behests of its founder, the great Lenin. But the Soviet people have never been, nor will they be, passive onlookers in the event of international outrages, when some colonial powers or others are trying to re-enslave by force of arms the states of the East which have become independent.

They also sympathise with the peoples who are trying to cast off the shameful colonial yoke and to obtain independence. The Soviet people therefore condemn the colonial war which is being waged against the unarmed people of Algeria, where blood has been flowing for several years already. Thousands and thousands of Algerian patriots, who have only primitive means of defence, are waging a selfless struggle against the colonialists who are armed with up-to-date weapons and who are now covering up their crimes against the Algerian people with the banner of the Socialists of France.

It has been stated in the leading circles of the USSR that if, in spite of the United Nations decisions, Britain, France and Israel do not evacuate all their troops from the territory of Egypt, and should they under various pretexts delay the implementation of these decisions and accumulate forces creating a threat of a resumption of military operations against Egypt, the appropriate bodies in the Soviet Union would not hinder the departure of Soviet citizens-volunteers who have expressed their desire to take part in the struggle of the Egyptian people for their independence.

*Izvestia*, November 11, 1956

## Message from Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers to Prime Minister of Israel

November 15, 1956

Mr. Prime Minister,

I have received your letter of November 8. Besides that, we have the texts of the official statements made by the leaders of the Israeli Government during the last few days, which enable us to judge about Israel's position in connection with the situation which has arisen in the Middle East at the present time.

The Soviet Government's position on the situation in this region was outlined in my letter of November 5 to you.

Since in your reply you try to justify Israel's actions against Egypt, I feel I must briefly answer your arguments.

You claim in your letter that the need for self-defence, because of some alleged danger to Israel from Egyptian territory, was the reason that the Israeli armed forces invaded the territory of Egypt. But in actual fact, it was Israel and not the Arab states, and this is stated by a number of the Security Council's resolutions, that initiated many armed attacks on the territory of the neighbouring Arab countries. The Security Council expressed profound concern over the Israeli Government's failing to honour its commitments under the armistice agreements, and called on the Israeli Government to fulfil its obligations from now on, or it would apply the appropriate sanctions under the UN Charter against Israel.

Your very assertions that Israel ventured an

armed attack on Egypt because some danger allegedly stemming from the latter, means that the Government of Israel does not wish to abide by the UN Charter which forbids members of the United Nations to use force and demands that the states settle controversies by peaceful means only.

The Soviet Government cannot overlook the fact that the Government of Israel not only failed to heed the appeal of the UN General Assembly for an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of troops, but even openly announced its annexationist intentions with regard to Egypt—its predatory plans for annexing the Gaza Strip, the Sinai Peninsula, and the Tiran and Sanafir islands in the Gulf of Aqaba. In your speech in the Israeli Parliament you declared that the armistice agreements concluded between Israel and the Arab states were "invalid."

It should be noted that even when being compelled to agree to withdraw its troops from Egyptian territory the Government of Israel is nevertheless trying to stipulate that in order to comply with these demands "satisfactory agreements must be concluded with the United Nations" with regard to international forces entering the "Suez Canal zone" which, as is well known, is an integral part of the sovereign Egyptian state. All this obviously contradicts the assertion in your letter that the policy of the Government of Israel is dictated by "a longing for peace" and "the vital needs" of Israel.

The Soviet Government is convinced that Israel's current policy, intended to incite hostility to the Arabs and to suppress them, is really dangerous for the cause of universal peace and lethal

for Israel. In actual fact, and the latest developments have confirmed it, this policy is only in the interests of the external forces seeking to restore colonialism in this region. We are profoundly convinced that it runs counter to the interests of absolutely all peoples of the Middle East.

The Soviet Government warned the Government of Israel about the dangerous consequences for Israel should she launch aggressive military operations against the Arab states. We regret that you did not heed the warning. Egyptian towns and localities have been ruined as a result of Israel's aggression, thousands of innocent people have been killed and crippled, Egypt's communications, trade and economy have suffered. What has Israel gained? One must be blind not to see that the aggression has not benefitted Israel either.

Undoubtedly, the aggression against Egypt has undermined Israel's international position, aroused deep hatred for Israel on the part of the Arabs and other eastern peoples, worsened Israel's relations with many states and has brought about new economic and other difficulties.

The Soviet Government takes into consideration the fact that the Government of Israel ordered a cease-fire and then announced that Israeli troops would be withdrawn from Egyptian territory. It goes without saying that the Israeli forces must be withdrawn from the territory of Egypt immediately.

At the same time the Soviet Government considers it necessary, for the sake of stabilising the situation in the region of the Middle East and eliminating the consequences of aggression against Egypt, that measures be taken to rule out

any probability of new provocations by Israel against the neighbouring states and to ensure a stable peace and tranquillity in the Middle East.

Justice demands that Israel, Britain and France compensate Egypt, as the victim of an unprovoked aggression, for the damage done her—destruction of Egyptian towns and localities, the shutting down of the Suez Canal and its installations. Israel must also return to Egypt all the property that the invading Israeli armed forces have taken away from Egyptian territory.

The Israeli Government having agreed to the establishment of the international UN forces, they must be stationed on both sides of the demarcation line between Israel and Egypt, fixed by the armistice agreement and laid down in the UN resolution.

I should like, Mr. Prime Minister, to express the hope that the Government of Israel will draw the proper conclusions from the lesson of recent events, conclusions that concern Israel as a participant in the aggression against Egypt.

*Izvestia*, November 16, 1956

### TASS Statement on the "Eisenhower Doctrine"

January 13, 1957

The President of the United States of America, Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower, on January 5 addressed a special message to Congress on the policy of the United States in the Middle East countries. In his message, which abounds in anti-Soviet remarks, the President, describing the present si-

tuation in the Middle East as "critical," demanded the authority to use the armed forces of the United States in the Middle East at any moment he might consider it necessary, without asking for the consent of Congress as is envisaged in the country's Constitution. The President of the United States also demanded that he be empowered to render military and economic "aid" to the countries of the Middle East. It is envisaged, specifically, that 200 million dollars will be spent for "economic support" to countries of that area.

President Eisenhower's message runs counter to the principles and the purposes of the United Nations and is fraught with grave danger to peace and security in the Middle East area.

Great changes have taken place in that area recently. The peoples have developed there a heroic struggle for their freedom and national independence, for complete liberation from imperialist oppression. This endangers the interests of the biggest American and British monopolies, which are exploiting the natural wealth of the Middle East countries and making colossal super-profits. This has obviously disturbed the owners of the monopolies.

Unleashing aggression against Egypt, the governments of Britain and France sought to restore the positions of the colonialists in that part of the world. They expected to crush Egypt, to demoralise thereby the other Arab states, and to pave the way for abolishing their national independence and for reimposing the domination of the colonial powers throughout the Middle East. Egypt was the first victim of aggression because her resolute actions set a good example of defending national rights and sovereignty.

In his message to Congress the President of the United States speaks of the sympathy which, he claims, the United States entertains for the Arab countries. Life, however, shows that in actual fact the American ruling circles are setting themselves obviously selfish aims in that area. It is a fact that when Egypt, as a result of the military aggression of Britain, France and Israel, was threatened with the loss of her national independence, the United States refused to pool its efforts with the Soviet Union in the United Nations in order to take resolute measures to cut short the aggression. The primary concern of the United States was not the defence of peace and the national independence of the Arab countries, but the desire to take advantage of the weakening of Britain and France in the Middle East to capture their positions.

At present, when a favourable situation has developed in the Middle East and real possibilities for consolidating peace and settling outstanding issues in that area have been created, the Government of the United States has come forward with a programme which envisages flagrant interference by the United States in the affairs of the Arab countries, up to an including military intervention. The aggressive trend of this programme and its colonialist nature with regard to the Arab countries are so obvious that this cannot be disguised by any nebulous phrases about the love for peace and the concern claimed to be shown by the United States for the Middle East countries.

It is permissible to ask: Of what love for peace do the authors of the "Eisenhower Doctrine" speak when the threat to the security of the

Middle East countries emanates precisely from member-states of NATO, in which the United States plays first fiddle? What concern for the afore-mentioned countries can be in question when it is the United States and its NATO partners that regard those countries merely as sources of strategic raw materials and spheres for the investment of capital, with the object of extracting maximum profits? Is it not clear that the uninvited "protectors" of the Middle East countries are trying to impose on that area nothing but the regime of a kind of military protectorate, and to set back the development of these countries for many years?

The declarations of the American President that the United States will support the sovereignty and independence of the Middle East countries are in no way compatible with the adoption of an aggressive programme which provides for the use of United States armed forces in this area. It is well known that the proposal to use United States armed forces in the Middle East goes much further than the notorious tripartite declaration of Britain, France and the United States of 1950 and the 1951 plan for the establishment of the so-called Middle Eastern Command, both of which were rejected by the Arab countries which rightly saw in them a real threat to their national independence.

The peoples of the Middle East countries, who have suffered from the colonial yoke for long years, are well able to discern the machinations of the colonialists under any disguise. They have chosen the road of independent national development and are steadily adhering to the basic principles of equal relations between states formu-

lated in the decisions of the Bandung Conference, which the Soviet Union fully supports.

The mighty advance of the national-liberation movements in the countries of the Arab East and the defeat of the aggressors in the war against Egypt show that the resolve of the Middle East peoples to do away with colonialism and its consequences is growing from day to day. These countries are aware of the fact that in this struggle they are not alone, that they have unselfish friends.

The United States ruling circles consider that the weakening of the positions of the Anglo-French colonialists in the Middle East and the successes of the Arab countries in consolidating their independence have produced a "vacuum," which they would like to fill by their military and economic intervention in the internal affairs of those countries. But what "vacuum" can be in question here? Since when do countries which have liberated themselves from colonial oppression and have taken the road of independent national development constitute a "vacuum"? It is clear that the strengthening of the national independence of the Arab countries, the intensification of their struggle against colonial oppression by no means create some kind of "vacuum," but are a restoration of the national rights of the Middle East peoples and constitute a progressive factor in social development. The United States tries to present its policy as an anti-colonialist one. But it is not difficult to see the falseness of these assertions, clearly designed to blunt the vigilance of the peoples in the Middle East. The programme of the United States insistently stresses that the Middle East must recognise its inter-

dependence with the Western countries, that is, with the colonialists—specifically with regard to oil, the Suez Canal, etc. In other words, the United States is stubbornly seeking to impose a "trusteeship" of the colonialists on the peoples of the Middle East countries.

In practice the interdependence of the Middle East countries and the colonial powers would mean that those countries have to place their natural resources and national wealth at the disposal of foreign monopolies. To put it plainly, the United States is trying to implant the former colonial system in the Middle East countries under a new signboard, capturing dominating positions there.

The authors of the colonialist programme try to sweeten it by a promise of economic "aid" to the Middle East countries. Every intelligent person, however, understands that in reality the United States is offering as charity to the peoples of the Arab countries only a small fraction of what the American monopolies have received and are receiving by plundering, by exploiting the natural wealth belonging to those countries. The United States promises the countries of the Middle East 200 million dollars in the financial years of 1958 and 1959, whereas in 1955 alone the American and British oil monopolies extracted 150 million tons of oil in the Middle East at a total cost of 240 million dollars, and made a net profit of 1,900 million dollars on this oil. Such is the real picture of American "philanthropy."

President Eisenhower's message contains the assertion that the United States is concerned over the fate of religions in that area, including Islam, which is professed by the majority of the peo-

ples in the Arab East. But this assertion cannot be taken seriously. Islam, as a religion, arose many centuries before America was discovered and it withstood four Crusades. At the present time the Moslems of the Arab East hardly need Islam to be protected by the United States or anyone else. Assertions that the interests of religion in the Arab East demand the dispatch of American armed forces to that area are utterly untenable. It is not the interests of religion in the Middle East but the interests of the biggest American oil trusts that prompt the United States Government to send its troops there. The plans for United States intervention in the religious affairs of the Moslem countries are rightly regarded as an insult to the religious feelings of the peoples of those countries.

Mention should also be made of the fact that United States interference in the internal affairs of the Arab countries, and the crude threat to employ force against those countries can only encourage the aggressive tendencies of Israel's ruling circles with regard to the Arab countries.

These extremist circles, closely connected with American monopolies, will seek—relying on United States support—to carry out their predatory plans, which in turn can aggravate the situation in the Middle East still more and greatly heighten the danger to peace in that area.

Seeking to cover up gross intervention in the internal affairs of the Middle East countries and their aggressive policy with regard to these countries, the United States ruling circles resort to inventions about a threat to the Arab countries emanating from the Soviet Union. These slanderous assertions will deceive no one. The peoples

of the Middle East have not forgotten that the Soviet Union has always defended the self-determination of peoples, the gaining and consolidating of their national independence. They have learned from experience that in relations with all countries the Soviet Union steadfastly pursues the policy of equality and non-interference in internal affairs. They also know very well that the Soviet Union is actively supporting the right of each people to dispose of its natural wealth and use it at its own discretion.

It was not the Soviet Union, but Britain and France—the United States' chief partners in the North Atlantic bloc—which committed aggression against Egypt, inflicting great losses and suffering on the Egyptian people. This is borne out by the fresh ruins of Port Said and other Egyptian cities, as well as by the new plans for United States economic, political and military expansion in the Middle East proclaimed by the American President. These aggressive plans of the American imperialists express their striving for world domination, of which they speak now quite shamelessly, presenting this aspiration as the need for "energetic leadership" of the world by the United States.

In the days of hard trials for the Arab peoples it was the Soviet Union, and no one else, who came out as their sincere friend and, together with the peace-loving forces of the whole world, took steps to end the aggression against Egypt. All this is well known.

The United States President's message demands of the Arab countries that they give up all ties with the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist camp which base their relations with

the Arab states on the principles of equality and friendship, on the principles of the Bandung Conference. This demand of the United States rulers speaks for itself and unwittingly gives away the hidden schemes of those who would like to isolate the young independent Middle East states so that it may be easier to break their resistance to the colonialists and to carry out the predatory plans aimed at establishing the world domination of American imperialism. The policy of setting countries at loggerheads, any aspiration to sow the seeds of mistrust between peoples are alien to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union's foreign policy is based on the principle of peaceful co-existence of states, regardless of differences in their social systems, and the establishment of businesslike co-operation among the nations. It is generally known that, while strengthening its friendly ties with Egypt and other Arab countries, the Soviet Union has never sought to worsen the relations of those countries with the United States. Quite the reverse, it has stressed the need for ensuring lasting peace and creating a climate of confidence in this as well as in other areas of the world.

It is well known that the Soviet Union, as distinct from the United States, does not have and does not seek to have any military bases or concessions in the Middle East with the object of extracting profits, does not strive to gain any privileges in that area, since all this is incompatible with the principles of Soviet foreign policy.

The Soviet Union is vitally interested in the maintenance of peace in the Middle East area, situated as it is in direct proximity to its fron-

tiers. It is sincerely interested in consolidating the national independence of those countries and in their economic prosperity and regards this as a reliable guarantee of peace and security in that area.

In our age the national-liberation movement of the peoples is a historical force that cannot be repressed.

The Soviet Union, loyal to the great Leninist principles of recognising and respecting the rights of peoples, large and small, to independent development, regards as one of its prime tasks the rendering of every assistance and support to the countries fighting to consolidate their national independence and their sovereignty. That is why it welcomes the growing unity of the peoples of the Arab countries in their struggle for peace, security, national freedom and independence.

The Soviet Union opposes any manifestations of colonialism, any "doctrines" which protect and cover up colonialism. It is opposed to unequal treaties and agreements, the setting up of military bases on foreign territories, dictated by strategic considerations, and plans for establishing the world domination of imperialism. It proceeds from the premise that the natural wealth of the underdeveloped countries is the inalienable national possession of the peoples of those countries, who have the full right to dispose of it independently and to use it for their economic prosperity and progress. The need to strengthen peace and security demands the wide development of political, economic and cultural ties between all countries. The development of these ties is an important prerequisite for using the

achievements of contemporary science and technology for the good of mankind. The policy of establishing closed aggressive military blocs, such as NATO, SEATO and the Baghdad pact, and the raising of artificial economic barriers hampering normal relations between states seriously impairs the cause of peace. The Soviet Union, striving to render assistance to peoples fighting for the consolidation of their national independence and the earliest elimination of the aftermath of colonial oppression, is willing to develop all-round co-operation with them on the principles of full equality and mutual benefit.

The imperialist programme of colonialism, advanced by the United States, shows that the American ruling circles have not drawn the necessary conclusions from the failure of the aggression against Egypt. They are clearly trying to go back to the bankrupt "policy of strength." All this, far from easing tension in that area, on the contrary, aggravates the situation, increases the danger to peace in the Middle East and violates the peaceable principles of the United Nations, by which the General Assembly was guided in condemning the recent aggression against Egypt. The voice of war, and not the voice of peace, resounds in Mr. Eisenhower's message.

Authoritative Soviet circles hold that the steps with regard to the Middle East area outlined by the United States Government, which envisage the possibility of employing United States armed forces in that area, might lead to dangerous consequences, the responsibility for which will rest entirely with the United States Government.

*Izvestia*, January 13, 1957

## Soviet Government's Notes to Governments of Great Britain, the United States and France \*

February 11, 1957

The Foreign Ministry of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics presents its compliments to the Embassy of the United States of America and, on the instruction of the Soviet Government, has the honour to communicate the following:

As a result of the efforts of the peace-loving peoples, supported by the United Nations, an end has been put to the aggression against Egypt, a favourable situation has developed, and concrete possibilities have appeared for ensuring peace and for the settlement of international problems in the Middle East area.

The liquidation of the hotbed of war in that area has established the prerequisites for strengthening the national independence and sovereignty and for the economic development, not only of Egypt but also of all the Middle East countries, and has paved the way for extensive co-operation among the countries of this area and all other countries on the principles of equality among states, set forth specifically in the decisions of the Bandung Conference.

The peace-loving peoples had good reason to

---

\* This is the Note to the Government of the United States. The Notes to the governments of Great Britain and France were of analogous contents.

expect that, from now on, peace could be preserved and strengthened in the Middle East, that an end would be put to the policy of foreign interference in the domestic affairs of the countries in that area, that the sovereignty and independence of the Middle East countries would be sincerely respected, and that the countries of this area, and in particular the victim of aggression, Egypt, would be given disinterested economic aid.

Unfortunately, the *détente* in this area was short-lived, and the hopes of the peoples have not been justified.

The situation in the Middle East has again been seriously aggravated as a result of the unilateral steps taken by certain powers. This aggravation is being caused, first of all, by the fact that—without the consent of the United Nations, but at the discretion of a certain great power—the intentions exist of making unilateral use of the latter's armed forces in the Middle East with the aim of interfering in the domestic affairs of this area. There is also a plan to offer so-called economic aid to the Middle East countries only on the condition that these countries agree to sever all contacts with certain member-states of the United Nations—that is, if they accept the political conditions of this "aid," conditions incompatible both with these states' dignity and sovereignty, and with the high principles of the United Nations.

It cannot but be appreciated that the putting into practice of such a policy, in circumvention of the United Nations, would result in a dangerous new aggravation of the situation in the Middle East area—an area which has recently

been the scene of military operations resulting from the aggression against Egypt—and that it would endanger peace throughout the world.

These plans are nothing but a continuation of the policy of establishing closed aggressive groupings of the NATO, SEATO and Baghdad pact type, the policy of erecting artificial economic and political barriers, hampering normal contacts among states.

The Soviet Union's foreign policy stems from the principle of the peaceful co-existence of states, regardless of differences in their social and state systems. It is well known that, in establishing friendly relations with the Arab countries, far from striving to worsen these countries' relations with other great powers, the Soviet Union was, on the contrary, championing the need for broad international co-operation and insisting on the need to ensure a lasting peace and to create an atmosphere of trust in the Middle East area. The Soviet Union does not have, nor is she striving for, military bases or concessions in the Middle East countries for the purpose of extracting profits; she does not strive to acquire any privileges in this area, for all that would be incompatible with the principles of Soviet foreign policy.

The Soviet Union is vitally concerned that peace should prevail in the Middle East area, situated as it is in direct proximity to her frontiers. She has a sincere concern for the consolidation of the national independence of the Middle East countries and for their economic progress.

It is the opinion of the Soviet Government that the preservation of peace in the Middle East is indispensable, not only for the development of

the Middle East countries themselves, but also, as the recent events have shown, for ensuring the economic prosperity of many other countries as well.

The need to strengthen peace and security in the Middle East calls for the extensive development of political, economic and cultural contacts among all countries, and especially for joint efforts—efforts in line with the United Nations Charter—by the great powers which bear the main responsibility for safeguarding peace.

The Soviet Government believes it possible to ensure firm and lasting peace in that area through the joint efforts of the four great powers—the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain and France—i. e., the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, if all these great powers base their relations with the Middle East countries on the general principles of the policy of non-interference in their domestic affairs and respect for their national independence and sovereignty.

Proceeding from this, the Soviet Government is approaching the governments of the United States, Britain and France with a proposal that basic principles for peace and security in the Middle East and non-interference in the domestic affairs of the Middle East countries should be worked out and proclaimed. These principles could be made the cornerstone of a joint declaration, the adoption of which would eliminate the possibility of dangerous unilateral steps by individual great powers with regard to the Middle East countries, and which would help to strengthen peace and security in that extremely important area, and to

develop the national economies and consolidate the independence of those countries.

This declaration would, of course, be open for the accession of any state concerned for peace and security, and wishing to base its relations with the countries of the Middle East on these already stated principles.

The proposals with regard to the commitments respectively assumed by the signatories of the declaration could be communicated immediately to the governments and peoples of the Middle East countries.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs encloses herewith the principal theses for a draft declaration of the four powers—the USSR, the United States, Britain and France—proposed by the Soviet Government; and it would be grateful to the United States Embassy if it will inform it with regard to the acceptability to its government of the basic principles for a declaration on peace and security in the Middle East, and non-interference in the domestic affairs of countries in that area, set out in the draft.

Nor would the Soviet Government object to the governments of Britain, the United States, France and the Soviet Union making separate but identical declarations on their relations with the Middle East countries—declarations based on the principles set forth in the draft enclosed.

Supplement: Draft of "Basic Principles for a Declaration by the Governments of the USSR, the United States, Great Britain and France on Peace and Security in the Middle East and Non-Interference in the Domestic Affairs of the Countries of that Area".

*Basic Principles for a Declaration  
by the Governments of the USSR,  
the United States, Great Britain and France  
on Peace and Security in the Middle East  
and Non-Interference in the Domestic Affairs  
of the Countries of that Area*

The governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Republic of France, guided by the high peaceful aims and principles of the United Nations Organisation, set forth in its Charter,

declare their agreement that their policies with regard to the Middle East countries are based on the desire to establish peace and security in the Middle East and throughout the world;

recognise and respect the high principles of relations among states set forth at the Bandung Conference of Asian and African countries;

strive to create favourable conditions for the strengthening of the national independence and sovereignty of the Middle East countries;

express their sincere desire to promote, through joint and disinterested efforts, the economic progress of the countries of that area, proceeding all the time from the premise that the natural resources of the underdeveloped countries are the inalienable national property of their peoples, who have the full right to dispose of them and use them at their own discretion, in the interests of developing their national economies and promoting their progress.

The governments of the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain and France,

wish to assist in the all-round development of

economic, trade and cultural contacts between the Middle East countries and all other countries, on the basis of equality and mutual benefit,

consider that broad economic and commercial relations with the countries of this area are in the interests not only of these countries themselves, but are also in the interests of ensuring the economic prosperity of the other countries of the world,

recognise the need to settle peacefully by means of negotiations all international problems and disputes related to the Middle East.

Aware of the responsibility which they bear for the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world, the governments of the USSR, the United States, Britain and France pledge that they will abide by the following principles in their policy with regard to the Middle East:

(1) The preservation of peace in the Middle East through the settlement of all issues by peaceful means alone, and by means of negotiations.

(2) Non-interference in the domestic affairs of the Middle East countries; respect for their sovereignty and independence.

(3) The renunciation of all attempts to involve these countries in military blocs in which great powers participate.

(2) The liquidation of foreign bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of the Middle East countries.

(5) Reciprocal refusal to deliver arms to the Middle East countries.

(6) The promotion of the economic development of the Middle East countries without the attachment of political, military or other terms to this, incompatible with the dignity and sove-

reignty of these states.

The governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Republic of France express the hope that in their relations with the Middle East countries, other states will also abide by these principles.

*Izvestia*, February 13, 1957

**From Speech by Soviet Representative  
A. A. Sobolev at Plenary Meeting of  
11th Session of UN General Assembly  
on Withdrawal of Israeli Troops from Egypt**

February 26, 1957

The General Assembly has been compelled to resume its discussion of the Israeli Government's failure to comply with the demand of the United Nations Organisation on an immediate and complete withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from Egyptian territory.

It was to be expected that after hostilities had ceased on Egyptian territory the United Nations would make a maximum effort to eliminate the consequences of the aggression against Egypt as soon as possible and would prevent future interference in the internal affairs of the Arab states. Like all peace-loving peoples, the peoples of the Arab countries justly hoped that from now on peace in the Middle East could be preserved and strengthened. They expected a stop would be put to the policy of interference in the domestic affairs of the states in this part of the world, and

that Egypt, the victim of aggression, would be rendered selfless assistance in eliminating the consequences of the aggression against her.

However, as the Secretary-General's report of February 11 indicates, the Israeli Government not only continues to keep its forces on Egyptian territory, but is putting forward more and more demands in order to cover up its non-compliance with the General Assembly's decisions and to derive certain benefits from this. The Secretary-General pointed out, among other things, that the Government of Israel seeks to secure Israel's control over the Gaza Strip and to have other strategically important areas of Egyptian territory occupied by the United Nations forces for an indefinite period. . .

Israel's position is just what certain circles need in order to put the "Eisenhower Doctrine" into effect as soon as possible, and to interfere in the domestic affairs of Egypt and other Arab countries. In all its actions the Israeli Government fully relies on the support of the US ruling quarters, and above all, of the influential groups interested in establishing US military and economic influence in the Middle East.

One cannot fail to notice that a carefully premeditated operation is unfolding before the eyes of the whole world. In this operation Israel, the aggressor, is being told to be intractable and even to make increasing demands on Egypt and the United Nations, while the United States is being cast in the role of peace-maker who is supposed to help the United Nations overcome this intractability whereas in reality it is entrenching itself in the Middle East, either directly or at first as the United Nations force.

It is well known that the "Eisenhower Doctrine," which testifies to the United States' desire to pursue a policy of vast economic expansion and direct military aggression in the Middle East, to attempts to again foist the colonial yoke on the peoples of this region, has been resolutely rejected by the peoples of the Arab countries, just as it is being rejected by the peoples of other countries of the world. The peoples have correctly viewed these attempts as a real threat not only to the independence of Middle East nations, but also to general peace. This plan of military-economic expansion has been soundly criticised also in the most diverse quarters in the United States, the Congress included.

In these circumstances the United States Government and the Government of Israel are playing a subtle game trying to use the situation that has developed in such a way as to don the cloak of "arbiter" and "guarantor" in the Middle East, thus establishing its influence in this region. Aware that all peace-loving peoples condemn the aggressor United States ruling circles prefer the double game—by verbally urging the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Egyptian territory, while doing everything possible to prevent this withdrawal and to back up the aggressive policy of the Israeli extremist circles. Moreover, the men responsible for America's foreign policy are declaring that the United States Government will "guarantee" freedom of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba, provided Israel agrees to withdraw her troops from Egyptian territory.

It is well known that US Secretary of State Dulles, in a statement, reported in the American press on February 12, pointed out, under the

guise of working out a "compromise solution for the Arab-Israeli crisis in the Middle East," that the United States will pledge to support the principle of free shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba if this principle is violated. And, as American papers explain, the United States intends to exercise its control over the said region in an "effective way," i. e., with the use of its naval and other armed forces.

Secretary of State Dulles stated bluntly on February 19 that the United States intends to move its ships into the Gulf of Aqaba to give it the "status of an international waterway" and is prepared to "apply force" in that area.

In this way the United States intends to act unilaterally as a self-styled international guarantor or, to be more correct, an international policeman with respect to the Middle East countries. These intentions of the United States betray the true meaning of the "Eisenhower Doctrine." It is common knowledge that the authors and advocates of this doctrine are trying to convince the Arab and other countries, that this policy allegedly is directed against "communist infiltration." However, the case in point graphically proves that this policy is directed first and foremost against Egypt, which has fallen victim to aggression, because her policy was unpalatable to the Western imperialist circles.

This is a pertinent, graphic illustration of the "Eisenhower Doctrine" in action, especially since the United States armed forces are preparing to assist Israel, the aggressor, and not Egypt, the victim of this aggression.

Judging from recent press reports, the United States is drawing its NATO partners into a dan-

gerous gamble in the Middle East. These reports state that the United States Government is already discussing with them a draft joint declaration to proclaim the Strait of Tiran an international waterway. The United States Government is thus arrogating the right to dispose of the territorial waters of the Arab states as if they were its own. Is not the United States Government taking too much upon itself? And what will the peoples of the Arab countries concerned think when an attempt is being made to ignore their interests completely?

To make a long story short, the United States Government is going to reward Israel generously for the aggression against Egypt, entering into collusion with Israel at the expense of the interests of the nation which has fallen victim to the aggression. And all this is attempted to be passed off almost as a contribution to the cause of peace.

The American press has already reported, for instance, that the United States has proposed to offer aid to Israel in developing the areas it has wrested from Egypt, and, notably in setting up military bases there. According to press reports, Israel is to receive 122 million dollars from the United States under the "Eisenhower Doctrine," 96 million dollars worth consisting of shipments of arms and military equipment.

It is clear to everybody that Israel would never have unleashed the aggressive war against Egypt, and would have been far less likely to sabotage the General Assembly's demand for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from Egyptian territory, had she not had backers, who encouraged her actions, while seeking to put across their plans concerning Egypt

and other Arab countries.

There is nothing accidental about the United States' interest in establishing its domination in that area. This interest is quickened by the rich oil deposits available in the Arab countries. Only in a tense situation can the United States hope for any success in its plan. And for such plans Israel, with its "intractability," which is being dictated by the United States oil companies, is a real godsend.

One cannot fail to notice that the recent actions of Britain and France and the United States' other North Atlantic bloc partners have also been directed at exacerbating the situation in the Middle East.

It is common knowledge that Britain and France, who have unleashed the aggression against Egypt and tried to seize the Suez Canal, have made another attempt to impose their control over this canal. Together with the United States and Norway they have made a "take it or leave it" proposal to Egypt to conclude an "interim agreement" whereby the Suez Canal will in fact be removed from Egypt's sovereignty and place under the control of an international agency headed by the Western powers. This agreement stipulates, among other things, that the toll paid by ships going through the canal should not be credited to Egypt's account, but to the account of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Under this agreement 50 per cent of the collections should be set aside for Egypt so that she should see to the functioning of the canal, and the remaining 50 per cent, should be withheld pending the final settlement of the canal's status. This agreement is in fact nothing but

the well-known "Dulles plan" which was submitted to the London Conference in 1956 and which was turned down by Egypt. The same fate awaits the so-called new plan of the United States, Britain and France.

It is beyond any doubt that this policy of the United States and the actions of Britain and France, its allies in the North Atlantic aggressive bloc, have been instrumental in whetting Israel's appetite for aggrandisement.

As for the Israeli Government it is playing a dangerous game. It is well known that it was this government that launched the aggression against Egypt, to give Britain and France a formal pretext for hostile action against that country.

Through its refusal to remove its troops from Egyptian territory Israel is today seeking to lay the ground for interference in the affairs of the peoples of the area by the US ruling quarters, who while condemning Israel's policy in words, are actually inspiring Israel to persist in it, for this creates favourable opportunities for penetration into the Middle East.

The delegation of the Soviet Union wishes to draw attention to the importance of the problem of ensuring security in the Middle East. Now that the world has witnessed the British-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt, now that the "Eisenhower Doctrine" has been announced, this question has become a burning issue. It was in recognition of the necessity of ensuring a lasting and stable peace in the Middle East that the Soviet Government has proposed to the governments of the United States, Britain and France on February 11 that they undertake to base their Middle East policies on the following principles:

(1) The preservation of peace in the Middle East through the settlement of all issues by peaceful means alone, and by means of negotiations.

(2) Non-interference in the domestic affairs of the Middle East countries; respect for their sovereignty and independence.

(3) The renunciation of all attempts to involve these countries in military blocs in which great powers participate.

(4) The liquidation of foreign bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of the Middle East countries.

(5) Reciprocal refusal to deliver arms to the Middle East countries.

(6) The promotion of the economic development of the Middle East countries without making it conditional on any political, military or other terms incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of these states.

The Soviet Government has proposed to the governments of the United States, Britain and France that these six principles be enunciated in a joint declaration or in separate statements.

To accept such a declaration at this juncture will, in the Soviet Government's opinion, rule out the possibility of dangerous unilateral action by any of the great powers with regard to the Middle East countries and will contribute to strengthening peace and security in that all-important area, to advancing their national economies and consolidating their independence.

The six points suggested by the Soviet Government offer a workable and constructive programme of peace for the Middle East.

As regards overcoming the consequences of the aggression against Egypt, the most important is-

sue of the moment is, as has already been stated, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Egyptian territory.

The previous speaker, the Canadian representative Pearson, made an attempt in his statement to give equal treatment to Israel, the state which has committed the aggression, and Egypt which has suffered from it. Taking this line means encouraging the aggression.

The Soviet Union unreservedly supports the fair demand for the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from Egyptian territory—from the Gaza Strip and from the Gulf of Aqaba.

If Israel refuses to remove its forces from Egyptian territory in defiance of the General Assembly's repeated demands, the United Nations has the right to take drastic action against Israel in accordance with the United Nations Charter, to the extent of applying sanctions.

Since the implementation of such measures will require the members of the United Nations, and the organisation itself, to take definite action, the Soviet delegation would prefer a decision on this subject to be taken by the Security Council, inasmuch as such a decision would, by virtue of the United Nations Charter, be binding on all nations, unlike a General Assembly decision, which would be a mere recommendation. At the same time the fact should not be ignored that the Security Council has already prevented the adoption of a similar decision with regards to Israel. As is known Israel's partners in aggression—Britain and France—prevented the Council from adopting a resolution envisaging economic sanctions against Israel in November 1956.

In view of the above-said the Soviet delegation will support the draft resolution which has been introduced by the delegations of Afghanistan, Indonesia, Iraq, the Lebanon, Pakistan and the Sudan in which the General Assembly urges all states to deny Israel any military, economic or financial assistance, in view of her continuing to ignore the preceding decisions by the General Assembly.

*Izvestia*, February 28, 1957

### **TASS Statement on Preparations for New Aggression Against Egypt by Israel with Support of Western Powers**

March 28, 1957

Recent statements by certain Israeli statesmen and reports in the French press are speaking ever more frequently of preparations for new Israeli aggression against Egypt. Israeli statesmen have voiced open threats against Egypt. On March 19, the American magazine *Newsweek* published a statement by the Israeli Prime Minister, Mr. Ben-Gurion, which said that "Israel will start a war" if Israel's demand on navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba was not satisfied. The Israeli radio has broadcast Mr. Ben-Gurion's statement in Parliament that "if attempts are made to re-establish the situation which prevailed in the Gaza area four months ago on the basis of the armistice agreement, Israel will demand freedom of action and the opportunity to use her armed forces."

In making such provocative statements Israeli

statesmen are openly ignoring the decisions of the United Nations General Assembly, which condemned the actions of Israel and came out in defence of Egypt's legitimate national rights. At the same time they unequivocally point out that the United States has assumed some sort of guarantees to Israel against the Arab countries.

It is said that these guarantees were given under a gentleman's agreement between the American Secretary of State and the Israeli Foreign Minister, of which the French Prime Minister, M. Guy Mollet, and the Foreign Minister, M. Poincaré, were notified.

Moreover, foreign press reports say that the official representatives of the French Government have also assured Israel that France will fulfil her promises to support Israel in the event of Israel's aggression against Egypt being resumed. It is pointed out that, if need be, French air forces would be prepared to take part in an attack against Egypt and ensure air support for the Israeli forces. In this connection the steps taken in France in preparation for her participation in the new aggression against Egypt are being advertised.

It is noteworthy that press reports on preparations in France for new aggression against Egypt have not been repudiated by the French Government.

These circumstances cannot fail to attract the attention of world public opinion, which resolutely condemned the British, French and Israeli aggression against Egypt. They indicate that the colonialists and their henchmen are continuing to play with fire and are continuing their attempts to utilise Israel as the initiator of a new and dan-

gerous provocation against Egypt and other Arab states defending their sovereignty and legitimate rights.

It is stated in leading Soviet circles that the Soviet Government has been and remains a resolute opponent of the use of force against Middle East countries, as in international relations in general. New aggression against Egypt would create a dangerous situation and a direct threat of a large-scale military conflict, with dire consequences for the cause of peace. That is why these circles resolutely condemn the stand adopted by extremist circles in Israel, and also in France, who, instead of assisting the peaceful settlement of the situation in the Middle East, the artificially and deliberately exciting passions, aggravating the situation and preparing new and dangerous war gambles.

*Izvestia*, March 29, 1957

### **Statement by USSR Foreign Ministry on Imperialist Intrigues in Jordan**

April 29, 1957

It was not so long ago that the world was faced with serious trials in connection with the aggression against Egypt. As a result of the efforts of the peace-loving states and the unanimous condemnation of that aggression by the United Nations peace was restored in the Middle East and conditions were created for normalising the situation in that important area.

Today the situation in the Middle East has worsened once again. This time it is Jordan that has

become the object of imperialist intrigues. For the past two or three weeks crude pressure from outside has been brought to bear on Jordan and the Jordan Government. This is being accompanied, now by threats to dismember Jordan's territory and deprive the people of Jordan of their independence, now by promises of financial and other aid, provided the patriotic forces in Jordan opposing Jordan's submission to a foreign *diktat* are suppressed. No secret is made of the fact that, following Jordan, Syria and also Egypt, who resolutely reject the notorious "Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine" and every attempt to draw them into aggressive military blocs and to undermine their national independence and subjugate their foreign policy to the plans of the colonialist powers, may become the objects of similar colonialist actions.

The situation that exists in the Jordan area cannot fail to arouse the serious concern of the peace-loving states, including the Soviet Union, the interests of whose security call for peace and order in the Middle East. The Soviet Union is concerned with the situation existing over Jordan, not because of internal changes in Jordan of whatever nature they may be—such as, for example, changes in the government. Such questions are exclusively the internal affairs of each country, of each people. The Soviet Union cannot ignore the events in that area, because the situation in Jordan, and also the situation in the Middle East as a whole in connection with the events in Jordan, are the result of flagrant foreign interference, the result of a new imperialist plot which constitutes a grave threat to peace. This plot is designed to undermine the unity of the Arab peo-

ples, who are opposing colonialism and striving to consolidate their national independence, and to set the Arab countries against one another with the obvious hope that in the resulting circumstances it would be easier to reimpose the colonialist yoke on the Arab peoples and to plunder their resources.

It was precisely with this aim in view that a new and dangerous centre of clashes and conflicts has been created. That this is a fact is borne out by the failure of the United States Government and also the governments of other Western powers to voice their condemnation of the provocative military preparations carried on by Israel, as well as by Iraq and certain other members of the Baghdad pact. The extremist ruling circles of Israel, and also of Iraq, who is being used as an instrument by foreign imperialist circles, do not conceal their plans for attacking Jordan in the event of the internal situation in that country developing contrary to the wishes of the colonialist powers and the participants in the aggressive Baghdad bloc. It is well known that military preparations are being openly and demonstratively carried out on Jordan's frontiers, with Israel playing a particularly unsavoury role on this occasion, too.

The Soviet Government would be shirking its duty if it ignored these new schemes with regard to the countries of the Middle East. As in the past, it is basing itself on the necessity of giving the peoples of the Middle East an opportunity to settle their own internal affairs and to determine their foreign policy without external interference. The peoples of these states have repeatedly proved that they are opposed to plans for setting up

aggressive military blocs in the Middle East and plans for foreign colonialist expansions.

Guided by the need to protect the states of the Middle East from foreign interference and thus assist in strengthening their national independence and peace in that area, the Soviet Government proposed that the four powers—the USSR, the United States, Britain and France—should declare that foreign interference in the internal affairs of the countries of the Middle East is inadmissible. It also put forward a number of other proposals, the implementation of which would bring about a healthier atmosphere in the Middle East.

Since the governments of the United States, Britain and France were not prepared to make such statements and assume the obligation not to interfere in the internal affairs of the countries of the Middle East, the Soviet Government in its Notes to the governments of the United States, Britain and France dated April 19, 1957, proposed that the four powers should declare their condemnation of the use of force as a means of settling outstanding issues in that area. The Soviet Government regrets that no reply has been made to its proposal by the governments of the three Western powers, although the situation in the Middle East has been further worsened and immediate steps should be taken to halt the dangerous course of events.

Instead of preventing such a development of events in the Jordan area and, by their condemnation of the use of force, dampening the ardour of those who continue to engage in sabre-rattling, the United States has itself dispatched its Sixth Fleet to the eastern coast of the Mediterranean—an overt military demonstration against the

countries of the Arab East which is further worsening the situation.

The current events in that area also shed light on the real role played by the United States in the recent aggression against Egypt. It is an example of how the imperialist circles of the United States are trying to secure a foothold in the Middle East and to oust Britain and France from that area in order to take their place, subjecting the peoples of that area to still greater colonial oppression. The insistence with which these circles are attempting to implement their plans shows that these are not isolated episodes but a striving to achieve a situation in which the American tycoons would hold complete sway in the Middle East. Fearing above all a consolidation of the unity of the countries of the Arab East, they are attempting to separate these countries and artificially to foment contradictions between them according to the old precept of the colonialists: "Divide and rule!"

But while the aggressive circles of the United States which are to blame for the current events in the Middle East are attempting to sow discord among the Arab countries, the vital interests of the Arab peoples, on the contrary, make imperative their cohesion and unity in the struggle for the preservation of their independence and sovereignty. Victory in the just national cause of the Arab peoples will depend primarily on their unity, their cohesion, which has already led, with the support of other peace-loving peoples who took a firm stand in defence of Egypt's legitimate rights, to the failure of the aggression against Egypt. It is beyond doubt that a similar failure also awaits the organisers of the present plot

against the independence of the Arab peoples which has led to the events in Jordan. The tide of the development of the peoples of the East who have taken the wide road of independent national development cannot be turned back.

Events in Jordan are an apt illustration of the widely advertised "Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine." Although only a short period has elapsed since it saw the light, its real imperialist nature has become sufficiently clear. Yesterday it was Egypt, today it is Jordan, and tomorrow some other Arab state may become the object of the imperialist plot.

The events in Jordan and the subsequent intentional worsening of the situation in the Middle East are the "Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine" in action. These events in themselves are sufficient to reveal whom this "doctrine" serves, and the aims of its initiators and propagandists abroad.

It is no mere accident that as soon as a settlement of the Suez issue appeared in sight in conformity with the legitimate rights of the Egyptian state, and as soon as a possibility appeared for normalising the situation in the Middle East the circles which are interested in maintaining international tension set out to worsen the situation in that area, this time over Jordan. The question thus arises of whether these circles of the United States who are chiefly to blame for the present situation, wish to transform the area of the Middle East into a constant centre of provocations and military conflicts. This can be desired only by the enemies of peace, the advocates of the "policy of strength," the advocates of an arms race who cannot stomach an easing of international tension.

The new worsening of the situation in connection with the events in Jordan is fraught with grave danger. It may lead to dire consequences. It is self-evident that the responsibility for the possible effects of the present situation rests with the Western powers who are intent on worsening the situation in the Middle East, and with the United States above all.

*Izvestia*, April 30, 1957

**USSR Foreign Minister A. A. Gromyko's Replies  
to Correspondents' Questions on the Situation  
in Syria, Oman and the Yemen**

September 10, 1957

Question by "Pravda" correspondent: Could you say what is behind the anti-Syrian campaign launched by the United States, the United Kingdom and Turkey?

Reply: It is common knowledge that an anti-government conspiracy prepared by certain foreign circles has recently been uncovered in Syria. The purpose of the conspiracy was to overthrow the Syrian Government and replace it by a reactionary puppet government which would please the big foreign monopolies and carry through a policy in conformity with the interests of the colonial powers. The failure of this conspiracy enraged its organisers.

The foreign press carries extensive reports stating that the organisers of the conspiracy against Syria, having lost hope of their agents inside the

country succeeding, are seeking to prepare armed provocations on the frontier with Syria in order to take advantage of them for armed intervention in Syria's internal affairs. Eisenhower's and Dulles' special emissary, the American diplomat Henderson, recently toured the Middle East. The American press itself does not conceal that his tour of that area and the talks which Henderson has had in Turkey and the Lebanon have been connected with these plans to strangle Syria as an independent state.

This journey is a typical illustration of the actions by the master-minds of the conspiracy against Syria, who, like Egypt, is now in the forefront of the heroic struggle of the peoples of the East against colonialism.

The master-minds behind these plans would obviously prefer to have others pull the chestnuts out of the fire. Look what they are doing now. They want to set on Syria certain Arab states, such as, for instance, Iraq, Jordan and the Lebanon. They are adopting the stick and carrot policy. Yet they have to take into consideration the fact that the governments of certain Arab states which are not averse to serving the colonialists, who have knocked together the so-called Baghdad pact, are one thing, and the peoples of those countries, who are trying to get rid of colonialism and who owe no allegiance to the aggressive Baghdad bloc, are another.

Taking this into account, the organisers of the conspiracy are searching for more reliable people to execute their plans. They are paying special attention to Turkey in this connection, persuading her to act as a kind of gendarme in the Middle East. It must be said bluntly that the Turkish

leaders, to judge by everything, are inclined to take this road, evidently caring little for the fact that Turkey, following this, may land in an abyss. It seems to us that it would be dangerous for Turkey to be guided in this case by the advice of those who want to make her execute the adventurist plans for unleashing war in the Middle East.

Today the position is such that Turkish troops are being concentrated along Syria's frontiers and, in addition to political pressure and attempts to impose an economic blockade against Syria, a threat of armed intervention in the internal affairs of Syria is created. The question arises: How would Turkey like it if troops of a foreign state were concentrated along her frontiers?

The Soviet Government would like to believe that the Turkish statesmen will be far-sighted and will not place Turkey in a situation fraught with great misfortunes for her. Perhaps someone is counting on a war gamble against Syria remaining a local conflict. But these are dangerous calculations. Even in the past it was difficult to localise military conflicts. It will be recalled that both the First and the Second World Wars were preceded by local military actions by the aggressors. What this led to can still be seen in the ruins of hundreds upon hundreds of towns in Europe and other parts of the world, let alone the countless losses in human lives. If the present situation and especially the development of military techniques are taken into consideration, it must be recognised that the risks of local military conflicts turning into a big conflagration of war have become much greater.

We should not like to believe that there are

men in Turkey who could dream of reviving the Ottoman Empire, which oppressed many countries in the Middle East and on the ruins of which was set up the national Turkish state, whose independence the Soviet Union has profoundly respected and continues to respect. It is well known that the Soviet state, from the very inception of the new Turkey, immediately extended a hand of friendship to Turkey, courageously fighting under the leadership of Ataturk, who raised the banner of his country's independence. The Soviet Union now, too, seeks to maintain with Turkey the most friendly and good-neighbourly relations. But that is precisely the reason why we want nothing to cloud the development of these relations.

Everything that is now going on around Syria is nothing but the "Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine" in action. It is common knowledge that an attempt was made to crush Egypt last year, and when this could not be brought about by political threats, economic pressure and blackmail, armed aggression was launched against that country. Now they want to crush the people of Syria. The colonialists would like to see Syria as their helpless victim, to bring her back to the former position of subordination and dependence. The anti-Syrian campaign, which is particularly frenzied in the United States, once again shows that they stoop to anything. In so doing they are ready to declare that every Syrian patriot who stands for his country's independence is all but a Soviet agent.

The organisers of the present conspiracy against Syria are resorting to fabrications alleging that Syria, like other Arab countries, is all

but threatened with "communisation" by the Soviet Union. US statesmen are most zealous in this connection.

Significant in this respect is President Eisenhower's statement read by Secretary of State Dulles to correspondents on September 7. The statement points out that the United States is going to expedite the implementation of measures with regard to the Middle East countries, envisaged by that doctrine, and expresses feigned concern over the fairy tale conceived in America about the possibility of "aggressive actions" by Syria against her neighbours. The statement also contains an ill-concealed attempt to drive a wedge between the people of Syria and the Syrian Government which, expressing the will of the people, rejects imperialist dictation.

The American press was not slow in interpreting this statement as some "warning" addressed to the Soviet Union in connection with the events in Syria and the situation in the Middle East. It goes without saying that all the fabrications implicating the Soviet Union in these events were needed in order to divert public attention from the aggressive actions by the United States in the Middle East, especially against Syria.

In order to see to whom the warning should be addressed, let it suffice to put the following questions:

Who sends a special representative to the Middle East for the implementation of the plans for strangling Syria as an independent state—the Soviet Union or the United States? — The United States Government does this.

Whose navy is plying the Eastern Mediterra-

near off the shores of the Arab states, and Syria in particular—the Soviet or the United States navy?—It is the United States Sixth Fleet.

Who is seeking to place Syria and other Arab states in the vice of an economic blockade in order to break their resistance to the imperialists—the Soviet Union or the United States?—The United States is doing this, first and foremost, for the sake of the selfish interests of the oil magnates.

Who is staging massacres of Arab patriots and democratic forces in the Arab countries as, for instance, has been the case in Jordan—the Soviet Union or the United States?—The United States and its hangers-on in certain Arab countries are doing this.

Lastly, who conceived a special “doctrine” to sanctify all these actions which are alien to the interests of the Arab peoples and are trampling underfoot the principles of the United Nations—the Soviet Union or the United States?—The Government of the United States.

All this goes to show to whom the warning should be addressed.

As for the allegations that there has been a threat of “aggressive” actions by Syria against neighbouring states, it may be asked why the United States Government, if it has such misgivings, does not raise the question in the Security Council. It is common knowledge that if there is a threat to peace by one state or another, let alone a violation of peace, the matter must be brought immediately to the notice of the Security Council, which must take measures in accordance with the United Nations Charter. However,

the United States Government is not appealing to the United Nations on this question, and not without reason. The US statesmen know full well that the "aggressive" intentions attributed to Syria are an invention.

The Soviet Union demands that an end be put to the imperialist encroachments on the independence of countries and that an outbreak of war in that region be prevented, while the United States ruling circles are grossly and brazenly interfering in the internal affairs of the states of that area in an attempt to put another colonial yoke upon them.

The lovers of easy profit, reaching out for goods that belong to others, should not forget, however, that colonial slavery and plunder is a thing of the past, that Syria is a member of the United Nations and has many reliable friends. The advocates of armed intervention in the affairs of Syria should bear in mind the lessons of the fiasco of last year's gamble against Egypt.

As for the Soviet Union, pursuing as it does a policy of peaceful co-existence and co-operation among peoples on an equal footing, it cannot ignore such developments which constitute a definite threat to peace and security in the Middle East. This is understandable, since the Soviet Union cannot but be concerned when, in an area directly adjacent to its frontiers, provocateurs are active, threatening to unleash war.

Question by "Izvestia" correspondent: The Soviet public is concerned about the British aggression in Oman. Have you any comments on these events?

Reply: The British ruling circles are trying

to create the impression that the struggle of the people of Oman has ended and that there is now no reason to discuss this matter. Such statements, however, are calculated to mislead the public and evade responsibility for the continuing armed aggression against the people of Oman. In actual fact the national armed forces of Oman, as Mohammed El-Harsi, the Oman representative in Cairo, said recently, have not laid down their arms and are waging guerilla warfare against the invaders.

It will be recalled that the representatives in the Security Council of the United Kingdom and of the countries supporting it on this question, prevented a discussion in the Security Council on the Oman question, which was submitted by 11 Arab countries. Nevertheless the fact cannot be concealed that jet planes, artillery and armoured forces are now being used before the eyes of the whole world to massacre the people of Oman solely because they want to decide their own destiny, because they, like other peoples of Asia and Africa, want national independence.

The imperialists would like this question—unpleasant as it is for them—to be hushed up. However, it is impossible to keep silent—that would mean approving their actions. The Soviet people have always raised their voices in defence of the rights of any people, no matter how small, that is fighting for its independence and sovereignty.

Soviet people, like all honest people throughout the world, deeply resent the foreign armed intervention in the internal affairs of Oman. The events in Oman, one would think, will attract the attention of the 12th session of the United

Nations General Assembly, which must say its weighty word in defence of Oman.

Question by "Krasnaya Zvezda" correspondent: The Yemen Legations in London and Washington have issued statements on raids by British bombers on towns and villages in the Yemen. Could you comment on the attack by British armed forces on the Yemen?

Reply: The Yemen has for several decades been an independent state. The Yemen is a member of the Arab League and the United Nations and it is carrying through an independent peace-loving policy. The Yemen has refused to join the aggressive Baghdad pact and has not accepted the colonialist "Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine." Such a policy on the part of the Government of the Yemen displeases the colonialists who, in violation of their obligations under the United Nations Charter, are using armed forces against the Yemen and are bombing Yemeni towns and villages.

There is no need to dwell at length on the fact that the Soviet Union, in this case too, denounces the use of force against a sovereign Arab state upholding its independence.

It must be supposed that all the peace-loving states and the United Nations, which will meet in session before long, will have their say on this question, too, and will come out in defence of the Yemen's independence.

We should like to hope that all peace-loving states and the United Nations which will in the near future assemble for its session, will voice their opinion on this issue as well, and will come out in defence of the Yemen's independence.

*Izvestia*, September 11, 1957

## Soviet Government's Statement on Events in Middle East

July 16, 1958

On July 15 the whole world learned with indignation of the armed intervention by the United States of America in the Lebanon. Ships of the United States Sixth Fleet entered the port of Beirut and landed marines on the territory of the Lebanon.

On the same day the White House—in the name of the President of the United States—issued a statement attempting somehow to justify this flagrant military intervention in the Lebanon's internal affairs. The statement alleges that the United States has sent its troops to the Lebanon to demonstrate United States concern for the integrity and independence of the Lebanon, which, so it claims, is being threatened from without, and also to protect American citizens in that country.

The complete absence of any grounds for this contention is self-evident, for no one is threatening the Lebanon's integrity and independence. Abundant evidence of this is provided, for example, by the statement of the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld, and by the report of United Nations observers on the situation in the Lebanon. As for "concern" for the safety of American citizens, one may be permitted to ask what standards of international law allow foreign powers to send their armed forces to the territories of other states for such purposes. There are no such standards in international law. It is common knowledge, however, that references

to the need to protect their citizens have, from time immemorial, been a favourite device of all colonialists to justify gangster-like attacks on small countries.

The real reason for United States armed intervention in the Lebanon is the desire of the oil monopolies of the United States and other Western powers to retain their colonial hold on countries of the Middle East, and also the obvious bankruptcy of their policy in the Arab East and the collapse of the Baghdad pact and of the notorious "Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine."

This is borne out in a striking way by the latest events in Iraq, which the White House statement regards as a reason which speeded up armed intervention by the United States. However, the events in Iraq are fresh proof of the Arab peoples' unflinching determination to rid themselves of colonial dependence and to take their destiny into their own hands.

It is well known that on the night of July 13, the monarchy in Iraq was overthrown by the army, supported by the people; a republic was proclaimed and a Government of the Republic of Iraq was set up.

The first acts of this government, led by General Abdel Kerim Kassem, in the sphere of foreign policy were statements expressing full support for the principles of the Bandung Conference, withdrawal from the aggressive military Baghdad pact, and recognition of the United Arab Republic.

The Government of the Republic of Iraq declared that it would "act in accordance with the principles of the United Nations," would "follow an Arab policy and strictly abide by the decisions

of the Bandung Conference," and that it was prepared "to honour commitments and treaties springing from the interests of the motherland." It also announced that it guaranteed the security of foreign nationals and their property.

These actions are evidence of the government's intention to defend the country's national independence and to strive, together with the other freedom-loving Arab peoples, to overcome the grievous aftermath of colonialism, to develop the national economy and to raise the living standards of the people.

It is natural that the policy statements of the Government of the Republic of Iraq, being in accordance as they are with the desires of the Iraqi and all other Arab peoples, should meet with unanimous support, both in Arab countries and in all peace-loving countries which regard the establishment of a republic as an entirely internal affair of the people of Iraq.

This turn in events in the Middle East obviously does not suit the colonial powers, which received the news of the establishment of the Republic of Iraq with undisguised hostility. Feverish activity began immediately in Washington, London and Ankara.

The existence of plans for large-scale intervention by the colonial powers in the internal affairs of countries of the Arab East is also borne out by the statement by the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, that the British Government had been informed in advance of the United States Government's intention to land its troops in the Lebanon, that the British Government fully supported this action of the United States and that the British armed forces in the area were

being kept ready.

In order to provide a pretext for armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Arab countries a statement by the Lebanese President Chamoun asking the governments of the United States, Britain and France to send troops to the Lebanon, was inspired. It is well known, however, that the present events in the Lebanon are a result of purely internal causes and that only interference by countries of the Baghdad pact and the United States, seeking to preserve an anti-national regime at any cost, has led to civil war and to a worsening of the entire situation in the area.

It should be noted that the landing of American troops in Beirut is an act of armed intervention, not only against the Lebanon, but also against all the freedom-loving Arab countries. No bones are made about this in, for instance, the afore-mentioned White House statement, which—certainly not by accident—links the dispatch of troops to the Lebanon directly with the events in Iraq. This is also borne out by the fact that King Hussein of Jordan, obviously on advice from his patrons, has proclaimed himself the head of the now non-existent Iraqi-Jordanian federation in place of King Feisal, deposed by the Iraqi people, even though he had neither substantive nor formal grounds for this. The provocative nature of this step is self-evident, and the fact is being ignored that the Government of the Republic of Iraq, supported by the whole of the people, has officially announced Iraq's withdrawal from the Iraqi-Jordanian federation.

Armed intervention by the United States in the Lebanon shows clearly that the imperialists have

cast off their disguise and have begun open aggression against peace-loving Arab peoples. In this connection it becomes particularly clear why the Government of the United States did not accept the Soviet Government's proposal of February 11, 1957, concerning non-interference by the great powers in the internal affairs of the countries of the area. The Government of the United States refused to undertake commitments which would have ensured peace and eased the tension in that part of the world.

It wanted to keep its hands free for aggression in the area.

United States armed intervention in the Lebanon creates a grave threat to peace and is fraught with far-reaching consequences. The peoples cannot remain unconcerned in face of this brazen imperialist aggression, this gross encroachment on the sovereignty and national independence of the Arab countries and this unceremonious violation of the principles of the United Nations.

The White House plea that American troops are being sent to the Lebanon for purposes of self-defence and in the national interests of the United States is open mockery of these principles. Who does not know that the United States lies thousands of kilometres from the Lebanon and that the people of the Lebanon and other Arab countries can in no way threaten either the national interests or the security of the United States? As for the Lebanon, it is precisely American armed intervention that is the main threat to the security of this small Arab country.

Having taken to the road of flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, the Government of the United States is now attempting to con-

front the Security Council and the whole of the United Nations with a *fait accompli* and to bring pressure to bear on the United Nations to make it approve the unilateral aggressive actions of the USA.

The Soviet Government considers that the situation in the Middle East—a situation created by open aggression on the part of the United States, supported by other colonial powers—is an alarming one and is dangerous to world peace. In these circumstances, the Security Council and the United Nations General Assembly should take urgent and vigorous measures to curb aggression and to protect the national independence of Arab states which have fallen victim to an unprovoked attack.

The Soviet Government urges the Government of the United States to cease its armed intervention in the internal affairs of Arab countries and to withdraw its troops from the Lebanon immediately.

The Soviet Government declares that the Soviet Union cannot remain indifferent to events creating a grave menace in an area abutting on its frontiers, and reserves the right to take the necessary measures dictated by the interests of peace and security.

*Izvestia*, July 17, 1958

### **Soviet Government's Statement on United States and British Aggression in Middle East**

July 18, 1958

On July 17, the Government of the United Kingdom committed an act of armed aggression

against Jordan-British airborne units landed in the Jordan capital, Amman.

Attempting to justify this open armed intervention in the internal affairs of this Arab state, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan, insisted in the House of Commons that it was undertaken to help the Jordanian Government to resist aggression, although it is common knowledge that Jordan is threatened by no one, and the British Prime Minister was unable to give any facts or instances testifying to the existence of such a danger. The British Prime Minister said further that these actions of the British Government were fully supported and approved by the Government of the United States. Thus, the British Government has supported the United States, aggression, while the Government of the United States supports Britain's aggression.

Britain's intervention in Jordan, undertaken right after the American invasion of the Lebanon, shows that the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have a broadly conceived plan of aggressive actions to suppress the national-liberation movement in the Arab East. They want to impose the yoke of colonialism on the peoples once again and to retain the possibility for American and British monopolies to continue plundering the natural resources and manpower of these countries.

By their decision on armed intervention in Jordan, the ruling circles of Britain, pretending to help King Hussein, are attempting to regain their colonialist positions in the country, which were forfeited to a considerable extent in 1956 when, on the demand of the Jordan people, the British military advisers, headed by Glubb Pasha, who

actually controlled the Jordan army, were expelled from the country.

It can be seen from the British Prime Minister's statement that the purpose of Britain's armed intervention in Jordan is not only to suppress the movement of the Jordan people for their independence, but to entrench itself in Jordan and use this country, along with American-occupied Lebanon, as a military base for the suppression of the popular revolution in Iraq. At present the United States and Britain are hastily conditioning public opinion to the further extension of the American-British armed intervention against the nations of the Arab East.

One cannot fail to see that the governments of the United States and Britain have embarked upon the road of armed interference in the internal affairs of other countries, a practice categorically prohibited by international law and the United Nations Charter.

This path of military ventures is fraught with the gravest consequences for peace, and those who embark upon it must realise that the peoples will make them answer for these aggressive actions. Who better than the British Government should realise, particularly after the shameful failure of the military venture against Egypt, that the time has gone forever when the fire of colonialist gun-boats and the landing of armed detachments in this or that colonial or dependent country could crush the uprisings of the oppressed peoples and save the colonialist regimes.

Today, when hundreds of millions of formerly oppressed colonial peoples have started a struggle for their national rights, any attempts to prevent these nations from achieving their indepen-

dence are doomed to failure. The sacred right of the peoples to shape their life as they think fit is proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations, which was signed also by the United States and Britain.

The United States and British governments have broken their commitments to the United Nations and have come out as violators of peace.

The aggressors should bear in mind that all the peoples, particularly the Moslem population in the Middle East and the adjacent areas, will not be indifferent to the fate of the peoples who have fallen victim to foreign armed intervention. The peoples of the Arab East are not alone in their struggle for independence and freedom, against the criminal actions of the American and British colonialists.

The peoples of the entire world condemn with wrath and indignation the American and British aggressors. A wave of protest against the bloody venture of the United States and British ruling circles in the Middle East has surged throughout the world, including Britain herself. The peoples demand an immediate end to the armed intervention of the United States and Britain, they demand the withdrawal of the American and British troops from the Lebanon and Jordan.

The governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have committed hostile acts against peace and they bear the responsibility for the consequences of their acts of aggression against the Lebanon and Jordan.

The governments of the United States and the United Kingdom must end their armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Arab States and withdraw their troops at once from the Lebanon

and Jordan.

The Soviet Government believes that at this crucial moment the Security Council and the United Nations General Assembly must fulfil their duty of safeguarding peace, must curb the aggression, uphold the national independence of the Arab states which have fallen victim to an unprovoked attack, and must stamp out the hotbed of war.

The Soviet Government declares that the Soviet Union will not remain indifferent to the acts of unprovoked aggression in an area adjacent to its frontiers, and that it will be compelled to take the necessary steps dictated by the interests of the Soviet Union's security and of safeguarding world peace.

*Izvestia*, July 19, 1958

### **Soviet Government's Note to Government of Israel**

August 1, 1958

The Soviet Government considers it necessary to make the following statement to the Government of Israel:

Since the first days of the armed intervention of the United States and Britain against the Lebanon and Jordan, American and British military planes have been making extensive use of the air space of Israel for transferring British occupation troops to Jordan, for supplying them from bases in Cyprus and other points in the Middle East and Europe and also for staging "demon-

trations of strength."

According to a statement by officials of the United Kingdom, the Israeli Government "has given its unconditional permission" for these flights of British and American military planes taking part in the aggressive actions of the United States and Britain in the Middle East.

This attitude of the Israeli Government makes Israel a direct accomplice in the aggressive actions of the United States and Britain against the peoples of the Lebanon, Jordan and other Arab states.

The Soviet Government draws the attention of the Government of Israel to the full gravity of the possible consequences of such an attitude on the part of Israel at a time when the threat to peace in the Middle East has increased. The Soviet Government also considers it necessary to draw the attention of the Government of Israel to the fact that, by placing its air space at the disposal of Britain and the United States, it bears responsibility for the heightened tension in the Middle East, which can develop into a conflict with extremely dangerous consequences for the national interests of Israel herself.

*Izvestia*, August 2, 1958

**Statement by USSR Foreign  
Minister A. A. Gromyko at New York  
Press Conference**

August 22, 1958

The delegation of the Soviet Union has invited you here, taking into consideration the wishes of

the representatives of the press and radio who want to know how we assess the results of the special emergency session of the UN General Assembly.

It should first of all be pointed out that the Soviet delegation is satisfied with the results of the session of the General Assembly that has just concluded, as the session, in adopting the resolution which you know about on the subject that was under discussion, took an important step towards easing the tension in the Middle East caused by the aggression of the United States and Britain against the Lebanon and Jordan.

The Assembly's resolution reflected the will of the peoples who have demanded, and still continue to demand the earliest withdrawal of foreign troops from the Lebanon and Jordan, as it unequivocally speaks of the need for an early withdrawal of the forces of the United States and Britain from the territories of those countries. No pretexts or subterfuges can help to escape this fact and any attempts to read a different meaning into the contents of the resolution are utterly unfounded.

It is sufficient to read the statements of the delegates to the session in order to see that the overwhelming majority of the delegations, including the delegations of countries bordering on the United States, which is very gratifying, have spoken in favour of the withdrawal of the British and American troops. The neighbours of the United States know, too, what even indirect approval of the United States' armed intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, not to mention direct approval, would have meant for their own destinies.

By accepting the proposal of the 10 Arab countries, the Assembly has vigorously condemned foreign interference in the internal affairs of the Middle East countries. It has not only refused to support the actions of those who, in violation of the Charter of our Organisation, undertook armed intervention in the internal affairs of two sovereign Arab states, but also, expressing the will of the overwhelming majority of countries, has declared that the internal affairs of the Arab peoples must be settled by those peoples themselves.

In this way the United Nations has taken up a most determined stand in defence of its own Charter, and this is a very good thing, as there have been quite a few attempts in recent years to reduce this Charter to a scrap of paper, although it bears the signatures of nearly all the states of the world, including the signatures of the great powers. The resolution adopted contains an appeal to all the United Nations member-countries to act in their international relations in strict conformity with the principles of respect for one another's territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, and strict non-interference in one another's internal affairs. Who will deny that this appeal constitutes an unequivocal warning to all those who have grossly violated the principles of the United Nations by committing armed intervention against the Lebanon and Jordan.

Perhaps some people will choose to pretend that it is only with reservations that the principles of international relations approved by the Assembly can be applied to the Arab states, and that some of the Arab countries are still not able to do without foreign bayonets. But there cannot

be two yardsticks here, of course. Non-interference in internal affairs is one of the basic principles of international relations—a principle that is equally binding on the Arab states and on the United States, Britain and all other countries.

By reaffirming once again the principle of non-interference by one set of powers in the affairs of others, the Assembly has gone on record against the "doctrines" of all kinds that are being used in an attempt to justify expansion and aggression against the countries of the Middle East. This conclusion cannot be disputed, even though some delegations did not speak openly about this, for reasons that are obvious to everyone. It is no accident that there have, in fact, been no statements in the Assembly in defence of such doctrines.

It would certainly be wrong to assume that now, when a good resolution has been approved by the General Assembly, everything has been done to settle the situation in the Middle East. It is not enough to pass a good resolution; it is necessary to ensure that it is enforced and, moreover, quickly. No procrastination must be permitted in enforcing it. It must be said that a certain share of responsibility in this connection devolves on the United Nations Secretary-General who, we hope, will facilitate the early withdrawal of foreign troops. It would be ignoring the will of the Assembly, if anyone were to hide behind the Secretary-General's back in an attempt to drag out the withdrawal of the troops. It seems to us that the United Nations must be on the alert in this connection.

The decision adopted by the Assembly shows that the overwhelming majority of its members

have rejected the attempts of the United States and Britain to get their armed aggression approved, or at least to secure approval for their policy of prolonging the occupation of the Lebanon and Jordan. The well-known letters from the US State Secretary and from the British Foreign Secretary to the President of the Assembly, which the Assembly ignored, and also the draft resolution tabled on behalf of Norway and some other countries, but actually reflecting the viewpoint of the United States and Britain, have represented precisely such attempts.

Another positive fact to be noted is that the Assembly did not let itself be led astray from the consideration of the main subject—the withdrawal of troops—by talk about plans for the “economic development” of the Arab countries, plans for the creation of United Nations armed forces or any other similar projects which have nothing to do with the task of ending the tension and the critical situation in the Middle East brought about by the action of the United States and Britain.

In face of the almost unanimous condemnation of the United States’ and Britain’s intervention in the Middle East, those responsible for it are now making the best of a bad job, starting to praise to the skies the Arab nationalism which they were abusing only yesterday. The words they are uttering today are difficult to believe. They are scarcely being taken seriously by the Arab peoples, who are well aware of the value of the change of front arising from considerations of the moment.

It is necessary to deal with one more important aspect of the resolution approved by the General Assembly. This resolution indicates that the Arab

countries have taken what is not a bad step towards their unity. This experience shows that unity of the Arab countries is possible, once their actions are based on the interests of peace, on the national interests of the Arab peoples, and not on the alien interests of foreign circles who regard the Arab world as an object for expansion.

It is to be hoped that this experience will be instrumental in rallying the Arab states for the sake of defending and strengthening their independence and sovereignty. This is the sole wish for the Arab peoples from the Soviet Union, which is vitally interested in the Middle East becoming an area of lasting peace rather than an area of imperialist intrigues and military provocations where there has been a continuous piling up of explosives for a number of years and, consequently, a growing danger of an explosion fraught with grave consequences for the cause of peace.

It would certainly be too optimistic to conclude that the dangers of the policy of playing on artificially created contradictions between individual Arab states and of new attempts at pitting them one against the other have now been removed. The powers which through their action have brought about the present strained situation in the Middle East area, may, all things considered, persist in their attempts to divide the Arab states and to profit from differences between them. It can be said just as confidently, however, that it is becoming more and more difficult to carry out this policy in relation to the Arab states.

Many people may ask why the Soviet Union has taken up such an adamant position on the question of the withdrawal of the United States'

and Britain's troops from the Middle East and is insisting on their immediate withdrawal. This question does not seem to be a difficult one to answer. The countries of the Middle East are our neighbours, and the Soviet Union, all our people are far from being indifferent to what is going on in that area. The presence of foreign troops on the territories of the Middle East countries, the setting up of foreign military bases and the weaving of all kinds of intrigues there, presenting a danger of a breach of the peace in that area, constitute a direct threat to the security of the Soviet Union. We are convinced that only those who are blind or those who deliberately shut their eyes to realities can fail to see this.

The Soviet Union also proceeds on the basis of the fact that the tension in that area, let alone a breach of the peace, represents a danger to world peace in general.

This is the reason why the Soviet Union is so adamant on this question and why it has repeatedly drawn the attention of the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and many other countries to the danger of the situation which has developed in the Middle East.

The Soviet Union has more than once tried to reach agreement with the Western powers on steps to put an end to foreign interference in the internal affairs of the Middle East countries and to let the people of those countries settle their internal affairs without any interference from outside. We regret that these attempts have so far been unsuccessful. It is to be hoped that the General Assembly's resolution stating that there must be no interference by some states in the internal affairs of others will compel the Western

powers, and above all the United States, to make a more sober assessment of the situation in the Middle East and renounce their policy of flagrant interference in the internal affairs of the countries of that area.

All that has been said permits us to express satisfaction with the results of the emergency session of the General Assembly, which was called at the Soviet Union's suggestion, and which, as the Soviet delegation pointed out at the final meeting yesterday, has done a very good job.

*Izvestia*, August 24, 1958

### **Soviet Government's Note to Government of Israel**

September 5, 1958

The Soviet Government deems it necessary to state the following in connection with the Israeli Government's Note of August 12, 1958:

The Israeli Government actually admits its complicity in the Anglo-American aggression against the Arab countries, since according to its own statement, it permitted British and American aircraft to use Israel's air space for transporting British occupation troops and equipment to Jordan. It tries to justify its participation in the Anglo-American intervention in Jordan by asserting that the flights of American and British planes through Israel and the military occupation of Jordan were carried out at the request of the Jordanian Government, allegedly for Jordan's defence against the threat of external attack.

This explanation of Israel's complicity in the Anglo-American aggression against the Lebanon and Jordan is utterly lame. It is well known that attempts by the United States and Britain to cite King Hussein's appeals for military assistance were refuted at the special emergency session of the UN General Assembly as a manoeuvre to cover up their acts of aggression against the Arab East. Britain's military intervention in Jordan was resolutely condemned by the said session of the UN General Assembly, which unanimously adopted a decision on the early withdrawal of American and British troops from the Lebanon and Jordan.

The attempt of the Israeli Government to justify its complicity in the aggression against the Arab countries by referring to the alleged weakness of the United Nations in assuring the observance of the UN Charter is groundless because the principles of the United Nations Charter are being violated by those forces which are flagrantly interfering in the internal affairs of the Middle East countries and which have committed aggression against the Lebanon and Jordan.

Israel's complicity in this aggression does not by any means indicate her concern for the observance of the United Nations Charter. If that were so she should not support the aggressors but the forces that are safeguarding peace and opposing the policy of doctrines aimed at interference in the internal affairs of other states.

In its Note the Israeli Government declares that it is striving for peace with the neighbouring Arab countries. However, as far as its relations with the Arab countries are concerned, its actions are quite the contrary. Had the Israeli Govern-

ment really been striving for peace with its neighbours, it would not have participated in the Anglo-American aggression against the Arab countries, and would in no case have allowed British and American planes to use its air space to transport troops and armaments to Jordan; its officials would not have threatened to seize the western part of Jordan.

The Soviet Government still considers that the Government of Israel bears no small share of responsibility for the tense situation existing in the Middle East.

*Izvestia*, September 7, 1958

### **From Joint Communiqué on Talks Between USSR and United Arab Republic**

Both sides have thoroughly examined the situation in the Middle East and have condemned the policy of imperialism, which is a source of constant tension in that region. The Soviet Union expresses its full support for the Arab people's struggle against this policy of the imperialist forces, which are seeking to revive military-colonial blocs in the Arab East and to split the forces that are fighting against colonialism and neo-colonialism.

The Soviet side fully supports the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian Arabs. It supports the struggle and the efforts of Arab states against the aggressive intrigues of the imperialist forces that are seeking to exploit the Palestinian problem for the purpose of exacerbating tension in the Middle East.

The two sides have examined the situation existing in the south of the Arabian Peninsula. They have condemned the policy of oppression which is being carried out by the colonial power in Aden and in the Arab South of the Arabian Peninsula. Both sides express their full support for the courageous struggle of the Arab people for the realisation of their aspirations for freedom and self-determination. In this connection, they urge the British Government to carry out the decisions of the United Nations.

Both sides reaffirm their support for the Omani people in the struggle against colonialism. They draw the attention of the United Nations commission on decolonisation to the need for ending the colonial system in Oman and giving its people the opportunity to re-establish their sovereignty over their territory and its natural wealth.

*Pravda*, May 19, 1966

### **In the USSR Foreign Ministry**

A few days ago the Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of Israel was asked to come to the USSR Foreign Ministry where he was handed a statement in connection with Israel's unceasing acts of aggression against the neighbouring Arab states.

The statement pointed out that the Soviet Government had drawn the attention of the Government of Israel more than once to repeated aggravations of the situation in the Middle East resulting from the policy pursued by external imperialist forces and Israeli extremist and militarist circles,

a policy spearheaded against the sovereignty and independence of the neighbouring Arab states. The situation in this region has been the subject of many discussions by the UN Security Council, and it continues to trouble the world public.

The Soviet Government, the statement said, could not fail to notice the armed incident between Israel and Syria on April 7, in which the Israeli side permitted herself to engage in open military operations involving aviation, tanks and artillery against the Syrian Arab Republic. Israel's dangerous playing with fire in a region situated in the direct vicinity of the Soviet Union's boundaries, was accompanied by statements confirming Israel's desire to settle Israeli-Arab controversies from a position of strength. For example, the Chief of the Israeli General Staff declared that Israel's armed attack of April 7 was not the last and that Israel herself would choose the forms, methods and time for fresh similar acts.

The Statement by the USSR Foreign Ministry emphasised that in this way the world was once again faced with an act of aggression by Israel which displayed an aptitude for adventurism, jeopardising the cause of peace.

As for the April 7 attack on Syria, the Soviet Government deems it necessary to again warn the Government of Israel of the danger stemming from the risky policy Israel has pursued for several years now, and for which it will bear full responsibility. The Soviet Government expects that the Government of Israel will carefully assess the prevailing situation, and will stop going along with those who, displaying political shortsightedness, are prepared to reduce their country to something like a toy in the hands of hostile

external forces, thus threatening their people's vital interests and the very destiny of their country.

The Israeli Ambassador said he would deliver the statement to his government.

*Pravda*, April 27, 1967

### **Soviet Government's Statement on Situation in Middle East**

May 24, 1967

A situation giving rise to anxiety with regard to the interests of peace and international security, has been taking shape in the Middle East in recent weeks.

After the armed attack by Israeli forces on the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic on April 7 this year, the ruling circles of Israel continued to inflame the atmosphere of war hysteria in the country.

Leading statesmen, including Foreign Minister Eban, openly called for large-scale Israeli "punitive" operations against Syria and for "a decisive blow" to be struck against her.

The Defence and Foreign Policy Committee of the Knesseth (Parliament) on May 9 granted the government powers to carry out military operations against Syria. Israeli troops which had been moved to the frontiers of Syria were alerted. Mobilisation was proclaimed in the country.

It is quite clear that Israel could not act in this way if it were not for the direct and indirect encouragement it has had for its position from certain imperialist circles which seek to restore colo-

nial oppression to the Arab lands.

These circles regard Israel in the present conditions as the main force against the Arab countries which pursue an independent national policy and resist pressure from imperialism.

Israeli extremists apparently hoped to take Syria by surprise and alone, but they miscalculated. Showing solidarity with the courageous struggle of the Syrian people who are upholding their independence and sovereign rights, the Arab states—the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Algeria, the Yemen, the Lebanon, Kuwait, the Sudan and Jordan—declared their determination to help Syria in the event of an attack by Israel.

The United Arab Republic, honouring its commitments of alliance for joint defence with Syria, took steps to contain the aggression.

Considering that the presence of UN troops in the Gaza area and the Sinai Peninsula would, in this situation, give Israel advantages for staging a military provocation against Arab countries, the UAR Government asked the United Nations to pull out its troops from this area.

A number of Arab states voiced their readiness to place their armed forces at the disposal of the Joint Arab Command to repel Israeli aggression.

As is known, the Soviet Government, in connection with the April 7 armed provocation, warned the Government of Israel that it would bear the responsibility for the consequences of its aggressive policy.

It appears that a reasonable attitude has not yet triumphed in Tel Aviv. As a result Israel is again to blame for a dangerous worsening of tension in the Middle East.

The question arises: What interests does the

state of Israel serve by pursuing such a policy? If they calculate in Tel Aviv that it will play the role of colonial overseer for the imperialist powers over the peoples of the Arab East, there is no need to prove the lack of foundation for such calculations in this age when the peoples of whole continents have shaken off the fetters of colonial oppression and are now building an independent life.

For decades the Soviet Union has been giving all-round assistance to the peoples of the Arab countries in their just struggle for national liberation from colonialism and for the advancement of their economy.

Let no one, however, have any doubts about the fact that should anyone try to unleash aggression in the Middle East he would be met not only by the united strength of the Arab countries but also by the strong opposition to aggression of the Soviet Union and all peace-loving states.

It is the firm belief of the Soviet Government that the peoples have no interest in kindling a military conflict in the Middle East.

It is only a handful of colonial oil monopolies and their hangers-on who can be interested in such a conflict. It is only the forces of imperialism, with Israel following in the wake of their policy, that can be interested in it.

The Soviet Government keeps a close watch on the developments in the Middle East. It proceeds from the fact that the maintenance of peace and security in the area directly adjacent to the Soviet borders meets the vital interests of the Soviet peoples.

Taking due account of the situation, the Soviet Union is doing and will continue to do everything

in its power to prevent a violation of peace and security in the Middle East and to safeguard the legitimate rights of the peoples.

*Pravda*, May 24, 1967

### **Soviet Government's Statement**

June 5, 1967

On June 5, 1967, Israel started military actions against the United Arab Republic, thus committing aggression. The armed forces of the United Arab Republic are waging battles against Israeli troops who have invaded the territory of the UAR.

Taking part in hostilities on both sides are tanks, artillery and aviation.

The Arab Republic of Syria has taken the side of the United Arab Republic and is giving it armed assistance in repelling aggression. Jordan has declared that it is in a state of war with Israel and that it will give military support to the United Arab Republic. Iraq, Algeria and other Arab states have also announced their support for the UAR with their armed forces and resources.

Thus, a military conflict has flared up in the Middle East because of the adventurism of the rulers of one country, Israel, which has been encouraged by the covert and open actions of certain imperialist circles.

That country has been pushed into those dangerous actions by leaders who keep on saying that they are waging a struggle for the existence of Israel as a state. Yet if there is anything that can undermine most of all the foundations for the

development and the very existence of the state of Israel, it is the course of recklessness and adventurism in policy which has been chosen by the Israeli ruling circles today.

The Israeli Government cannot say that it was not aware of what course it was taking. Nor can it say that it was not clear to it what position peace-loving states would take in the event of it launching a war of aggression.

The Israeli Government knew that war could be avoided. That is what it was called upon to do by the Soviet Union and other peace-loving states. But it chose the road of war. There can be no doubt that the venture undertaken by Israel will rebound first of all upon Israel herself.

The Soviet Union, loyal as it is to its policy of helping peoples who are victims of aggression, and of helping states newly liberated from colonial oppression, declares its resolute support for the governments and peoples of the United Arab Republic, Syria, Iraq, Algeria, Jordan and other Arab states and expresses confidence in the success of their just struggle for their independence and sovereign rights.

In condemning Israeli aggression, the Soviet Government demands that the Israeli Government—as the first urgent step to end the military conflict—should immediately and unconditionally stop its military actions against the United Arab Republic, Syria, Jordan and other Arab countries and pull back its troops beyond the truce line.

The Government of the USSR expresses the hope that the governments of other states, including the great powers, will, for their part, do everything they can to extinguish the conflagration of war in the Middle East and restore peace.

The United Nations must discharge its direct duty—condemn the Israeli actions and promptly take steps to restore peace in the Middle East.

The Soviet Government reserves the right to take all steps that may be necessitated by the situation.

*Pravda*, June 6, 1967

### Soviet Government's Statement to Israeli Government

June 7, 1967

The Soviet Government addressed the following statement to the Israeli Government on June 7:

"Reports are coming in from various sources that the resolution of the United Nations Security Council on an immediate cease-fire and ending of all hostilities is not being carried out by the Israeli side.

"Israel is grossly and blatantly trampling this decision under foot and is continuing the war against the Arab states.

"This stand of the Israeli Government is additional proof of the aggressive nature of your policy, which disregards elementary standards of international relations and openly shows disregard for the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter.

"The Soviet Government has explicitly warned the Government of Israel against pursuing a policy of aggression and adventurism. The Israeli leaders, however, have not listened to the voice of reason.

"If the Israeli Government now does not immediately abide by the common demand of states for an immediate ending of the shooting, which is expressed in the Security Council's resolution, the Soviet Union will revise its attitude in respect to Israel and take a decision concerning the further maintenance of diplomatic relations with Israel, which by its actions is opposing itself to all peace-loving states.

"It goes without saying that the Soviet Government will consider and implement other necessary measures stemming from Israel's aggressive policy."

*Pravda*, June 8, 1967

**From Statement by Central Committee  
of Communist and Workers' Parties and  
Governments of Poland, Hungary, GDR, USSR,  
Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia**

June 9, 1967

Those attending the meeting studied the situation created in the Middle East by Israel's aggression, which is the result of the collusion of certain imperialist forces and first of all, the United States, against the Arab countries.

Those taking part in the meeting exchanged views on the measures necessary to cut short the aggression and to avert its consequences, which are dangerous to the cause of universal peace.

Those taking part in the meeting find it necessary to draw the appropriate conclusions from the fact that Israel did not comply with the decision

of the Security Council and did not stop its military actions against the Arab states.

The occupation of the territory of Arab states by Israeli troops would be used for the restoration of the foreign colonial regime.

On June 9, despite the cease-fire statement by the Government of Syria, Israeli troops conducted a new offensive on Syria's border, subjecting Syrian towns to barbaric bombing.

Struggling against imperialism for their freedom and independence, for the integrity of their territories, for their inalienable sovereign right to decide independently all questions of their domestic life and foreign policy, the peoples of the Arab countries are upholding a just cause.

The peoples of the socialist countries are completely on their side.

The peoples of the United Arab Republic and a number of other Arab countries have scored historic victories in recent years in the field of winning national independence and freedom.

Important social transformations in the interests of the working masses of the people have been carried out.

We express our confidence that these gains will be preserved and that progressive regimes will be consolidated, despite the difficulties in the path of the Arab peoples.

At a difficult hour for the states of the Arab East, the socialist countries declare their full and complete solidarity with their just struggle and that they will render them aid in the cause of repelling aggression and defending their national independence and territorial integrity.

The states taking part in this meeting demand that Israel immediately stop its military actions

against the neighbouring Arab countries and withdraw all its troops from their territories to behind the truce line.

It is the duty of the United Nations to condemn the aggression. If the Security Council does not take the appropriate measures, a grave responsibility will rest with those states which failed to fulfil their duty as members of the Security Council.

Resolute concerted actions by all peace-loving and progressive forces and all those who treasure the cause of the freedom and independence of the peoples are necessary today as never before.

If the Government of Israel does not stop its aggression and withdraw its troops behind the truce line, the socialist states which signed this statement will do everything necessary to help the peoples of the Arab countries to administer a resolute rebuff to the aggressor, to protect their lawful rights, to extinguish the hotbed of war in the Middle East and to restore peace in that area.

The just struggle of the Arab people will triumph!

*Pravda*, June 11, 1967

### **Soviet Government's Note to Government of Israel**

June 10, 1967

The following Note from the Soviet Government to the Government of Israel was handed to the Israeli Ambassador in the USSR on June 10:

The news has just reached here that Israeli troops, ignoring the Security Council's resolution on the termination of military operations, are proceeding with these operations, seizing Syrian territory and are advancing in the direction of Damascus.

"The Soviet Government has warned the Government of Israel that it bears the full burden of responsibility for its perfidy and its glaring violation of the Security Council decisions.

"Unless Israel immediately halts its military actions, the Soviet Union, jointly with other peace-loving states, will adopt sanctions against Israel, with all the consequences flowing therefrom.

"The Soviet Government states that in view of the continued Israeli aggression against Arab states and its gross violation of the Security Council resolutions, the Soviet Government has decided to sever the Soviet Union's diplomatic relations with Israel."

*Pravda*, June 11, 1967

**From Speech by A. N. Kosygin, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at Special Emergency Session of UN General Assembly, June 19, 1967**

If the events in the Middle East are analysed, the conclusion will unfailingly be reached that the war between Israel and the Arab states, too, did not result from some kind of misunderstanding or inadequate understanding of one another by the parties concerned. Nor is this just a local conflict. The events that have taken place recently in the Middle East in connection with the armed

conflict between Israel and Arab states must be considered precisely within the context of the general international situation.

I do not want to go into details, but basic facts have to be mentioned in order to give a correct assessment of what has happened.

What were the main features in the relations between Israel and the Arab countries during the past year? They were the continually increasing tension and the mounting scale of attacks by Israeli troops against one or another of Israel's neighbours.

On November 25, 1966, the Security Council censured the Government of Israel for a carefully planned "large-scale military action" against Jordan in violation of the United Nations Charter, and warned that if such actions were repeated, the Security Council would have to consider "further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter." Israel, however, did not want to draw the lesson from this.

On April 7, this year, Israeli troops launched an attack against the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic. It was a large-scale military operation involving planes, tanks and artillery. Following this, Israel provoked new military incidents on her frontier with Jordan.

Once again Israel was warned by a number of states about responsibility for the consequences of the policy she was pursuing. But even after that the Israeli Government did not reconsider its course. Its political leaders openly threatened "more extensive military actions against Arab countries."

The Prime Minister of Israel made it clear that the armed attack on Syria in April was not the

last step and that Israel was herself going to choose the method and time for new actions of this kind. On May 9, this year, the Israeli Parliament authorised the Government of Israel to carry out military operations against Syria. Israeli troops began concentrating at the Syrian frontier and mobilisation was carried out in the country.

In those days the Soviet Government, and I believe others too, began to receive information to the effect that the Israeli Government has timed for the end of May a sudden strike at Syria in order to crush her and then carry the fighting over into the territory of the United Arab Republic.

When the preparations for war entered the final stage, the Government of Israel suddenly began to spread, both confidentially and publicly, profuse assurances of its peaceful intentions. It declared that it was not going to start hostilities and was not seeking a conflict with its neighbours.

Literally a few hours before the attack on the Arab states, the Defence Minister of Israel swore that his government was seeking peaceful solutions. "Let diplomacy work," the Minister was saying at the very moment when the Israeli pilots had already received orders to bomb towns in the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. Unprecedented perfidy, indeed!

On June 5, Israel started war against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. The Government of Israel flouted the Charter of the United Nations and the standards of international law, and thus showed that all its peaceful declarations were false through and through.

What followed is well known.

Here, within the United Nations, I will only recall the arrogance with which the unbridled aggressor ignored the Security Council's demands for an immediate cease-fire.

On June 6 the Security Council proposed an end to all hostilities as a first step towards the restoration of peace, Israel extended the operations on the fronts.

On June 7 the Security Council fixed a time-limit for stopping all hostilities. The Israeli troops continued their offensive, and Israeli aircraft bombed peaceful Arab towns and villages.

On June 9 the Security Council issued a new and categorical demand prescribing a cease-fire. That was also ignored by Israel. The Israeli Army mounted an attack against the Syrian defence lines with the aim of breaking through to the capital of that state—Damascus.

The Security Council had to adopt yet another, its fourth, decision, and a number of states had to sever diplomatic relations with Israel and give a firm warning about the use of sanctions before the Israeli troops stopped military actions. In fact, the greater part of the territory of Arab countries now actually occupied by Israel was seized after the Security Council had taken the decision on an immediate cessation of hostilities.

The facts irrefutably prove that Israel bears the responsibility for unleashing the war and for the victims and the consequences of that war.

However, if anyone needs additional proof that it was Israel who unleashed the war in the Middle East and that she is actually the aggressor, that proof has been furnished by Israel herself.

It is impossible to interpret in any other way the refusal of the Israeli Government to support

the Soviet Union's proposal that a special emergency session of the UN General Assembly should be called. If the government of Israel had not been conscious of its guilt before the peoples of the world, it would not have been so afraid of our discussion and of those decisions which this General Assembly must take.

Israel has no arguments that would justify her aggression. Her attempts to justify herself, like the attempts of her advocates to whitewash the policy and actions of Israel, which are based on assertions that the attack on the Arab states was an action which Israel was forced to take and that the other side left her no alternative, are a deception.

If Israel had any claims against her neighbours, she should have come here to the United Nations and should have sought a settlement here, by peaceful means, as is prescribed by the UN Charter. After all, Israel claims to be entitled to the rights and privileges offered by membership of the United Nations organisation. But rights cannot exist in isolation from duties.

More and more reports are coming in about atrocities and acts of violence committed by the Israeli invaders on the territories they have seized.

What is going on in the Sinai Peninsula and in the Gaza Strip, in the western part of Jordan and on the Syrian soil occupied by the Israeli troops, brings to the mind the heinous crimes perpetrated by the fascists during the Second World War. The indigenous Arab population are being evicted from Gaza, Jerusalem and other areas. In the same way as Hitler Germany used to appoint gauleiters in the occupied regions, the Israeli Go-

vernment is establishing an occupation administration on the territories seized and is appointing its military governors there.

Israeli troops are burning villages and destroying hospitals and schools. The civilian population are deprived of food and water and of all means of subsistence. There have been instances of prisoners of war and even women and children being shot and of ambulances carrying the wounded being set on fire.

The United Nations cannot overlook these crimes. The Security Council has already addressed itself to the Government of Israel with a demand that the safety, wellbeing and security of the population in the occupied regions be ensured. That resolution is in itself an accusation against the aggressor. The United Nations must compel Israel to respect international law. Those who are the master-minds behind the crimes on the occupied territories of the Arab countries and those who commit those crimes must be sternly called to account.

Loyal to the principle of rendering aid to the victims of aggression and supporting the peoples who are fighting for their independence and freedom, the Soviet Union has resolutely come out in defence of the Arab states. We warned the Government of Israel both before the aggression and during the war that if it had decided to take upon itself the responsibility for unleashing a military conflict, that government would have to pay in full measure for the consequences of that step. We still firmly adhere to this position.

When the question is one of war and peace, and of protecting the rights of peoples, there must be no place for political zigzags. It does, of

course, happen that in order to solve this or that problem, states chart several possible routes. But in such matters as the one which is being considered now by the emergency session of the General Assembly there is no alternative to resolute condemnation of the aggressor and those forces that stand behind him; there is no alternative to the elimination of the consequences of the aggression. There is no other way to bring about the cessation of the aggression and to rein in those who might wish to embark on new adventures in the future.

It may be asked: "Why is the Soviet Union so resolutely opposing Israel?" However, gentlemen, the Soviet Union is not against Israel—it is against the aggressive policy pursued by the ruling circles of that state.

Throughout its 50 years' history, the Soviet Union has regarded all peoples, large or small, with respect. Every people enjoys the right to establish an independent national state of its own. This constitutes one of the fundamental principles of the policy of the Soviet Union. It was on this basis that we formulated our attitude to Israel as a state, when we voted in 1947 for the United Nations' decision to create two independent states, a Jewish one and an Arab one, on the territory of the former British colony of Palestine. Guided by this fundamental policy, the Soviet Union was later to establish diplomatic relations with Israel.

While upholding the rights of peoples to self-determination, the Soviet Union just as resolutely condemns attempts by any state to pursue an aggressive policy in relation to other countries, a

policy of seizing foreign lands and subjugating the people living there.

What, however, is actually the policy of the state of Israel?

Unfortunately, throughout most of Israel's history the ruling circles in Israel have pursued a policy of conquest and territorial expansion that has cut into the lands of neighbouring Arab states, evicting or even exterminating, in the process, the indigenous population of those areas.

This was the case in 1948-49, when Israel forcibly seized a sizeable portion of the territory of the Arab state whose creation the UN decision had envisaged. About a million people found themselves evicted from their homeland and condemned to hunger, suffering and poverty. Throughout all these years, deprived of a country and of the means of subsistence, these people have remained in the position of exiles. The acute problem of the Palestinian refugees, created by Israel's policy, remains unsolved to this day, constantly increasing tension in the region.

This was also the case in 1956, when Israel became a party to aggression against Egypt. Her forces invaded Egyptian territory along the same routes as today. At that time Israel also tried to retain the lands seized, but she was obliged to go back, beyond the armistice lines, under the powerful pressure exercised by the United Nations and the majority of its members.

The members of the United Nations are well aware that through all the years that followed, Israel committed aggressive acts, either against the United Arab Republic, or against Syria or Jordan. Never was the Security Council convened so often in those years as it was to consider ques-

tions relating to conflicts between Israel and the Arab states.

As we have seen, the very recent aggressive war unleashed by Israel against the Arab countries is a direct continuation of the policy which the extremist ruling groups in Israel have continued to impose upon their state throughout its existence.

It is this aggressive policy that is resolutely and consistently opposed by the Soviet Union, together with other socialist countries and all peace-loving states.

The duty of the United Nations is to force Israel to obey the demands of the peoples. If the United Nations were to fail in this, it would not be fulfilling its noble function, the function for which it was created, and the peoples' faith in this organisation would be shaken.

Only on the path of peace, on the path of renunciation of the aggressive policy towards neighbouring states can Israel assert herself among the countries of the world.

We would not have been consistent and fair in estimating Israel's policy, if we did not declare with all certainty that in her actions Israel has enjoyed outside support from certain imperialist circles. Moreover, those powerful circles made statements and took practical actions which could only have been interpreted by Israeli extremists as direct encouragement to commit acts of aggression.

For example, how else could one describe the fact that on the eve of the Israeli aggression a plan was urgently devised in the United States and the United Kingdom—and this was widely reported in the press—for establishing an inter-

national naval force to bring pressure to bear on the Arab states? How else could one describe the military demonstrations by the American Sixth Fleet off the coasts of the Arab states, and the build-up of the British Navy and Air Force in the Mediterranean and the Red Sea area, or the increase in the deliveries of modern arms and ammunition for the Israeli Army?

The campaign of incitement against the Arab states and their leaders was promoted especially in the United States and West Germany. In the Federal Republic of Germany, in particular, it was announced that discriminatory financial measures against the Arab states had been introduced. The recruitment of so-called volunteers for Israel started in several West German towns.

Significantly, after the start of hostilities, when in the first hours of the armed clash the Soviet Union strongly condemned the Israeli aggressors and demanded universal condemnation of their perfidious acts, an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of troops beyond the armistice lines, the very same forces which could not be termed other than accomplices in aggression, did all they could to help Israel to gain time and carry out new conquests and achieve her aims.

As a result, the Security Council found itself unable to take the decision which was prompted by the existing emergency. That is why the responsibility for the dangerous situation in the Middle East rests squarely, not only with Israel, but also with those who backed her in those events.

At the present time extremist belligerent circles in Tel Aviv claim that their seizure of Arab territories, engineered by them, provides them—and

this they have the effrontery to assert—with grounds for presenting new demands to the Arab countries and peoples.

An unbridled anti-Arab propaganda campaign, played up by the press in certain western countries, is being conducted in Israel: the force of arms is being extolled; new threats are being voiced against the neighbouring countries, and it is being declared that Israel will not heed any decision, including that of the present session of the UN General Assembly, unless it meets her claims.

The aggressor is in a state of intoxication. The long-nurtured plans for carving up again the map of the Middle East are now being put forward. The Israeli leaders are proclaiming that Israel will not leave the Gaza Strip or the western banks of the River Jordan. They are claiming that Israel intends to maintain her control over the whole of Jerusalem, and are asserting that in the event of the Arab countries being reluctant to comply with Israeli demands, the Israeli forces will simply remain in their present positions.

What is the attitude of the United States and British governments to the Israeli claims? In actual fact they are encouraging the aggressor here as well. In what other way can the aggressor interpret their attitude in the Security Council, which blocked the adoption of the proposal for an immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops behind the armistice lines? The words in support of the political independence and territorial integrity of the Middle East countries coming lavishly from the US representatives would only make sense if those uttering them were to reject in no uncertain way the territorial claims of the aggressor and

were to favour the immediate withdrawal of troops.

In putting forward a programme of annexation, Israel seems to have completely lost a sense of reality and has set out on a very dangerous path. Any attempt to consolidate the results of aggression is bound to fail. We are confident that the United Nations will reject attempts to impose on the Arab peoples a settlement that might jeopardise their legitimate interests and hurt their feelings or self-respect.

Territorial conquests, if they were to be recognised by various states, would only lead to new and perhaps bigger conflicts. Consequently, peace and security in the Middle East would remain illusory. Such a situation cannot be permitted to arise, and one may rest assured that this is not going to happen. Attempts to consolidate the fruits of aggression will in the long run act as a boomerang against Israel and her people.

By occupying territories of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria, Israel is continuing to challenge the United Nations and all peace-loving states. That is why the main task of this Assembly is to condemn the aggressor and take steps for an immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops beyond the armistice lines. In other words, the task is to clear all the territories of Arab countries, occupied by the Israeli forces, of the invaders.

The Israeli aggression has resulted in paralyzing the Suez Canal, an important waterway which has been transformed by the invaders into a line on the battle front. The Soviet Union is making a categorical demand that the Israeli forces be

immediately removed from the banks of the Suez Canal and from all occupied Arab territories.

Only the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the territories seized can change the situation in favour of a *détente* and the creation of conditions for peace in the Middle East.

Is it not clear that unless this is done, and unless the forces of the Israeli invaders are evicted from the territories of Arab states, there can be no hope of settling other unsolved problems in the Middle East?

Those who unleashed war against the Arab states should not cherish hopes that they may derive certain advantages from this. The United Nations, which is called upon to serve the cause of preserving peace and international security, must use all its influence and all its prestige in order to put an end to aggression.

In demanding that aggression be condemned and the troops withdrawn from the seized territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, the Soviet Government is proceeding from the need to preserve peace, and not only peace in the Middle East. It must not be forgotten that there are many regions in the world where there are bound to be persons eager to seize foreign territories and where the principles of territorial integrity and respect for the sovereignty of states are far from being honoured. If Israel's claims do not receive a rebuff today, tomorrow a new aggressor, big or small, may attempt to overrun the lands of other peaceful countries.

The peoples of the world are watching closely to see whether the United Nations will be able to administer a fitting rebuff to the aggressor and safeguard the interests of the peoples of one of

the major regions of the world—the Middle East. The present developments in this region give rise to anxiety on the part of many states from the point of view of their own security. And that is quite understandable.

If we here, in the United Nations, fail to take the necessary measures, even those states which are not parties to the conflict may draw the conclusion that they cannot expect protection from the United Nations. In order to enhance their security they may set out on the path of an arms build-up and increase their military budgets. This would mean that funds earmarked for the development of the national economy and the improvement of the living standards of the people would be channelled to an ever greater extent into the arms race. Those who cherish peace, cannot and must not allow events to take this course.

There is another important aspect of the aggression perpetrated by Israel. The point is that this aggression was aimed at toppling the existing regimes in the United Arab Republic, Syria and other Arab countries, which, by their determined struggle for the consolidation of national independence and the progress of the peoples, arouse the hatred of the imperialists, and on the other hand, this is countered by solidarity and support on the part of the peoples who have set out on the path of independent development. Therefore, to permit the actions of Israel against the Arab states to go unpunished would mean opposing the cause of the national liberation of peoples and the interests of many states of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The Soviet Union does not recognise the territorial seizures of Israel. True to the ideals of

peace and the freedom and independence of the peoples, the Soviet Union will undertake all measures within its power, both in the United Nations and outside this organisation, in order to achieve the elimination of the consequences of aggression and promote the establishment of lasting peace in the region. This is our firm and principled course. This is our joint course together with other socialist countries.

On June 9 the leaders of the Communist and Workers' Parties and governments of seven socialist countries declared their full and complete solidarity with the just struggle of the states of the Arab East. Unless the Government of Israel ceases its aggression and withdraws its troops beyond the armistice lines, the socialist states "will do everything necessary to help the peoples of the Arab countries to administer a resolute rebuff to the aggressor, to protect their lawful rights, to extinguish the hotbed of war in the Middle East and to restore peace in that area."

No state, however far it may be situated from the area of aggression, can remain aloof from the problem which has been proposed for discussion at the present emergency session. The problem concerns war and peace. In the present tense international situation hours or minutes can settle the fate of the world. If a curb is not put on the dangerous developments in the Middle East, South-East Asia or any other place where peace is being violated, and if conflicts are permitted to spread, the only possible outcome today or tomorrow will be a major war. And not a single state would be able to remain on the sidelines.

No state or government, if it genuinely displays concern for peace and for preventing a new

war, can reason that if some incident takes place far from its borders, it can regard it with equanimity. Indeed, it cannot.

A seemingly small incident or so-called local wars may grow into big military conflicts. This means that each state and government should not only refrain from bringing about new complications by its actions—it must make every effort to prevent any aggravation of the situation and, moreover, prevent the emergence of hotbeds of war, which should be quenched whenever they appear. This must be stressed particularly in connection with the recent events in the Middle East which have greatly complicated the already complex and dangerous international situation.

The Arab states which have fallen victims to aggression are entitled to expect that their sovereignty, their territorial integrity and their legitimate rights and interests that have been violated by an armed attack, will be restored in full and without delay. We repeat that this means, first of all, the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories. This is the crucial matter today, without which there can be no *détente* in the Middle East.

The elimination of the consequences of aggression also means making restitution for the material damage inflicted by the aggressor on those whom he has attacked and whose lands he had occupied. The actions of the Israeli forces and Israeli aircraft have resulted in the destruction of homes, industrial projects, roads and means of transport in the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, Israel is in duty bound to reimburse the full costs of all she has destroyed, and to return all captured property. She is in duty bound

to do this within the shortest possible time.

Can this session measure up to this task and can it accomplish it? Yes, it can. The General Assembly should pronounce itself authoritatively in favour of justice and peace.

The Soviet Union and its delegation are ready to work together with other countries whose representatives have assembled in this hall. They are ready to work together with all other states and delegations in order to achieve this aim.

Much depends on the efforts of the great powers. It would be good if their delegations, too, were to find a common language in order to reach decisions meeting the interests of peace in the Middle East and the interests of universal peace.

Guided by the noble principles of the United Nations Charter and the desire to eliminate the consequences of aggression and restore justice as quickly as possible, the Soviet Government submits the following draft resolution to the General Assembly:

“The General Assembly,

“Stating that Israel, flagrantly violating the United Nations Charter and the universally-accepted principles of international law, has committed premeditated and previously prepared aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, and has occupied part of their territory and inflicted great material damage upon them,

“Noting that in contravention of the resolutions of the Security Council on the immediate cessation of all hostilities and a cease-fire, of June 6, June 7 and June 9, 1967, Israel continued to conduct offensive military operations against the

afore-mentioned states and expanded her territorial seizures,

"Noting further that although at the present time hostilities have ceased, Israel is continuing the occupation of territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, thus failing to cease the aggression and challenging the United Nations and all peace-loving states,

"And regarding as inadmissible and unlawful the presentation by Israel of territorial claims to the Arab states, which is preventing the restoration of peace in the area:

"1. Resolutely condemns the aggressive actions of Israel and the continuing occupation by Israel of part of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, which constitutes an act of flagrant aggression;

"2. Demands that Israel immediately and unconditionally withdraw all her forces from the territory of those states to positions beyond the armistice demarcation lines, as stipulated in the general armistice agreements, and respect the status of the demilitarised zones, as prescribed in those armistice agreements;

"3. Also demands that Israel make restitution in full and within the shortest possible period of time for all the damage inflicted by her aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, and their nationals, and return to them all property and other material assets that have been seized;

"4. Appeals to the Security Council to undertake, for its part, immediate effective measures in order to eliminate all the consequences of the aggression committed by Israel."

The Government of the Soviet Union expres-

ses the hope that the General Assembly will take an effective decision which will ensure the inviolability of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab states and the restoration and consolidation of peace and security in the Middle East.

The convening of the emergency session of the General Assembly is an event of great international significance.

If it were to happen that the General Assembly should find itself incapable of reaching a decision in the interests of peace, that would deal a heavy blow to the expectations of mankind regarding the possibility of settling major international problems by peaceful means through diplomatic contacts and negotiations. No state which genuinely cares about the future of its people, can fail to take this into consideration.

The peoples should rest assured that the United Nations is capable of achieving the aims proclaimed by its Charter, the aims of safeguarding peace on earth.

*Pravda*, June 20, 1967

**Statement by Plenary Meeting of CPSU Central Committee "On Soviet Union's Policy in Connection with Israel's Aggression in Middle East," June 21, 1967**

After hearing and discussing the report by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "On the Soviet Union's Policy in Connection with Israel's Aggression in the Middle East," the plenary meeting

of the CPSU Central Committee states the following:

its complete approval of the policy and practical activities of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee aimed at cutting short Israel's aggression, at supporting the UAR, Syria and other Arab states which have been attacked, and at preventing the dangerous consequences of the aggression for the cause of universal peace.

Israel's aggression is the result of collusion with the most reactionary forces of international imperialism, and, first of all, with the United States, spearheaded against one of the detachments of the national-liberation movement, against advanced Arab states who have gone in for progressive socio-economic transformations in the interests of the working people, and who are pursuing anti-imperialist policies.

In circumstances when the United States continues its dirty war in Vietnam, Israel's aggression in the Middle East constitutes another link in the chain formed by the policies of bellicose imperialist circles, who are attempting to halt the historic advance of the cause of national independence, democracy, peace and socialism .

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, as well as all progressive anti-imperialist forces, side with the Arab peoples in their righteous struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism, for their inalienable right to decide all questions pertaining to their domestic and foreign policies by themselves. The plenary meeting of the Central Committee expresses the will of the Soviet Communists and all the Soviet people when it strongly condemns Israel's aggression and declares its solidarity with the peoples of

the United Arab Republic, Syria, Algeria and other Arab countries.

The plenary meeting points out that the speedy, resolute actions by the Soviet Union and other socialist states have played an important role in stopping the military operations in the Middle East. Our Party and the Soviet Government's stand and their practical steps in connection with the developments in the Middle East have been fully approved by the whole Soviet people.

The Central Committee plenary meeting is gratified to state that at a crucial moment in the development of international events the fraternal socialist countries, who signed the Statement of June 9, 1967, have acted jointly, shoulder to shoulder. It was further confirmed that joint action by the socialist countries is a powerful factor in the struggle against aggressive scheming on the part of international imperialism.

The plenary meeting of the Central Committee fully approves the June 9 Statement by the Central Committee of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the governments of the socialist countries and confirms that the Soviet Union along with the other socialist countries will do everything in its power to help the peoples of the Arab countries, to administer a sound rebuff to the aggressor, safeguard their legitimate rights, extinguish the hotbed of war in the Middle East and restore peace in that area.

Today when the forces of imperialism and neo-colonialism are exploiting the situation that has arisen in the Middle East as a result of Israel's aggression to encroach on the independence and territorial integrity of the Arab states, the most important task is to prevent the aggressor from

taking advantage of the results of his treacherous actions, to achieve the immediate and unconditional withdrawal behind the truce lines of the troops of the interventionists from the territories occupied by them, and to pay indemnity to the UAR, Syria and Jordan for the damage inflicted by the aggressor.

In accordance with the chief goals of our Party policy, outlined at its 23rd Congress and confirmed by the December 1966 Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee, it is necessary to continue to fight against the bellicose forces of imperialism and their policy of interference in the internal affairs of other countries, to continue to support the Arab states in their struggle for freedom, independence, territorial integrity and social progress.

It is necessary in future, too, to strengthen friendship and unity between the Soviet Union and the Arab states, to resolutely rebuff the intrigues of imperialism, to expose its true anti-popular nature and to resist the slander campaign and splitting activities of Mao Tse tung's group aimed at disuniting the anti-imperialist forces and undermining the trust between the peoples of the Arab states and the peoples of the socialist countries.

The plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee maintains that the developments in the Middle East emphasise with fresh force the need for united action by the Communist and Workers' Parties, the international working-class movement and the national-liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, as well as of all the peace-loving and progressive forces, all who cherish the cause of freedom and

independence of the peoples, the cause of struggle for universal peace.

To implement the decisions of its 23rd Congress the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will in future, too, persistently work against the aggressive forces of imperialism, maintain the Soviet people's keen vigilance, steadily follow the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and fulfil its internationalist duty—to provide all-round support of the peoples fighting for freedom, national independence and social progress. The joint actions by the forces of peace, democracy and socialism, and the national-liberation movement are capable of curbing the aggressor and averting a new world war.

The plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee calls on the Party organisations and on all the working people of the Soviet Union to even greater efforts in their work of building communism and consolidating their country's economic and military strength, so as to fittingly prepare for the glorious 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

*Pravda*, June 22, 1967

**Report on Meeting in Budapest of Leaders  
of Fraternal Parties and Governments  
of Socialist Countries**

July 11-12, 1967

A meeting of leaders of the Communist and Workers' Parties and heads of government of

Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia was held in Budapest on July 11 and 12.

The conference was held under an understanding reached at the Moscow meeting of leaders of Communist and Workers' Parties and heads of government of the above-mentioned countries on June 9, this year, concerning the maintenance of permanent contact on the situation in the Middle East which has taken shape as a result of Israel's aggression against the Arab countries.

The participants in the conference exchanged views on the latest events in the Middle East. They noted that the continuing occupation by Israel of territories seized as a result of aggression signifies the flouting of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and international law, and encroachment on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab states. By their predatory policy the ruling circles of Israel, which are backed by the aggressive forces of imperialism, and above all the United States, are challenging the forces of peace throughout the world.

Those taking part in the conference reaffirmed that the fraternal parties and socialist countries represented at the meeting resolutely support and will continue to support the friendly Arab states in their just struggle for the removal of the aftermath of Israel's aggression and, above all, for the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Arab territories they have seized. They favour still fuller use of appropriate means meeting the interests of the struggle against aggres-

sion and for the restoration of peace in the Middle East.

The participants in the conference exchanged information on the political support which each of the countries is rendering the friendly Arab states; on economic aid, including steps which may promote the development of the industry and agriculture of the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries that have fallen victim to imperialist aggression; on steps aimed at strengthening the defence potential of those countries, and also on steps for long-term economic co-operation with the Arab states. They unanimously expressed their firm intention to continue concerted efforts for the attainment of these aims.

The conference was held in a comradely atmosphere and in a spirit of complete unity.

The participants in the conference agreed to continue maintaining permanent contact in the future on questions related to the situation in the Middle East.

*Pravda*, July 13, 1967

### **Letter to Security Council President from Soviet Foreign Minister A. A. Gromyko**

In a letter to the President of the Security Council on July 18, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko called attention to the continued acts of provocation and military aggression by Israel in the Suez Canal zone. The letter said:

"Esteemed Mr. President, I consider it necessary to call the attention of the Security Council to the continued acts of military aggression by Israel in the Suez Canal zone.

"In his letters to the President of the UN Security Council of July 13, 14 and 15, 1967, the permanent representative of the United Arab Republic cites new concrete facts of the gross violation by Israel of the Security Council's cease-fire decisions.

"In recent days, Israeli armed forces have several times fired on and bombed towns and villages along the Suez Canal. As a result, there have been victims among the civilian population and material damage has been caused.

"The events in the Suez Canal area show that Israel is continuing its efforts to carry out its policy of aggression towards the UAR and other Arab states.

"The Soviet Government considers that the military clashes in the Suez Canal area, provoked by Israel, are extremely dangerous and could develop into a wider military conflict.

"The continuing Israeli occupation of Arab lands seized as a result of aggression is a violation of the fundamental principles of the UN Charter and of international law and is an encroachment on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab states.

"To prevent further military clashes and eliminate the danger of a resumption of war in the Middle East, it is necessary that Israel withdraw her troops at once from the occupied Arab lands.

"It is precisely this task that the United Nations must help to accomplish.

"I ask you to take appropriate steps to circulate this letter as an official document of the Security Council."

*Pravda*, July 19, 1967

## Soviet Government's Statement

July 23, 1967

On July 21, this year, the special emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly, convened to examine the question of the elimination of the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab states, adjourned. The Assembly resolved to forward all its materials to the Security Council in order to facilitate an examination by the Council of the tense situation in the Middle East as a matter of extreme importance.

The President of the General Assembly has been invited to reconvene the Assembly as and when necessary.

The special emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly was an important stage in the struggle of peace-loving states for the speediest elimination of the consequences of Israel's aggression. It brought up this question and drew to it the attention of public opinion throughout the world. The work of the session proved that a considerable majority of the United Nations members are showing sincere concern for the defence of the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab peoples who have been subjected to aggression, and that they condemn the aggressor and support the demand for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories.

By twice adopting, by an overwhelming majority of votes, resolutions demanding of Israel that she discard the measures for the annexation of the Arab part of the city of Jerusalem, the General Assembly clearly declared itself against any recognition of the results of Israeli aggres-

sion. It thus confirmed the principle banning the use of force for the annexation of territories—one of the most important legal and political principles of the United Nations Charter on which peaceful relations between the states are based.

The political intrigues of Israel and those states which are supporting her, and their attempts to evade responsibility for the aggression and even to obtain from the United Nations encouragement to retain the occupied Arab lands, have only exposed still further their actual predatory schemes. No one at the General Assembly, with the exception of Israel herself and two or three of her principal patrons, headed by the United States, ventured to justify the aggressor.

It is very significant that even the United States was compelled to withdraw from the voting in the General Assembly its draft resolution designed to shield the aggressor and reward him for the attack on the Arab countries.

Nevertheless, it is a fact that the General Assembly turned out to be unable to take a decision on the main question—the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories to the positions they held before the beginning of aggression.

During the voting on July 4, socialist states, Arab and many Afro-Asian states and some states of Western Europe which pursue an independent course in foreign policy in the international arena, voted for the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries, which contained a clear demand for the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli troops from the Arab territories.

The Soviet draft resolution also received considerable support in the General Assembly. It cal-

led for condemnation of the aggressor, the immediate withdrawal of his troops from the occupied territories and compensation by the aggressor for the damage he had done to the Arab countries. Neither the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries, however, nor the Soviet draft resolution was passed, because they did not receive the requisite majority.

Subsequent consultation, which continued until the moment when the session adjourned, did not lead to the drafting of a resolution providing for a decision on the question of the withdrawal of the Israeli forces such as would enjoy the support of the requisite majority of delegations. That is why the proceedings of the Assembly ended with the adoption of a procedural resolution on the transfer of the materials to the Security Council.

The question arises: Who prevented the General Assembly from discharging its duty in conformity with the aims proclaimed in the United Nations Charter, which strictly bans acts of aggression? There can be only one reply: The General Assembly was not able to adopt an effective decision on the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression and on the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the territories seized, because of the attitude of the United States of America and some of its allies, and also those states which submitted to United States pressure, to United States blackmail, which was resorted to at the crucial moment with blatant impudence.

The Soviet Government expresses the firm belief that all peace-loving states should continue their efforts to make the aggressor withdraw his

troops from the occupied Arab territories. There will be no peace in the Middle East as long as the troops of the aggressor remain on Arab territories and as long as Israel, with reckless impudence, makes territorial and other claims on the neighbouring Arab countries. The armed provocations staged by Israel in the Suez Canal zone show that war may break out again any day.

A great and responsible task is now entrusted to the Security Council, to which the General Assembly has turned over the materials of its special emergency session. When the question of the elimination of the consequences of Israel's aggression is further discussed, the Security Council will have to take fully into consideration the wish of the majority of the states, clearly expressed at the session, to achieve a constructive settlement of this question and, above all, to achieve the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories.

The Soviet Government, for its part, is ready, as hitherto to co-operate with all peace-loving states in order to achieve that goal.

The Soviet Government also reaffirms that the Soviet Union, together with other socialist states, will continue rendering political support to the Arab states in their just struggle for their legitimate rights and will continue giving them assistance in the restoration and development of their economy and the strengthening of their defences.

As for those states which, by their attitude up to the present, have prevented a solution to this question of the elimination of the consequences of

Israeli aggression, those states will be assuming a grave responsibility before all the peoples unless they revise their policy.

*Pravda*, July 23, 1967

### **Communique on Meeting of Foreign Ministers of European Socialist Countries**

December 19-21, 1967

A meeting of Foreign Ministers of European socialist countries was held in Warsaw from December 19 to 21, 1967. The meeting was attended by Ivan Bashev, Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria; J. Pudlak, First Deputy Foreign Minister of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic; Otto Winzer, Foreign Minister of the German Democratic Republic; Janos Peter, Foreign Minister of the Hungarian People's Republic; Adam Rapacki, Foreign Minister of the Polish People's Republic; M. Mihai, Deputy Foreign Minister of the Socialist Republic of Rumania; Andrei Gromyko, Foreign Minister of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Marko Nikezich, State Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Those taking part in the meeting had a detailed discussion on the development of the situation in the Middle East and exchanged information available to their governments on this question.

It was noted that the Middle East is still living in a state of extreme tension as a result of intervention by the imperialists. Contrary to the clearly expressed will of the overwhelming majority

of the countries of the world and the decisions of the United Nations, Israel continues to occupy the lands of a number of Arab states which she seized, and she is trying to derive political and other benefits from this. The Suez Canal, which is of great importance for international shipping and trade, has become a front line and is idle.

Many privations and difficulties have fallen to the lot of the one and a half million Arab refugees whose lands and homes have come under the occupation. The situation in the area is fraught with the danger of a new explosion.

The far-reaching plans and schemes of certain imperialist circles, and above all the United States-plans and schemes designed to restore in the Arab East a neo-colonialist regime which is completely inimical to the peoples of that region—are behind the tension which is continuing there and is being deliberately maintained. With this object in view, attempts are being made to transform the Mediterranean region into a region in which a policy of aggression is carried out.

The Foreign Ministers, on behalf of their countries, expressed solidarity with, and support for the friendly Arab states that are waging a just struggle against imperialist and neo-colonialist intrigues, for their legitimate rights and interests, for independence and state sovereignty, and for national unity, economic and social progress.

The parties to the meeting welcomed the constructive approach to a solution of the problems of the Middle East displayed by the governments of the United Arab Republic and other Arab states which are coming out in favour of reaching an early political settlement. The Ministers also

welcomed the desire of those governments to strengthen the unity of action of Arab states in order to repulse the hostile policy of neo-colonialism and imperialist aggression in the Middle East and the policy of imperialist intervention in the internal affairs of the Arab states.

In this connection the Ministers expressed their favourable attitude towards the idea of a meeting of heads of Arab states to be held in Rabat.

The parties to the meeting unanimously emphasised that the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from all the occupied territories of Arab states to the positions held prior to June 5, 1967, is the main and indispensable condition for the restoration and consolidation of peace in the Middle East.

The Ministers drew attention in this connection to the great importance of the implementation of the resolution of the United Nations Security Council of November 22, 1967, and the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli armed forces from all occupied territories of Arab states and emphasised the impermissibility of acquiring territories through war. Any interpretations designed to weaken this fundamental element of the Security Council resolution are contrary to the letter and spirit of that resolution.

At the same time the Ministers stressed the need for all United Nations member-states in the area to recognise the fact that each of them has the right to exist as an independent national state and live in peace and security. Actions by Israel aimed at keeping any part of the occupied Arab territories, hamper the solution of other problems of the area on the basis of the above-mentioned

principles and also the principles of non-interference in internal affairs and territorial integrity, and such actions must be condemned.

The Ministers exchanged views on possible steps to contribute towards a political settlement of Middle East problems through the implementation of the above-mentioned resolution of the Security Council.

It was decided to continue the necessary consultations among states taking part in the meeting on questions concerning the Middle East situation.

Those taking part in the meeting further expressed the solidarity of the socialist countries with the just struggle of the Yemeni people for their independence and sovereignty and against the scheming of imperialist and reactionary forces aimed at establishing neo-colonialist domination in the south of the Arabian Peninsula. The parties to the meeting also welcomed the establishment of a new independent Arab state—the People's Republic of Southern Yemen.

The meeting took place in a spirit of complete unity and close comradesly co-operation.

*Pravda*, December 23, 1967

## **Soviet Government's Statement**

March 23, 1968

The situation in the Middle East continues to attract the close attention of the peoples. The tension of the crisis brought about last summer by Israel's adventurist policy is not subsiding. Israel,

an imperialist state, is continuing the aggression against neighbouring Arab states, increasing the scale of the crisis and its dangerous international consequences.

Again and again the Government of Israel organises military provocations against Arab states. This is confirmed by the reports that in violation of the decision of the Security Council on the cessation of military actions, Israeli troops on March 21 carried out a new bandit attack on Jordan in which large ground and air forces were used.

In the occupied territories the Israeli military are committing arbitrary acts and crimes and are carrying out large-scale punitive operations against the local population.

Definite steps are being taken with the aim of securing the integration in the Israeli state of the indigenous Arab territories seized as a result of the aggression. Israel's Ministry of Internal Affairs officially announced on February 29 this year that the Sinai Peninsula, the Gaza area, the territory to the west of the River Jordan captured from Jordan, and the Golan Heights in Syria from now on "will not be regarded as enemy territory." By this unlawful act Israel is attempting to turn the cease-fire lines into its state frontiers.

Even earlier, the Israeli authorities had begun to grant numerous groups of Israeli settlers permission to settle in occupied Arab lands, including the west bank of the River Jordan. Military settlements of so-called farmer soldiers are being set up. The native Arab population is being driven away from the lands taken over by Israeli settlers and its property is being seized or destroyed.

The number of Arab refugees is growing daily. Israel is intentionally promoting this policy of driving the Arab population away from Israeli-occupied territories in order to prepare conditions for their annexation and for the colonisation of those lands.

Contrary to the unanimous decisions of the United Nations General Assembly, Israel is continuing her acts of conquest against the Arab part of Jerusalem.

The aim of the present actions by Israel, who has the support of the United States Government and of international Zionism, is to delay a political settlement in the Middle East as long as possible, to impose her imperialist terms on the Arabs and to force the Arabs to surrender and renounce the territories belonging to them.

In this the Israeli leaders are making use of the fact that their patron, the United States, is itself appearing in the role of aggressor in Vietnam, in the role of a state that is blatantly flouting the principles of the United Nations Charter and international agreements. What we have, both in the Middle East and in Vietnam, is an attempt by aggressive imperialist forces to strike a blow at the national-liberation movement and its advanced detachments.

The colonialist policy of Israel and the forces of world reaction that are backing her is a serious source of the present dangerous international tensions. As a result of this policy, the Suez Canal, that major international waterway, has now been inactive for more than nine months, with the result that considerable economic harm is being done to states whose ships use this canal and to international trade in general.

Displaying goodwill, the Government of the United Arab Republic expressed readiness to bring out of the Canal Zone the ships that were trapped there as a result of Israel's aggression and to start preparatory work for clearing the Suez Canal so as to make it usable for shipping as soon as possible. The Israeli authorities, however, prevented this by resorting to armed provocations.

Israel's continuing aggressive line cannot remain without consequences. The Security Council, in adopting on November 22, 1967, its resolution on the Middle East, set the states a clear task—to achieve the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the captured Arab territories and to take other measures necessary for achieving the speediest political settlement of the problems of that area. The principle of the "impermissibility of territories being acquired by means of war" and the demand for the "withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the territories occupied during the recent conflict" are given prominence in the resolution and are the main and imperative condition for the restoration of peace in the Middle East. It is only on this basis that secure and recognised frontiers can be ensured for the states in that area.

The Security Council's resolution on the Middle East is not a recommendation or an opinion that governments are free to follow or to ignore. On joining the United Nations, each state undertook to carry out unswervingly the decisions of the Security Council adopted in accordance with the United Nations Charter. Failing to fulfil those obligations means opposing the United Nations and challenging that organisation, whose purpose is to preserve international peace.

The United Nations has been officially informed of the readiness of the Arab states that have suffered most from Israeli aggression to carry out this resolution of the Security Council dated November 22, 1967, and to co-operate with the envoy of the Secretary-General in the Middle East who is empowered to facilitate the implementation of this resolution.

Israel, on the contrary, has from the start pursued, and is continuing to pursue a policy of obstructing the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly on the Middle East. In her adventurism Israel is going so far as to ignore the appeals from United Nations member-states asking that the organisation's principles and the decision of the Security Council be respected, and she is going so far as to present arrogant territorial claims to Arab states, threatening them with new acts of aggression and resorting to the use of armed force.

The Israeli Government has hindered in every way, and is continuing to hinder the activities of the United Nations Secretary-General's special envoy in the Middle East, Dr. Jarring, whose task it is to find the shortest ways to a political settlement of the conflict on the basis of the decisions of the Security Council and the United Nations General Assembly and of the United Nations Charter. Israel would like to use Dr. Jarring's mission in order to distort the meaning of the Security Council's resolution. Failing to say one single word about her being ready to withdraw her troops from all the Arab territories occupied during the recent conflict, i. e., to withdraw them behind the line as it was prior to June 5, 1967, Israel and those backing her are

trying to force on the Arab countries talks under conditions incompatible with their legitimate national interests and with their sovereignty, and are trying to deceive public opinion throughout the world.

Israel is following in the footsteps of the Hitlerite criminals. Fascist Germany, as is well known, also seized foreign territories and then tried to dictate her own terms for a "settlement" to the victim of aggression. Such actions, however, were branded by the peoples as banditry, while those who tried to apply them were condemned as international criminals following the rout of Hitler's Reich.

Those who today covet the lands of others and who like to interfere in the domestic affairs of states would do well to remember that.

The Soviet Union proclaims with all firmness its determination to press, together with other peace-loving states, for the ending of the Israeli aggression and the removal of all its consequences, for the return to their lawful owners of the territories seized from Arab states as a result of the aggression of 1967 and for the achieving of the necessary political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in that area.

The government of Israel must unswervingly implement the Security Council's resolution of November 22, 1967, and in the first place, must withdraw its troops from all the occupied Arab territories. It should know that its challenge to the interests of world peace and security by its attempts to wreck a political settlement in the Middle East cannot go unpunished.

As long as Israel's leaders, who have support from outside, take their stand on positions of annexing Arab territories, the USSR and other countries—friends of the Arab states and champions of a lasting peace in the Middle East—will help the victims of aggression, because they are thereby doing their duty in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the interests of maintaining peace. This must be clear to everyone.

*Pravda*, March 23, 1968

**From Report by USSR Foreign Minister  
A. A. Gromyko "On the International Situation  
and the Soviet Union's Foreign Policy," Delivered  
to USSR Supreme Soviet**

June 27, 1968

To paralyse any manifestation of the policy of aggression in any part of the world—this is the task accepted and in practice achieved by our country along with the other peace-loving states.

This also holds true of Soviet policy in the Middle East, where the consequences of imperialist aggression have not yet been eliminated.

Israel's troops continue to occupy the captured Arab territories. Its armed provocations continue ceaselessly against the neighbouring states. The Suez Canal has been out of service for more than a year now, which does great harm to the interests of international shipping. Tension in the Middle East does not subside.

Who is responsible for this situation, with all

its attendant dangers? There can be no two views on this score.

The Arab states have accepted the United Nations Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, as the basis for a solution of the Middle East crisis, and have declared their agreement to implement it.

They have so informed Dr. Gunnar Jarring, the special envoy of the UN Secretary-General who is charged with the task of helping the two sides to implement the Security Council's resolution.

Israel, on the contrary, refuses to carry out this decision, and enjoys US backing in this.

The Soviet Union is working for a relaxation of tension and the establishment of lasting peace in the Middle East, an area which directly adjoins the southern frontiers of our country.

We are taking every measure we can to do away with the consequences of the Israeli aggression, taking into account in the process the need to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state of this area, whether an Arab state or Israel.

Israel must implement the resolution of the Security Council and withdraw her troops from all the occupied Arab territories. If this is not done, the Israeli Government will, sooner or later, have to answer for this policy.

A short while ago the Government of the United Arab Republic put forward the proposal for a staged plan to be drawn up for co-ordinating the steps of the two sides to normalise the situation in the Middle East.

This is an important initiative, and the Soviet Government is ready to help in putting such a

plan to restore peace in the Middle East into effect.

I should like to express the hope that the governments of all countries will realise the need to settle the situation in the Middle East as soon as possible, because it is fraught with a grave danger for peace.

It is not only the countries of that area which will benefit by the normalisation of the situation there; the world as a whole will stand to gain from this.

We urge the governments of all countries to approach this important and acute problem in a reasonable way, and this requires, first and foremost, a solution of the main question—the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories.

*Pravda*, June 28, 1968

**From Speech by L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary  
of the CPSU CC, at Luncheon in Honour  
of UAR President Nasser, July 5, 1968**

Today, here in Moscow, we are heartily greeting President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic, eminent leader of the national-liberation movement, courageous fighter and patriot, and friend of our country.

Meetings between leading officials of the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic have become traditional and an important form of developing our contacts. In the course of our discussions we exchange views on the major ques-

tions of bilateral relations and on problems of international affairs. These meetings and talks, both in the Soviet Union and in the United Arab Republic are indicative of the firm friendship between our peoples.

This meeting is taking place on the eve of the 16th anniversary of the July 1952 Revolution, an event of utmost importance in the history of the United Arab Republic. This event ushered in a new stage in the Egyptian people's struggle for national and social emancipation. Our people, who carried through the October Socialist Revolution fifty years ago in order to create a new, socialist system in our country, rejoice at the progressive transformations in the United Arab Republic.

It is clear to all that as a result of the upsurge of the national-liberation struggle, as a result of the July revolution the positions of imperialism and neo-colonialism in the Middle East have been seriously undermined. The situation when the colonialists disposed of Egypt's wealth and determined her destiny, when the country's independence was purely fictitious, has been done away with for all time. For the first time in Egypt's centuries-old history the popular masses have begun to participate in the construction of a new life.

The profound socio-economic transformations in the United Arab Republic and the revolutionary achievements there are not to the liking of the colonialists. They are like an eyesore for world imperialism. This is exactly why Israel, doing the bidding of international imperialism and with its support, unleashed its aggression against the Arab countries.

We, like you, are perfectly aware that in their struggle against the forces of peace and progress the imperialists try any manner of means. Sometimes they act by themselves, ruthlessly and shamelessly, and sometimes, through their puppets. All this is intended to weaken the front of progressive states and to drive a wedge between the forces fighting against imperialism. In these conditions it is our common goal to continue to foil the intrigues by the forces that are seeking to undermine the unity of the anti-imperialist front.

At a difficult time for the Arabs, true friends—the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries—have come to their help. As a result imperialism has failed to achieve its main goal—to stop progressive development in the Arab East and to restore the bastions of colonialism there. The progressive regimes in the Arab countries have withstood the attack and their social base has expanded.

The consequences of the Israeli aggression have not been eliminated yet. The Israeli extremists, who are directly encouraged by the imperialist forces, are acting with the greatest effrontery. In defiance of the resolution by the UN Security Council, they are refusing to withdraw their troops from the Arab territories they have seized.

The Soviet people highly esteem the efforts by the UAR Government and President Nasser personally, for reaching a political settlement of the conflict on the basis of this resolution, for ensuring the unity of the anti-imperialist front of the Arab peoples in the struggle against the Israeli aggression.

We are confident that the predatory policy of

the Israeli extremists with regard to the Arab states is doomed to failure. The aggressor and his backers are becoming increasingly isolated, morally and politically, with each passing day.

The situation being as it is, we again declare our solidarity with the Arab peoples.

In view of the aggressive intrigues of the enemies of peace and progress, the Soviet Union has always rendered, and is continuing to render, all-round assistance and support to the United Arab Republic and other Arab states. This policy will be steadfastly implemented for the sake of the triumph of the cause of peace and justice in the Middle East. There must not be the slightest doubt about this. The Soviet Union will always side with the Arab nations in the struggle for the removal of the consequences of aggression and the withdrawal of Israeli troops without delay from all the Arab lands occupied as a result of the June aggression. There is no doubt that the Arab people's just struggle will be crowned with complete victory!

At present important measures are being carried out in the United Arab Republic to further activate the working masses, to improve the work of state institutions and enterprises and to reconstruct the Arab Socialist Union. I should like to wish you, dear President Nasser, and all your colleagues success in your work to further consolidate and develop the progressive regime in the UAR, in the interests of the Egyptian people and in the interests of international peace, national independence and social progress.

*Pravda*, July 6, 1968

**From Joint Communique on Official Visit  
by President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the UAR  
to the Soviet Union**

July 4-10, 1968

Special attention was paid to the situation that has arisen in the Middle East in connection with Israel's aggression against the Arab states.

The Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic maintain that Israel's aggression is another dangerous link in the chain of imperialist policy intended to undermine the progress of the Arab states and halt the liberation struggle of the Arab peoples.

Israel's continued occupation of the Arab territories seized as a result of her treacherous attack, is an encroachment on the major principles of the UN Charter and international law, and constitutes a threat to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab countries. Israel's policy of conquest backed by the imperialist forces and, above all, by the United States, is a challenge to the world at large. The Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic declare that the territorial claims put forward by Israel are illegitimate and, consequently, must be strongly condemned and rejected by all the peace-loving states.

The two sides resolutely condemn the policy of the imperialist forces who continue to use Israel as their weapon in this region of the world, and are engineering new plots and endless provocations against the United Arab Republic, Syria, Jordan and other Arab countries.

Both sides reiterated that the Middle East con-

flict must be settled on the basis of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967. The UAR Government displayed concern for the restoration of peace in stating its readiness to implement this resolution in the near future and taking important steps for that purpose. The Soviet Government is duly appreciative of the UAR initiative in this question, and supports it.

The withdrawal of Israeli troops to the positions held prior to June 5, 1967 and observance of the other stipulations laid down in the resolution, is an indispensable condition for the restoration of peace in the Middle East. Israel's refusal to implement this resolution of the Security Council proves once again that the policy and actions of this state are alien to the interests of peace. The strengthening of peace in the Middle East area must be based on respect of the lawful rights of the Arab peoples, including the Arab population of Palestine.

The two sides expressed their firm conviction that the attempts of Israel and the imperialist forces supporting her to perpetuate the results of the treacherous attack on the Arab countries in June, 1967, are doomed to failure. The just cause of the Arab states who work to establish a stable peace in the Middle East will triumph.

The Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic express their support of the efforts by Dr. Gunnar Jarring, special envoy of the UN Secretary-General, and call on all the sides concerned to promote the success of his mission, which is to bring about the implementation of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967.

President of the UAR and the Arab Socialist

Union Gamal Abdel Nasser expressed profound gratitude to the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Soviet Government and people for the political support and tremendous practical assistance in consolidating the economy and defence capacity, given by the Soviet Union to the United Arab Republic in the struggle against the aggressor, and in restoring the damage done as the result of the aggression. The UAR Government highly appreciates the Soviet Government's foreign political measures for removing the consequences of Israeli aggression, in defence of the legitimate rights and independence of the Arab peoples and for the sake of ensuring peace and security in the Middle East.

In the difficult situation which has been caused by Israel's aggression the setting up of a broad anti-imperialist front of the Arab states and peoples to contend with neo-colonialists and their agents becomes especially important for eliminating the consequences of the aggression.

The Soviet side highly commends the efforts by the UAR Government and President Nasser personally to achieve unity of the Arab nations.

The Government of the USSR once again expresses the Soviet people's complete solidarity with the UAR people and other Arab peoples in their courageous struggle against the Israeli aggressors. The Soviet Union and the other countries, supporting the just cause of the Arab countries suffering from aggression have rendered and will continue to render to UAR all-round political and economic support and assistance in strengthening its defence potential.

The sides have agreed on further joint steps

regarding the situation in the Middle East, for the sake of restoring peace and security in this area.

*Pravda*, July 11, 1968

Y. VASILIEV

### Just and Stable Peace in Middle East Is Urgent Need

The implementation of the Security Council resolution is the key to a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. Of course the establishment of peace in this area should be based on respect for the lawful rights of the Arab peoples, including the Arab population of Palestine.

Concrete ways of implementing the resolution are the main thing on which all those who would like to establish a just and stable peace, in which each and every state in this area could live safely, should concentrate their efforts.

What can be done in this respect after Israel and the neighbouring Arab countries confirm their agreement with the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967?

First of all, an agreement should be reached on simultaneous declarations by the Israeli Government and the governments of the neighbouring Arab countries on their readiness for an end to the state of war between them and the achievement of a peace settlement after the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories.

In this connection, Israel would announce its

readiness to start the withdrawal of the troops from the occupied Arab territories on a set date.

On the day the withdrawal of the Israeli troops starts, to be carried out under the observation of UN representatives, the Arab countries and Israel should deposit with the United Nations their respective documents on the termination of the state of war, on respect for and recognition of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in that area, and their right to live in peace within safe and recognised borders—in accordance with the resolution of the Security Council.

In keeping with an agreement that could be reached through Dr. Jarring, it would be expedient to co-ordinate the principles concerning safe and recognised borders, ensuring freedom of navigation on international waterways in that area, a fair settlement of the refugee problem and the territorial immunity and political independence of every state in the area.

The establishment of demilitarised zones is also possible. Agreement on all these problems, in line with the Security Council resolution, should be regarded as an integral whole, relating to all the aspects of a settlement for the whole Middle East area, as a kind of package deal.

So far as the withdrawal of the Israeli forces is concerned, that could obviously be carried out in two stages. During approximately the period of a month these forces would withdraw from the Arab territories to definite intermediary boundaries on the Sinai Peninsula, on the western banks of the River Jordan and also from the El-Quneitra district on the territory of Syria.

The day the Israeli troops reach definite boun-

daries on Sinai, the UAR Government would move its troops into the Suez Canal zone and start to clear the canal for the resumption of navigation.

In the course of the second month, the Israeli troops would be withdrawn to the lines they occupied before June 5, 1967.

The administration of the respective Arab country would be completely restored on the liberated territories.

During the second stage of the withdrawal of the Israeli forces on the Sinai Peninsula, United Nations forces would be deployed in Sharm as-Sheikh and the Gaza Strip, thus restoring the situation existing in May 1967.

The Security Council would adopt a resolution on sending UN forces and would confirm the principle of freedom of navigation through the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba for ships of all countries.

Finally, after the complete withdrawal of the Israeli troops to the lines of demarcation between states, the documents of the Arab countries and Israel deposited earlier would finally come into force.

Basing itself on the clauses of the UN Charter, the Security Council would adopt a resolution on guarantees for the Arab-Israel boundaries, for which a form of guarantee by the four powers who are permanent members of the Security Council is not excluded.

That is how the stage-by-stage implementation of the Security Council resolution aimed at the speediest achievement of a just and stable peace in the Middle East might look.

If all the circumstances are weighed up realis-

tically, there are now definite possibilities for a shift in favour of a peaceful political settlement of the Middle East problem.

The obstacle on this path is the aggressive, treacherous policy of the Israeli ruling forces, supported by certain imperialist circles outside the country.

*Pravda*, January 25, 1969 (Abridged)

**From Report by Foreign  
Minister A. A. Gromyko to USSR Supreme  
Soviet Session, July 10, 1969**

The situation in the world is immensely influenced by the situation in the Middle East. The Soviet Union has been paying a great deal of attention to the Middle East. This area still remains a breeding-ground of danger which may have serious consequences for the cause of peace. What is the main danger at the present time? It lies in the fact that Israel has still failed to get out of the territories occupied by her in Arab States—the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan.

The fumes of chauvinism apparently went to the heads of some leaders in Israel to such an extent after June 1967, that two years have not been sufficient for them to acquire the ability to take a more sober view of things. Taking a more sober view means admitting that it is impossible to keep foreign territories seized as the result of aggression, and that it is necessary to return them to their owners.

Pinning one's hopes on military superiority, as

they are doing in Israel, is a short-sighted policy. The only reliable way would be to resolve the problem on the basis of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories, with simultaneous recognition of the right of all states in the Middle East, including Israel, to an independent national existence and the establishment of lasting peace in that important zone.

This is the stand of the Arab countries. This is the stand of the Soviet Union and our allies in the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, and also of many other states in the world.

At the present time, governments concerned, including those of big powers that are permanent members of the Security Council—the USSR, the United States, France and Britain—are exchanging opinions on the ways of achieving a settlement of the situation in the Middle East. It is not yet possible to say how this exchange of opinions will end. But two conclusions already suggest themselves.

The first is that all those taking part in the exchange of views are fully aware that it is a great risk to leave the situation in the Middle East as it now is.

The second conclusion is that of the two sides directly involved in the conflict, one, namely the Arab side, is expressing its readiness for a settlement of the situation on a durable basis, ensuring peace in that area. The other side, Israel, with a stubbornness bordering on some sort of automatism, is rejecting any proposals aimed at a settlement.

Israeli leaders often say that they want a settlement such as will ensure that Israel can exist in conditions of peace. But their words do not

tally with their deeds, because they actually reject this kind of solution and in preference to it, they would rather have Israel existing in a state of war. It must be emphasised, however, that this is a slippery path and that the risk it entails for Israel cannot be eliminated either by inordinate self-assurance—and Tel Aviv has enough of that to suffice for ten great powers—or by an abundance of all sorts of unfounded ambitions.

The Soviet Union is of the opinion that every opportunity should be used to settle the situation in the Middle East. Procrastination is dangerous and does harm to everyone. It does political harm, because the danger of complicating the situation in this area is indeed great. It does economic harm, in the first place because the Suez Canal, that important international shipping route under the sovereignty of the United Arab Republic, remains idle.

There is another aspect to the problem—an aspect of principle. One must not permit, if one does not want to connive in aggression, a situation where a state which has attacked other countries and which is occupying part of their territories as a result of having used force, continues the occupation, flagrantly ignoring the United Nations Charter and the appropriate resolution of the Security Council.

The Soviet Government took an important initiative and worked out proposals aimed at a political settlement in the Middle East. These proposals, including those put forward very recently, are continuing to play an important part in the search for ways of bringing peace to that area.

We would like the United States Government, on whose policy Israel is leaning, to adopt a

more realistic attitude on this matter and to be guided by long-term interests instead of merely temporary considerations. All countries, large and small, cannot but be interested in a settlement in the Middle East. A solution to this problem would also have a favourable influence on the international situation and would certainly tip the scales in favour of peace.

*Pravda*, July 11, 1969

### TASS Statement of August 30, 1969

It was with indignation that the Soviet public learned that the Al-Aqsa Mosque—one of the most ancient and unique monuments of Arab architecture in the Middle East and a place of pilgrimage for many believers, revered as one of the Moslem sacred shrines—had been set on fire in the Arab part of Jerusalem occupied by the armed forces of Israel.

This crime has given rise to a wave of justified anger and indignation in countries of the Middle East, Asia and Africa.

The Israeli Government and the imperialist forces supporting the Israeli aggression, cannot escape responsibility for this act of vandalism. Moreover, the occupying forces are continuing provocative actions against peaceful citizens. The Israeli authorities meet peaceful demonstrations of protest by the Arab population in Jerusalem, Nablus and other occupied towns by sending paratroopers and men with submachineguns to deal with the demonstrators.

Relying on the support of imperialist and Zionist circles in the West, the present Israeli lea-

ders refuse to take world opinion into account; they are trampling on the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law and are seeking to wreck any settlement of the Middle East conflict.

The latest events in the Arab sector of Jerusalem, including the fire at the Al-Aqsa Mosque, and the systematic demolition by the Israelis of entire blocks occupied by the Arab population, once again confirm the need for urgent measures on the part of all peace-loving countries and peoples aimed at eliminating the aftermath of the Israeli imperialist aggression, and, in the first place, the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Arab territories occupied during the aggression in June 1967.

The Soviet public, sharing the just indignation of the Arab peoples over the barbarous actions of the Israeli authorities in the occupied Arab territories, call on all people of goodwill who are concerned for the preservation of peace, to come out in favour of the speediest political settlement in the Middle East and the establishment of a just and lasting peace in that area, in accordance with the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, and in the interests of the countries and peoples of that area.

*Pravda*, August 30, 1969

## COMMENTATOR

### Israel Must Observe UN Resolutions

The situation in the Middle East continues to deteriorate. Blood is being shed in the Suez Ca-

nal zone, on the banks of the River Jordan and on the Golan Heights. The Israeli troops that have entrenched themselves on the occupied Arab lands do not shun using napalm, rockets and the latest types of mines. The Israeli army's continuous provocations against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan are actually a continuation of Israeli aggression.

What is causing the grave situation in the Middle East? Firstly, it is Israeli's adventurist political course—the Tel Aviv extremists are becoming increasingly brazen. Secondly, it is the plain fact that in her adventurist policy Israel is being actively backed by certain circles in the United States as confirmed by the latest talks between Israeli Premier Golda Meir and US President Nixon.

Formally the American representatives declare that it is necessary to reach a Middle East settlement by political means. They have made enough statements to this effect. The United States is also taking part in the UN consultations charged with finding such means.

Nevertheless while American and Soviet representatives were meeting in New York to discuss prospects for a Middle East settlement talks were being held with Mrs. Meir in Washington concerning deliveries of offensive weapons to Israel—the aggressor who is flouting the UN resolutions.

The American press did not conceal the fact that Mrs. Meir was certainly not in the United States to seek Washington's assistance in solving the Middle East problem or in restoring peace in the Middle East. *The New York Times* wrote openly that Mrs. Meir had come to the United

States to obtain more weapons. And this meant the latest weapons. The details that were being kept secret were leaked out by papers close to Israeli ruling quarters. The *Yediot Aharonot* reported that Mrs. Meir had asked the American President for one thousand million dollars by way of "economic" aid. This huge sum was meant to cover the debt to foreign states that also had come from the purchase of arms. Besides, the Israeli Premier asked the White House to guarantee Israel a new shipment of "Phantom" jet fighter-bombers (apart from the 50 being delivered now), 80 "Skyhawk" turbo-jet planes (the Israeli air force already has such planes), 60 "Sikorski" helicopters, as well as the "Hawk" and "Nike Hercules" anti-aircraft missiles.

Actually a deal has been concluded in Washington to supply Israel with arms which can be used for aggressive purposes. Obviously, Mrs. Meir's trip abroad has little to do with the cause of peace in the Middle East. Israel is not obtaining arms for defence purposes. Mrs. Meir herself did not conceal the true aim of her Washington visit. Interviewed by the *Washington Post* she said in no uncertain terms that she had encountered the "goodwill" and "understanding" of President Nixon and the members of his government.

It is quite logical to ask: Would it not be desirable to use certain diplomatic corridors to cover up support for Israel and her aggressive actions? In what other way can one tie in assertions about a search for political settlement with the deliveries of new, big consignment of weapons to a state that has committed aggression and is continuing its provocations against the Arab

countries? It is only because of Washington's policy that Israel still finds it possible to refrain from complying with the well-known November resolution of the Security Council and is stubbornly resisting all international efforts to achieve a Middle East settlement.

In other words, speaking politically, while claiming that it is searching for a way to attain a peaceful adjustment the United States is actually rendering military assistance to the aggressor. And this is occurring at a time when the situation in the Middle East is deteriorating as a result of provocations by the Israeli military, at a time when the Israeli extremists seem to have lost their heads and are heading for a fresh aggravation of the Middle East crisis.

In this way, by its current Middle East policy the United States heightens the tension in that area of the world and is trying, through Israel, to overthrow progressive regimes in the Arab countries at any cost and to set back the Arab national-liberation movement many years.

The Soviet Union's position on the Middle East crisis is well known. The Soviet Government has been firmly and consistently upholding the just cause of the Arab peoples. Peace in the Middle East can and must be restored. The overwhelming majority of the world's population desire this. Procrastination of the solution of the Middle East problem is fraught with the gravest consequences, primarily for Israel herself. By challenging the peace-loving states and all countries advocating a peaceful settlement in the Middle East on the basis of the November resolution, the Israeli extremists are playing with fire and trying the peoples' patience.

Israeli troops should be withdrawn from all Arab territories they have been occupying. This Security Council demand should be complied with without any reservations whatever.

The United Nations is strong enough to compel Israel to carry out its decisions. Had this authoritative international organisation applied sanctions, it would have done its duty by the peoples who desire an early peaceful settlement of the Middle East crisis.

The Soviet Union has always been opposed to turning the Middle East into a hotbed of international tension and a peril to the security of nations. It will spare no effort to have the consequences of Israel's aggression eliminated and to have a stable and lasting peace established in the Middle East. An end must and will be put to the shameful neo-colonialist oppression of countries and peoples, which the Tel Aviv rulers and their overseas backers are vainly trying to ensure.

*Pravda*, October 4, 1969

### TASS Statement of October 26, 1969

The United States Embassy in the Lebanon, in a statement circulated the other day under the pretext of expressing concern about "the independence and territorial integrity of the Lebanon," in fact proclaimed the right of the United States to interfere in the internal affairs of the Lebanese Republic. It said that "the interests of the United States of America in that area exceed

the interests of any other individual state."

The aims pursued by the United States are evident from the statement itself. It recalls the old colonial practice when great powers referred to violations of their interests in some part of the world in order to interfere in the internal affairs of states and peoples and to deprive the peoples of their inalienable right to settle their own affairs.

No outside interference by a great power in events in the Lebanon can be justified.

The Lebanese Republic is an Arab country closely connected with the other Arab states and nobody is better placed than the Arab states themselves to decide problems arising over the Lebanon. They know their interests and their aims best.

It is understandable why the public of Arab countries, including the Lebanese public, have received the United States statement with indignation, rightly regarding it as an attempt to impose a sort of American patronage over the Lebanon.

The events around the Lebanon are undoubtedly a result of the mounting tension in the Middle East caused by the Israeli aggression, the aftermaths of which have not yet been eliminated.

Israel is not carrying out the decisions of the United Nations and is continuing the adventurist policy of provocations against the Arab states, while some Western powers, and the United States in the first place, are encouraging this Israeli policy.

A considerable role in these plans is given to

undermining the unity of action of the Arab states, making use of the forces of domestic reaction in the Arab countries and pushing them to oppose the national-patriotic forces.

It is apparent that a web of intrigues is again being spun and attempts are being made to turn the blows against the wrong targets in the Middle East and in connection with the Lebanon in particular.

Were the United States really interested, as it asserts in its statement, in the preservation of the independence and territorial integrity of Arab states, it would have directed its efforts first of all at ensuring the speediest fulfilment of United Nations decisions on the settlement of the situation in the Middle East, which provide for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied Arab territories and a just solution of the problem of the Palestinian refugees, as well as of other outstanding issues.

The events taking place in the Lebanon are arousing the concern of the Soviet people. The firm belief is expressed in leading circles in the Soviet Union that no foreign power must encroach on the sovereignty of the Lebanon and its right to settle its internal affairs, nor interfere in matters within the competence of the Arab states themselves.

The conviction is also expressed that the leaders of the Arab countries will be able to find ways of preventing the worsening of the internal situation in the Lebanon and will not allow anybody to sow discord among the Arab peoples or set Arab states at loggerheads.

*Pravda*, October 26, 1969

## Statement on Situation in Middle East

### *USSR Foreign Ministry Press Conference*

The following statement on the situation in the Middle East was read out at a Moscow press conference on October 31 by Leonid Zamyatin, head of the press department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

The situation in the Middle East is continuing to worsen to a serious degree. Israel is not stopping her military provocations against the Arab states. The provocations involve ever larger armed forces, which employ heavy weapons, rockets, aviation and tanks. Territories of the Arab countries are continuing to be bombed and shelled. The cease-fire line is actually being turned by Israel into a front line. The provocations by the Israeli Army in the Suez Canal zone, on the banks of the River Jordan and on the Golan Heights are a continuation of the Israeli aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan.

In the Arab territories which have been temporarily seized, Israeli troops are terrorising the peaceful Arab population and pursuing a policy of colonialism. Israeli leaders are urging Israeli citizens to settle in the occupied Arab territories. The other day a statement to this effect was made by Moshe Dayan, who emphasised that "the settlement of Jews in those territories must be Israel's main objective." In other words, Moshe Dayan is proclaiming the annexation of Arab territories to be Israel's state policy.

All this, as well as Israel's deliberate wrecking

of any proposals aimed at a political settlement in the Middle East, confirm the fact that the intentions of the Israeli leaders lie not in the direction of peace but of further complications in the area. This is the only possible interpretation of Israel's attitude to the decisions adopted by the United Nations Security Council, including its resolution of November 22, 1967. The statement by Israel's Prime Minister Golda Meir on October 21, in which she actually said that "Israel would reject any advice to rely on the United Nations," is evidence of the fact that the Israeli Government is steering a course aimed at blocking a political settlement, presumably expecting Israel to succeed in keeping the Arab lands that have been seized.

This adventurist policy of the Israeli ruling circles is a manifestation of the imperialist plans directed against progressive regimes in the Arab states and against the national independence and freedom of the Arab nations. Imperialist circles of the Western powers, and above all those in the United States of America, are encouraging the aggressive Israeli policy in the Middle East and are giving Israel financial and military assistance.

The fact that Israel is receiving active support, in her reckless course, from the United States ruling circles is borne out by the talks recently held in Washington between the Israeli Prime Minister and the US leaders, which resulted in a new shipment of arms to Israel, i.e., to a state which has committed aggression and which is continuing to stage provocations against the Arab countries.

The decision by the US Government permitting

Americans who enrol in the Israeli Armed Forces to retain their American citizenship is a dangerous step, encouraging Israel to embark on new military adventures. By virtue of this measure the US Government is offering Israel an opportunity to obtain not only military aircraft but also American pilots and personnel for technical maintenance. There is no doubt that this decision by the US Government can lead to serious complications in the Middle East.

The question arises: How can all these actions be compatible with the declarations which are being made in the United States about the need to seek a political settlement? Is it the case, perhaps, that some people would like to use diplomatic corridors to cover up their support for Israel and her aggressive actions?

Two years have gone by since the Security Council's decision which made it obligatory for Israel to withdraw her troops from the occupied Arab territories. That decision is aimed at establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The principal and, in fact, the only obstacle in the way of agreement on a political settlement is the attitude of Israel and of those circles outside Israel, and above all in the United States, who are actually conniving in the claims of the Israeli extremists.

Claims are frequently made to the effect that the Israeli leaders are defending the right of their state to an independent national existence. That is a false claim. Some personalities in Tel Aviv and international Zionist circles are trying in that way to camouflage Israel's adventurist plans aimed at keeping the Arab lands seized in June 1967. If the Israeli leaders were really concerned

about the security of their nation, the best solution for them would be to recognise and implement the Security Council's resolution. That resolution proceeds from the premise that all nations in the area are entitled to an independent existence and development. This applies equally to Israel.

By torpedoing a political settlement on the basis of the Security Council's resolution, the Israeli ruling circles are more and more entangling the Israeli people in the criminal and onerous struggle against the Arab peoples. Such policies create a serious threat to the destinies of the peoples in the Middle East and first and foremost to the Israeli people themselves.

The present serious situation in the Middle East demands immediate measures to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression. The withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories is the principal step in order to achieve this objective. Otherwise there cannot be a just or lasting peace in the area. The Soviet Government, proceeding on the basis of its firm conviction that the Security Council's resolution must be implemented, has stated, in the course of the consultations within the framework of the United Nations, a number of considerations aimed at an interlinked implementation by the sides concerned of all the provisions of the Security Council's resolution. It should be emphasised that together with other issues, the problem of the Palestinian refugees must also be given a just solution.

As is well known, there are contacts among various countries aimed at facilitating the implementation of the Security Council resolution. The

Soviet Union is taking part in those contacts.

We are in favour of a continuation of the contacts that have been established, including a resumption of meetings by the representatives of the four powers which are permanent members of the Security Council, the USSR, the United States, Great Britain and France—bearing in mind, in this connection, the fact that such meetings should make a speedy contribution to the elimination of the consequences of the Israeli aggression. So far, unfortunately, it cannot be said that the contacts which have taken place have produced tangible results. The reason lies in the obstructionist line of Israel and the one-sided attitude taken by the representatives of some Western states, who assume that Israel should benefit from the aggression she has committed. This approach is in contradiction with the Security Council resolution, which clearly proclaims the inadmissibility of acquiring territories through war and the need to withdraw the Israeli troops from the Arab territories occupied at the time of the June conflict. We would like to hope that further contacts will bring positive results and that the achievement of such results will not be protracted.

As for the Soviet Union, it will firmly continue to pursue its policy directed towards a settlement in the Middle East on the basis which has been repeatedly advocated by the Soviet Union and which is compatible with the decisions of the United Nations.

The Soviet Government considers that effective measures must be taken to implement the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967. The United Nations and its bodies have at their disposal sufficient means for that purpose.

Failure to implement the Security Council's resolution would, in fact, mean encouraging aggression and would discredit the United Nations and lead to a further dangerous aggravation of the situation in the Middle East.

At a time when the enemies of the Arab peoples are counting on undermining the unity of the Arab states, the strengthening of the unity and cohesion of the Arab states is of particular importance in the opinion of the Soviet Union. As the latest developments around Lebanon have shown, a web of intrigue is being woven in the Middle East: plans are being hatched in order to undermine the unity of Arab states and peoples and to divert their attention from solving vital problems of the present day.

The situation in the Middle East urgently demands the unity of all Arab countries in order to achieve the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression and the safeguarding of the national rights and gains of Arab peoples.

The need to have the aggression in the Middle East ended was again stressed in the address by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Comrade Leonid Brezhnev, at the Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship meeting. The interests of all peace-loving nations demand that a lasting peace be ensured in that part of our planet. This attitude of the Soviet Union is fully supported and approved by the Arab countries, by other peace-loving states and by progressive opinion throughout the world.

The Soviet Government considers it necessary to reiterate that it will continue to extend comprehensive aid to the Arab states which are struggling to maintain the progressive gains of their

peoples against the encroachments of Israel and her imperialist protectors. The Soviet Government has always advocated a speedy political settlement of the Middle East crisis in the interests of establishing lasting peace in the Middle East and in the interests of world peace.

*Pravda*, November 1, 1969

**Statement by Central Committees of Communist and Workers' Parties and Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, the USSR and Czechoslovakia on Situation in Middle East**

November 27, 1969

The area of the Middle East has recently been the scene of a dangerous worsening of tension as a result of the aggressive policy of the most belligerent circles of imperialism.

On an ever increasing scale Israel has been engineering military provocations against the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic, Jordan and other Arab states. Ever larger contingents of armed forces, using heavy weapons, aircraft and tanks, have been involved in these provocations. Israel is pursuing a policy of colonial plunder, oppression and violence against the Arab population in the occupied Arab territories. These actions by Israel are extremely dangerous: they are pushing events in this area towards a new military conflict.

This policy of provocation by Israel, which creates an obstacle in the way of the establish-

ment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, is an expression of plans spearheaded against progressive regimes in Arab countries, against the national independence of all Arab states and against the liberation movement of Arab peoples which plays an outstanding role in the struggle against imperialism. The imperialists are seeking to regain the positions they lost in the Middle East in order to continue their plunder of the national wealth of Arab countries and, in the first place, their oil resources. This is the reason why the imperialist circles of some Western countries, and first of all the USA, are actively encouraging the Israeli policy of annexations in the Middle East and are rendering ever increasing financial, military and other assistance to Israel. The newest weapons, including planes, rockets, etc., are being delivered to the aggressor in considerable quantities.

Two years have passed since the Security Council adopted a resolution binding Israel to withdraw her troops from the occupied territories and aimed at establishing a just peace in the Middle East. This resolution, however, has not yet been implemented because of the provocative adventurist position of Israel, which stubbornly ignores the will of the United Nations and the will of world public opinion.

Israel and her patrons are deliberately frustrating the possibilities of a political settlement in the hope that they will succeed in annexing the occupied Arab territories. This is the only way to assess Israel's attitude to the persistent demands by the broad world public and the resolutions of the UN Security Council, including its resolu-

tion of November 22, 1967. After the recent parliamentary elections in Israel, which were held in an atmosphere of chauvinistic passions, the positions of the notorious reactionary extremist forces, who are pushing the people of Israel to the continuation and aggravation of the conflict with their Arab neighbours, have become stronger.

Frustrating a political settlement of the Middle East conflict, the Israeli ruling circles have increasingly involved the Israeli people in the criminal, protracted fighting with Arab peoples. Such a policy creates a serious danger first of all for the Israeli people themselves, and it is fraught with a threat to universal peace.

This aggressive policy of Israel and those circles in the West which inspire and encourage the Israeli aggression arouses growing indignation all over the world.

The peoples of the world demand that effective measures should be taken at last for the implementation of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967. Non-compliance with this resolution means the encouragement of the aggressor and leads to discrediting the United Nations and to a further dangerous worsening of the situation in the Middle East.

The present serious situation in the Middle East calls for immediate measures. The peoples of the world must compel Israel to withdraw its troops from the occupied Arab territories. Without a settlement of this problem there can be no lasting and just peace in this area. Along with other problems, there must be a just solution to the problem of ensuring the legal rights and interests of the Arab people of Palestine, who

are waging a courageous national-liberation and anti-imperialist struggle.

Experience shows that imperialists are continuing their attempts to overthrow progressive regimes in Arab countries by using the ruling Zionist circles of Israel as their tool for this purpose. The enemies of the Arab peoples calculate on the weakening of the unity of Arab states. That is why the strengthening of the unity of Arab peoples is of special significance for the struggle to remove the aftermaths of the Israeli aggression.

The socialist countries, which have always been sincere friends of Arab states, express their fraternal solidarity with the peoples of the Arab countries who are carrying on a struggle in defence of their national independence, sovereignty and freedom.

Our parties, peoples and states are firmly determined to do everything in their power to frustrate the plans of the aggressors in the Middle East. The socialist countries will continue to render all-round assistance to the Arab states who are carrying on a struggle for the preservation of the progressive gains of their peoples, against the encroachments by Israel and her patrons.

On behalf of our parties, peoples and states, we call upon all peoples and all peace-loving states to render effective assistance to the Arab peoples in their just struggle for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories, in their struggle for freedom and independence, against the intrigues of the imperialist forces in the Middle East, and for a just solution to the Middle East crisis, in the interests of es-

tablishing a lasting peace in this area and in the interests of peace all over the world.

*Pravda*, November 27, 1969

**Message from the Presidium of the USSR  
Supreme Soviet and Soviet Government to the  
Arab Summit Conference**

On behalf of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government we greet the leaders of the Arab states who have gathered at their top-level conference, and through them, the peoples of the Arab countries, friends of the Soviet Union.

Your conference is taking place at a time when the situation in the Middle East remains tense due to Israel's continuing aggression against the Arab countries.

In their recent joint statement "On the Situation in the Middle East" the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries once again drew the attention of the world public to the grave situation in that part of the world and demanded that urgent measures be taken to ensure a lasting and just peace in the Middle East.

Today it is clear to all that the dangerous tension in the Middle East is a direct result of the fact that the Tel Aviv Government, backed by its imperialist protectors is hampering a political settlement of the Middle East crisis, flouting the UN resolutions and challenging the demand and will of the world public.

Israel's aggressive policy of conquest indicates that the imperialist forces will not give up their

schemes to halt the national-liberation movement of the peoples of the Arab East, restore the lost positions of the imperialists in that part of the world, and plunder the national wealth of the Arab countries. This is why they are seeking to fan new military conflicts, to split the Arab peoples, and to grossly interfere in the internal affairs of the Arab states.

Peace can and must be restored in the Middle East. This requires unconditional and full implementation of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967 and, above all, withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories.

It goes without saying that the solution of the Middle East problem must also ensure the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab people of Palestine.

In view of the prevailing situation, it is of particular importance to consolidate the unity of the Arab peoples and states, and their solidarity and co-operation with all the anti-imperialist forces, to pool the efforts of all Arab states in their joint actions to attain their legitimate rights and achieve a just political settlement of the Middle East conflict.

The struggle against the Israeli aggression is an inherent part of the peoples' struggle against the forces of militarism and war, for national independence and universal peace. The Soviet Union is determined to spare no effort in future, too, to frustrate imperialist plans in the Middle East area. It will continue to render the Arab countries assistance and support in their struggle for freedom and independence.

We wish participants in the conference success

in settling the issues pertaining to the strengthening of Arab unity in eliminating the consequences of Israeli aggression and establishing a lasting peace in the Middle East.

Nikolai PODGORNYY  
Chairman  
Presidium  
USSR Supreme Soviet

Alexei KOSYGIN  
Chairman  
USSR Council of Ministers

*Pravda*, December 22, 1969

### Peace Should Be Restored in Middle East

Alarming news is coming in, on the grave situation in the Middle East, caused by fresh acts of aggression by the Israeli military. Israeli aviation is extending the range of its criminal operations and bombing densely populated areas of the Nile delta, in the United Arab Republic. Bombs and shells continue to rain down on peaceful villages in Jordan and the Lebanon. On February 12, Israeli aviation bombed the iron and steel plant in Abu Zaabal near Cairo. Bombardment with missiles, napalm bombs, and delayed-action bombs have caused the death of nearly 80 plant employees; almost one hundred people were injured.

In its policy of annexation of the occupied Arab territories the Tel Aviv rulers are resorting to the most brutal methods. They have imposed a regime of unbridled terror on these territories, evicting the Arab population, destroying dwellings, throwing into prison all who resist their

inhuman measures, setting up Israeli military hamlets on Arab lands—in short, colonising areas they have seized. The bellicose Israeli Zionists are whipping up a campaign of outright chauvinist propaganda, sowing hostility and hatred for the Arab peoples and inculcating the spirit of sheer racialism among their own people.

It became known a few days ago that Washington is considering shipments of new consignments of armaments to Israel, including the "Skyhawk" and "Phantom" planes. Deliveries of aircraft under previous contracts are also continuing. No verbal acrobatics concerning the "balance of forces" in the Middle East can help the Washington propaganda-makers conceal the fact that these armaments are being delivered to Israel to continue the aggression.

Moreover, there have been numerous reports in the world press to the effect that Washington is favourably regarding Israel's request for new big loans. Israel is also aided by the monopolists of Western Germany. Money keeps pouring into Israel from international Zionist organisations to finance the aggression.

Modern Zionism is an ideology, a ramified system of organisations, the practical policy of a handful of Jewish bourgeoisie who form one whole with the monopoly circles of the USA and other imperialist powers. Its essence is unbridled chauvinism and vile anti-communism. Ignoring the real interests of the Israeli people the Zionists have also placed the state of Israel at the service of imperialism.

By their barbarous aggressive actions the rulers of Israel have completely exposed themselves to world public opinion as an instrument of

imperialist reaction. The reactionaries of the United States and other imperialist countries would like to use Israel as a means of reversing developments in the Middle East, defeating the national-liberation movement and turning this area into a sphere of neo-colonialist domination. The Israeli extremists and their backers hope by blackmail and threats, by escalation of the aggression to be able to undermine the Arab states' will to fight, force them to forgo their legitimate interests and submit to the imperialist dictate.

The aggressors have a short memory. They cannot seem to learn the lessons of history, even comparatively recent history. The American military, who pursued similar objectives in their dirty war against the people of Vietnam, suffered numerous defeats.

Gone are the times when the canon and the bomb could intimidate the peoples defending their vital national interests. The Arab peoples are determined to give a fitting rebuff to the Israeli invaders and their imperialist bosses; they are determined to completely overcome the consequences of the aggression and to keep on with the progressive social transformations in their countries. The Israeli raids do not go unanswered. Israel is suffering increasing losses in this "war to exhaustion," which is the subject of so much talk in Tel Aviv nowadays. The Palestine resistance movement is mounting.

The brazen activities of the Israeli military are arousing the wrathful indignation and resolute condemnation of the entire peace-loving public, who demand a stop to Tel Aviv's aggressive

ventures. At meetings and rallies the Soviet people are protesting against the provocations of the Israeli rulers. Our people enthusiastically support the Arab peoples in their just struggle against the Israeli invaders, in defence of their national interests, against imperialist encroachment, neo-colonialism and Zionism, and are denouncing the aggressors' crimes. On March 2, Soviet public organisations held a day of protest against Israel's escalation of aggressive military actions against the Arab countries.

Progressive mankind at large is demanding that Israel immediately stop the dangerous armed attacks and ventures against the Arab countries, that she observe the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. It is imperative that Israel should be made to renounce the policy of armed provocations, that a lasting peace should be established in the Middle East.

The policy of hostility and aggression towards the Arab peoples will not benefit its ringleaders and organisers. It is sure to be a fiasco. The Israeli rulers and their imperialist protectors should be aware of this when they continue to build up pressures in the Middle East.

The Soviet Union favours mutual observance by the parties concerned of all the stipulations of the Security Council resolution, for attaining a political settlement in that area. In this, the question of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories has been and continues to be the principal issue. Unless the troops are withdrawn there cannot be an end to the state of war or a stable peace. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and all progressive

forces of the world are determined to thwart the imperialist ventures and restore peace in the Middle East.

*Pravda*, March 3, 1970

### TASS Statement of May 30, 1970

For over two weeks the Israeli military have been constantly staging armed provocations on the Lebanon's southern frontier using armoured troops and infantry. These units, with air force and artillery support, are invading the territory of the Lebanese Republic. Grossly violating the Lebanon's state sovereignty the Israeli troops are engaged in military operations on her territory, causing mounting casualties among the peaceful population of the country's southern areas, destroying a large number of dwellings and inflicting other damage. The inhabitants are being compelled to leave their homes en masse. The present Government of Israel, with defiant cynicism and in spirit of the traditions of the colonialists proclaims its "right" to undertake these acts of aggression against Arab countries.

In order to justify all these armed provocations the Israeli rulers, as usual, refer to a "threat to Israel's security." In actual fact, the actions of the Israeli military are spearheaded against the territorial integrity of the Lebanon. Israel does not conceal that she is trying to force the Lebanon to leave the pan-Arab front and isolate her from the rest of the Arab world. Israeli aggressive actions, therefore, are not only direc-

ted against the Lebanon, but against all Arab states, against all Arabs and against peace. It is not accidental that these actions are correctly regarded throughout the world as premeditated and aimed at further aggravating the situation in the Middle East.

By ignoring the Security Council resolution on the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab territory occupied in June 1967, and with the backing of external imperialist circles, Israel hopes not only to consolidate her positions in the occupied territories but also to extend her occupation to the southern areas of the Lebanon.

These piratical actions of Israel show once again that the Israeli ruling circles, intoxicated to the point of blindness by chauvinism, are not seeking peace in the Middle East, as they declare, but are seeking for new territorial gains. They are seeking expansion at the expense of other countries and peoples.

The growing tension in the Middle East caused by Israel's reckless actions arouses the wrathful condemnation in the Soviet Union. The interests of peace in the Middle East require that Israel should be made to respect the UN Charter, cease her armed provocations, withdraw her troops from all occupied Arab territories and observe the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967 and the other UN decisions. It is high time for the Israeli rulers to realise the grave consequences that can come from continuing the perilous political course, for Israel first and foremost.

*Pravda*, May 30, 1970

## Statement by USSR Supreme Soviet on Situation in Middle East

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics expresses serious concern over the threat to world peace that is created in the Middle East by the aggressive actions of Israel and her imperialist patrons.

Three years have gone by since the time when, in accordance with the decision of the United Nations Security Council, the intrusion of Israeli troops into the territory of the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan was stopped. But Israel is continuing her aggression against the Arab states. She is occupying the Arab lands which she seized: she is carrying out raids on the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria, Jordan and the Lebanon. Because of this, the situation in the Middle East is fraught with the danger of another explosion.

Israel has not carried out a single decision of the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly in connection with the Middle East crisis. She has maintained, and is continuing to maintain, an obstructionist attitude with regard to any efforts directed towards achieving a political settlement in the Middle East. It is now particularly clear that Israel is fighting, not for her own existence, not for her own security, but with the aim of seizing other people's lands. On the occupied Arab territories, Israel is pursuing a policy of colonial plunder and mass terror towards the Arab population.

The essence of Israel's present policy is to block the roads to a political settlement in the Middle East and to intensify pressure on the Arab coun-

tries with a view to consolidating the results of her aggression. But these calculations are without any foundation. Any plans to enable Israel to prolong the occupation of the Arab territories and, what is more, to annex them, plans which would place the interests of Israel above the interests of other states in the area, are doomed to failure.

For decades the peoples of the Arab East have had no peace. They have been obliged to wage a hard struggle for national liberation and social progress. The whole area is often shaken by military conflicts. The reason for this is the policy of imperialism, which seeks to deal a blow at the liberation movement of the Arab peoples and to preserve its own strategic and economic positions in the area and, in particular, to preserve the opportunity to exploit the area's oil wealth. It is imperialist powers, above all the United States, and the instrument of imperialist policy in the area—the ruling circles of Israel—that are entirely responsible for the dangerous situation in the Middle East. The United States is actually encouraging the Israeli ruling circles.

Matters now stand like this: either the military danger in the Middle East will increase still more—and this might happen if the aggressor is not curbed—or measures will be taken to ensure a political settlement on the basis of observance of the Security Council's resolution of November 22, 1967, in its entirety.

Israel's aggression in the Middle East, supported by neo-colonialist circles, is not only directed against the Arab states. What happens in that area, at the junction of the Asian and the African continents, has a direct bearing on the destinies of the peoples of all the countries of

Asia and Africa, on the fate of world peace, on the security of the nations. The anti-imperialist and peace-loving forces realise that passivity in face of the aggressor would free the hands of the imperialists for new aggressive actions against other peoples and against other independent states.

The Deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet are convinced that in conditions in which the reckless actions of the Israeli leaders are creating a real threat to international peace and security, not a single parliament and not a single member of parliament can remain indifferent. All who treasure the ideals of peace, freedom and the independence of nations must take resolute action and must condemn and isolate the aggressor and his patrons so as to make the imperialists abandon their adventurist course.

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR entirely approves the policy of the Soviet Government in giving all-round assistance to the Arab states in their courageous struggle against Israeli aggression, the policy aimed at achieving a just and peaceful political settlement of the Middle East conflict.

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR believes that every state in the Middle East has the right to independent national existence and to independence and security.

The Soviet Union has believed and continues to believe that only the peoples and the governments of the Middle East states should be the masters of the situation in the Middle East.

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR expresses the hope that this statement will meet with a favourable response and with support from all the

peace-loving forces and will help the states to take the necessary measures in keeping with the aims of establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

**SUPREME SOVIET OF THE UNION OF SOVIET  
SOCIALIST REPUBLICS**

The Kremlin, Moscow. July 15, 1970

*Pravda*, July 16, 1970

**From Speech by L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary  
of the CPSU CC, at Meeting in Alma-Ata,  
August 28, 1970**

The situation in the Middle East, as in the past, merits serious attention. Israel's aggression and military provocations against Arab countries, which continued for over three years, were dictated by a scheme on the part of international imperialist circles—that of liquidating the progressive regimes in the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries and striking a blow against the national-liberation movement as a whole. Thanks to the staunch, courageous stand taken by Arab countries and the active support given them by the socialist countries and other progressive forces, that scheme was thwarted.

Ever since the outbreak of the conflict in the Middle East the Soviet Union, in close interaction with other socialist countries, has invariably striven for a political settlement on a just basis. Such a basis is provided by the resolution of the United Nations Security Council of November 22, 1967.

The Soviet Government has proceeded and is

proceeding now on the basis of the belief that the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East cannot be ensured through any rewarding of the aggressor for the crimes he has committed. Such a peace can be ensured only by the complete removal of all the consequences of Israel's aggression, and in particular as a result of the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied territories. We have come out and we continue to come out in favour of assuring the national rights, security and independence of all the states in the area, including assurance of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

As is well known, on August 8 the governments of the United Arab Republic and Jordan announced their agreement to suspend armed actions for three months. What is intended is that during this period fresh efforts will be made to find a mutually acceptable political settlement of the Middle East conflict. The United Arab Republic and Jordan appointed their representatives to discuss ways of settling the situation in the Middle East.

These actions by Arab states compelled the ruling circles of Israel also to agree to a cease-fire and declare for the first time, through clenched teeth, their readiness to comply with the provisions of the Security Council resolution. Representatives of the parties concerned are said to have established the first contacts through the representative of the United Nations Secretary-General, Dr. Gunnar Jarring.

The Soviet Union, naturally, takes a positive view of this development of events. Our country has always insisted that Gunnar Jarring's mission, which was entrusted to him by the Security

Council, should be carried out fully and effectively.

The Soviet Union has welcomed with satisfaction the constructive attitude adopted on this matter by the Government of the United Arab Republic, headed by President Gamal Abdel Nasser, an outstanding statesman with whom we recently had very frank, friendly and useful talks in Moscow.

Opportunities now exist for approaching the settlement of the Middle East conflict from the positions of realism and responsibility. What is needed now is not new provocations and subterfuges designed to circumvent or violate the cease-fire agreement, but honest observance of the agreement reached and real steps in favour of peace. Those who have been trying in recent years to impose their will "from a position of strength" on Arab countries and who have carried out aggressive actions, now have the chance to think better of it and to abandon that hopeless and adventurist line which is dangerous to world peace.

We are deeply convinced that an end to the conflict in the Middle East would meet the vital interests of both the Arab countries and Israel. The Arab peoples need peace for the progressive development of their national economy and for raising the living standards of the working people, while for Israel a war with neighbouring countries is not only hopeless but also extremely dangerous for her further destinies.

Only a little step towards peace has been taken so far in the Middle East, but this step has already met with sharp opposition from supporters of continued military actions and from all the ad-

herents of an aggressive policy. It is very important now for the peace forces in the Middle East not to let the initiative in settling the conflict slip from their hands and not to allow the enemies of peace to wreck the agreement reached or use it to cover up their own aggressive schemes.

It is in the general interests of the peoples to do everything possible for a settlement of the Middle East conflict and for the present ceasefire to become a good beginning for a just, firm and lasting peace in the Middle East. As for the Soviet Union, this country, loyal as it is to the Leninist policy of peace and friendship among the peoples, will do everything in its power to contribute towards rebuffing the aggressors, eliminating hotbeds of war and the danger of war, and strengthening world peace.

*Pravda*, August 29, 1970

**From Speech by N. V. Podgorny, Chairman  
of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at  
Luncheon in Honour of President Varahgiri  
Venkata Giri of India, September 23, 1970**

The imperialist forces have not abandoned their adventurist plans in the Middle East, where the Israeli invaders, with the support of their foreign patrons, refuse to comply with the United Nations Security Council's decisions and sabotage Dr. Jar-ring's mission.

Under these circumstances, the fratricidal conflict which started the other day in Jordan gives rise to serious concern and anxiety, particularly in connection with the threat of direct interference of external forces, indicative of which are

movements of the US Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean and other facts.

In the interests of the national-liberation and anti-imperialist movement of Arab peoples and of ensuring their unity in the struggle for the elimination of the consequences of Israel's aggression, it is urgently necessary to put an end as soon as possible to the bloody clashes in Jordan, to terminate discord between Arabs and to reach a just agreement between the Jordanian Government and the organisations of the Palestinian resistance movement.

The Soviet Union has consistently come out for this, too, in its appeals recently to a number of states—both those belonging and not belonging to the area—firmly stressing the inadmissibility of outside interference in the developments in Jordan, under any pretext whatsoever.

Resolutely condemning the actions of the Israeli aggressors and their imperialist patrons, the Soviet Union continues to insist on the unconditional implementation of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, on the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories and on the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

*Pravda*, September 24, 1970

## Concerning Developments in Jordan

### *USSR Foreign Ministry Statement*

September 24, 1970

In connection with the armed clashes in Jordan between units of the Jordanian Army and Pales-

tinian units, the USSR Embassy in Amman and also the Embassies of the USSR in Damascus and Baghdad have, on instructions from the Soviet Government, established contact with the leaders of Jordan, Syria and Iraq.

Firm confidence has been expressed from the Soviet side that everything should be done to end as soon as possible the fratricidal fighting which started in Jordan, fighting which can only play into the hands of forces which are not interested in establishing a lasting peace in the Middle East.

Permanent contact is being maintained with President Nasser of the United Arab Republic on all questions linked with the developments in Jordan.

In view of the increasing concentration of the forces of the American Sixth Fleet in the Eastern Mediterranean, as well as other war preparations by the United States in the area, the Soviet Government called the attention of the Government of the USA, through the Embassy of the USSR in Washington, to the need for all states to display caution in their steps in connection with the present complicated situation in the Middle East, and also to the fact that any interference from outside into the events in Jordan would further complicate the situation in the Middle East and the international situation as a whole. It was also stressed that the Government of the United States could use its influence with the Government of Israel in order that Israel should not try to exploit the Jordanian events for its aggressive aims.

The British Government was informed of Soviet views on current events through the Embassy of the USSR in London. In doing so, the Soviet side expressed the hope that Great Britain, for its

part, would not permit any interference in the internal affairs of the countries of the area.

The French Government was contacted through diplomatic channels in order to exchange opinions and information on the current events and on steps taken both by the Soviet and French sides.

The Soviet Mission at the United Nations is keeping in contact with the UN Secretary-General and with the missions of a number of states who are members of the Security Council.

The necessary steps will be taken further to help bring the conflict in Jordan to an end and prevent intervention by external forces in this conflict.

*Pravda*, September 24, 1970

**From Speech by L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary  
of the CPSU CC, at Grand Rally in Baku,  
October 2, 1970**

All who hold dear the cause of peace and the security of the peoples cannot but feel concerned over the situation in the Middle East. The contacts which were started between the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Israel through the United Nations representative, Dr. Jarring, have not been developed, because of the policy of the ruling circles in Tel Aviv, who, with the support of the United States Government, are doing everything in their power to thwart Dr. Jarring's mission.

Behind a smoke-screen of cooked-up accusations against the United Arab Republic, the Israeli military command is trying in every way to strengthen its positions in the occupied Arab terri-

tories, particularly on the eastern bank of the Suez Canal, and is building up forces for fresh piratical blows against Arab countries. With characteristic impudence, Israeli leaders are declaring, for the whole world to hear, that "they are not going to pull back to the frontiers of 1967," i.e., they are not going to return what they have stolen by means of aggression.

The United States Government is continuing to connive with the Israeli aggressors, actually encouraging their policy of frustrating the talks, and sending ever new consignments of offensive weapons to Israel for new attacks on her neighbours. It seems that Washington, while talking about peace, is actually sowing the seeds of discord and animosity.

Unfortunately, the bloody clashes that flared up recently in Jordan between government troops and armed units of the Palestine organisations have done great harm to the common cause of the Arab peoples, including the Palestinian Arabs. This fratricidal struggle is truly tragic. The Israeli aggressors rubbed their hands with glee as they watched it, and the imperialists across the ocean took the opportunity to bring up forces in the hope that there might be an opportunity for fresh military intervention in the affairs of the Arabs, so as to make it easier for them to strangle the liberation movement of the Arabs and plunder their national wealth.

However, nowadays it has become very dangerous to trifle in such a cynical way with the destinies of independent states and peoples. By so doing it is possible not only to burn one's fingers but even to lose one's whole arm. It is not hard to imagine what stormy reactions and what out-

bursts of anger on the part of the people would be aroused by fresh armed intervention by the imperialist powers in the Middle East.

As for the Soviet Union, its position is absolutely clear. We have tried to contribute in every possible way towards a final ending of the fratricidal struggle in Jordan and towards stopping the extermination of the units of the Palestine resistance movement. We have believed, and we believe now, that any foreign military intervention in the events in Jordan is categorically inadmissible.

It is our firm belief that the main task of all freedom-loving and peace-loving forces in the Middle East today is to achieve a peaceful settlement by political means, eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression and bring back peace and tranquillity on a sound and durable basis to all peoples in the area.

The untimely death of the hero of the liberation struggle of the Arabs, the President of the United Arab Republic and Chairman of the Arab Socialist Union, Gamal Abdel Nasser, is a great loss to the Arab people and to the cause for which they are fighting. He was a great patriot, a courageous fighter against oppression and aggression and for freedom, independence and social progress, a wise statesman and one of the most authoritative leaders of the Arab world. We Soviet people mourn the loss of our comrade-in-arms, our comrade in the joint anti-imperialist struggle, a true friend of our country and of the entire socialist community.

Gamal Abdel Nasser was one of those who laid a sound foundation for the great friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the

United Arab Republic, and all Arab countries. We know for certain that the magnificent edifice of our friendship, built on this foundation, will grow and become stronger, because this friendship is an expression of a profound necessity of historical development and is destined to flourish for ages.

I take the opportunity to extend from this rostrum warm and comradely greetings to our good friends, the leaders of the United Arab Republic, Gamal Abdel Nasser's associates, who, we are sure, will continue to work with honour for the cause of the late President, a cause that is so important for the United Arab Republic, for the entire Arab people and for the forces of peace and freedom throughout the world.

Our Arab friends must know that the Communist Party and Government of the Soviet Union and all Soviet people will continue to pursue unswervingly the policy of sincere friendship and fraternal co-operation with the United Arab Republic. We shall continue to give all possible support to the just struggle of the Arabs to liberate their territories which have been occupied by the aggressors, and to establish a lasting peace in the Middle East.

*Pravda*, October 3, 1970

Y. PRIMAKOV

### Way to Just Peace

#### *On Soviet Proposals for a Political Settlement in Middle East*

What is the Soviet plan for the normalisation of the Middle East situation?

First, in drafting our proposals, we proceed from the need for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It is precisely a lasting peace that we have in mind, and not a precarious truce.

It is quite natural that peace of this order cannot be ensured by encouraging the aggressor and cannot be made stable unless Israeli troops are withdrawn from the extensive Arab territories which they have seized.

The Soviet Union has always proceeded, and continues to proceed, on the basis of the right of all Middle East states to a safe and autonomous national existence. The statement adopted at the Soviet Parliament's most recent session once again emphasised:

"The Supreme Soviet of the USSR fully approves the Soviet Government's policy of giving all-round assistance to the Arab states in their courageous struggle against the Israeli aggression, a policy whose aim is to achieve a just and peaceful political settlement in the Middle East conflict.

"The Supreme Soviet of the USSR maintains that every state in the Middle East enjoys the right to autonomous national existence and to independence and security."

A just solution to the Middle East crisis must be worked out not only because it is morally necessary—even though the moral factor is of extremely great importance. Without justice—that is to say, without the ending of the Israeli occupation of seized Arab territories, and not only without an end to the state of war, but also without the establishment of peace between states in this area, and equally without recognition of the rights of the Palestinian Arabs—there will be

no reasonably stable settlement.

Engels once wrote that the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine had made war a permanent factor in European politics. Is there any less reason to believe that Israel's present occupation of Arab territories turns war into an inevitable prospect in the Middle East?

Meanwhile, we know that there are a number of United Nations resolutions which provide for the repatriation of the Palestinian refugees or for compensation for their property. It is clearly necessary to decide the question of the Palestinian refugees in order to have a stable peace in the Middle East. All the more so do we regard as impermissible attempts to have "self-determination" for one people or a set of peoples on the basis of other peoples being completely deprived of their national rights.

Secondly, our proposals provide not just for the simple proclamation of peace in the Middle East, but for an understanding between the sides which would impose commitments on both of them. A tangible way to this now could be provided by contacts through the UN Secretary-General's special envoy, Dr. Gunnar Jarring.

The Soviet Union has been and is in favour of the implementation of the Jarring mission. But is this mission an aim in itself? Of course not. What is needed is to establish contacts between the sides through Dr. Jarring; the Jarring mission is required to find concrete ways of implementing the UN Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967.

It should be remembered that this resolution provides for the evacuation of Israeli troops from occupied Arab territories, the ending of the

state of war between the Arab countries and Israel, their right to live in peace within secure and recognised frontiers, the freedom of shipping along sea lanes and a solution to the problem of the Palestinian refugees.

In the Soviet view, for the Jarring mission to be successful it is first of all necessary for the two sides, straightforwardly and unequivocally to declare their readiness to implement the UN Security Council resolution all along the line.

A statement of this kind has already been made by the Government of the United Arab Republic, which is contributing most to the effort to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression.

From the formal point of view Tel Aviv also seems to have consented to implement this resolution. However, this was done too indefinitely and in too general a form. Meanwhile, subsequent pronouncements by the Israeli leaders conflict with the provisions of the resolution to so great a degree that one cannot but doubt the sincerity of this Israeli consent.

Thirdly, the Soviet proposals guarantee the practical implementation of the entire complex of provisions of this Security Council resolution.

It is particularly important today to stand firm on the two main lines of settlement, which are: Israeli evacuation from all Arab territories occupied in 1967 and the simultaneous establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Both issues are organically fused and must be viewed as one composite entity.

The Soviet proposals thus co-ordinate the solution of these questions: the moment the final document, as co-ordinated through Dr. Jarring, is

deposited with the United Nations, the two sides must refrain from all action that would operate against the termination of the state of war; juridically, the termination of the state of war and the establishment of peace will begin the moment the first phase of the Israeli troop withdrawal from the territories occupied in June 1967 is completed—the evacuation may be carried out in two phases.

The Israeli leaders often indulge in talk about what they call "secure frontiers"; in practice it is uncurbed expansion for Israel that is being talked about under the guise of establishing "secure frontiers." Thus, the Chief of the General Staff of the Israeli Army went so far as to say that the River Jordan would constitute a "secure frontier" for Israel.

It is absolutely plain that today, in this age when armaments are rapidly developing, the safety of this or that frontier is not at all ensured by shifting it a few miles away, but by having it universally recognised.

Were the present Israeli leaders really concerned about anything other than expansionist projects for territorial "acquisitions," Tel Aviv would pay closer heed to proposals guaranteeing the frontiers of the states in this area, including the frontiers of Israel, which would accord with the demarcation lines that existed on June 4, 1967.

As for guarantees for the frontiers of the Middle East states, the Soviet proposals ensure them by having the two sides adopt specific commitments to recognise, in conformity with the UN Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, the impermissibility of acquiring territory through war, to respect one another's sovereignty,

territorial integrity, inviolability and political independence, to do all in their power to prevent hostile acts against one another from their respective territories, and mutually to refrain from interference in one another's internal affairs.

The Soviet proposals also stipulate demilitarised zones on either side of the frontier: such zones would give no advantage to either side, and their regime would incorporate restrictions of a purely military character, the introduction of UN troops at a number of points and direct guarantees from the Permanent Members of the Security Council or from the UN Security Council itself.

Such are the Soviet proposals. If the Israeli leaders, who are supported by the imperialist circles of the USA, had not blocked their adoption, a just and lasting peace would long ago have become an established fact in the Middle East.

*Pravda*, October 15, 1970 (Abridged)

## **For a Stable Peace and Security in Middle East**

December 2, 1970

The People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Rumania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, represented at the Berlin Conference of the Political Consultative Committee of states-members of the Warsaw Treaty, have examined the situation in the Middle East and adopted the following statement.

Peace continues to be in jeopardy in the Middle East. For over three years now Israeli troops

have been occupying Arab territory. The imperialist policies of Israel and the forces of international reaction backing her are creating new obstacles in the way of attaining a political settlement in the Middle East. Considering the international importance of this region, one must not underestimate the extent of the danger emanating from such policies.

Two opposing policies are evident in the Middle East. One is a consistent course for reaching a political settlement which would guarantee all peoples of the Middle East, the people of Israel included, an independent and secure national existence; make their boundaries safe; and enable these peoples to channel their efforts, resources and energy into securing their vital needs. But there can be no peace in the Middle East unless Israeli troops quit all the occupied Arab territories. Without this, good-neighbourly relations among the Middle East peoples are inconceivable. The advocates of this course—the United Arab Republic and other Arab states, as well as the socialist and other peace-loving countries that are supporting them—are for observing the stipulations of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, as the basis for restoring peace in the Middle East. As the first practical steps they insist that contacts should be established and talks held between the parties to the conflict, with the UN Secretary General's special envoy, Dr. Gunnar Jarring, as mediator.

The other policy is for retaining at any cost and annexing the occupied territories of the Arab states, for maintaining tension in the Middle East, overthrowing progressive Arab regimes and undermining the Arab national-liberation movement.

Israel and her backers are deliberately sabotaging any measures for reaching a just settlement. They attempt to dictate their demands to the peoples of this area, actually stating that these demands be accepted or there will be no peace. Recently this policy was again condemned by the 25th session of the UN General Assembly.

The forces of international imperialism, particularly American imperialism, bear full responsibility for the fact that the Middle East continues to be one of the most dangerous seats of tension in the world. Flaunting their plans of conquest and "great Israel" programmes, Israel's militarist rulers actually jeopardise their people's vital interests.

The conference expresses confidence that the attempts by the imperialist countries to split and set the Arab peoples against each other will continue to be counteracted by the efforts of the Arab peoples and states to strengthen their unity and cohesion. Those attending the conference are convinced that, as in the past, the intrigues of international reactionaries against the progressive Arab regimes are doomed to failure. They express profound satisfaction over the statements by the UAR leadership that it will continue the course taken by the UAR during the time of the late President Gamal Abdel Nasser, and that it is working against international imperialism, for a political settlement of the Middle East conflict, for independence, freedom and progress, friendship with the socialist countries, peace and international concord.

Those taking part in the conference confirm their readiness resolutely to support in future too, the just struggle of the Arab peoples, including

the Arabs of Palestine, against the imperialist policy of aggression in the Middle East, for the liberation of the occupied Arab territories, for freedom and social progress.

*Pravda*, December 4, 1970

From Speech by N. V. Podgorny, Chairman  
of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at the  
Opening of the Aswan Hydropower Complex,  
January 15, 1971

Dear friends, you are building a new life in the complicated, tense situation caused by the Israeli aggressors' occupying part of your territory, plundering the wealth of your land and scoffing at the peaceful population. However, all difficulties can be surmounted, the attacks by the imperialists and their henchmen can be repulsed if the people pool their efforts, choose a correct programme of action, maintain vigilance against the enemies and seek support among true, reliable friends and allies.

When a state is strong internally, when its people fully appreciate and support their government's policies, as is the case in the United Arab Republic, no intrigues by hostile forces will imperil it.

You are waging a just struggle against imperialism, aggression and oppression. Having treacherously attacked and seized Arab lands, the Israeli aggressors and their imperialist protectors are now trying to dictate their demands to the peoples of the Arab East.

Obviously, Israel would never have risked military ventures against the Arab states, had not she

been sure of the assistance of the imperialist powers, particularly the United States, which supports Israel's aggressive aspirations by supplying her with weapons and money.

The conscience of humanity cannot be reconciled to the fact that the Israeli extremists are ignoring world public opinion in the hope of attaining their adventuristic goals and retaining captured lands.

The lofty principles of freedom and independence must not be reduced to a matter of bargaining and unseemly political gambling. Peace in the Middle East cannot be achieved by way of trampling on the legitimate rights of the Arab peoples.

The sooner the Tel Aviv rulers dispense with their illusions that they will always be able to base their relations with the neighbouring countries on a policy of strength, the better it will be for Israel and her people. For they need peace as much as the peoples of the Arab countries do.

The Israeli rulers are ignoring this and plainly losing their sense of reality. The United Arab Republic and the other Arab states are successfully opposing the aggression. Moreover, progressive, anti-imperialist regimes are becoming stronger in the UAR, Syria, the Sudan, Libia and other Arab countries; a basic change is taking place in the balance of forces and potentialities of the two sides.

The Arab peoples' struggle to eliminate the consequences of Israel's aggression is encountering the mounting support of the peace-loving peoples and countries. With growing persistence they are demanding that an end be put to the aggressive policies of Israel and her backer, the United States,

who finds itself increasingly isolated, as is particularly evident from the results of the last session of the UN General Assembly.

The withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, the observation of all the stipulations of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967; respect for the legitimate rights of all the peoples of the Middle East, of the Arabs of Palestine included—such is a realistic programme of establishing a just and lasting peace in this area.

*Pravda*, January 16, 1971

**From Speech by A. N. Kosygin, Chairman  
of the USSR Council of Ministers, at Kremlin  
Dinner in Honour of the Party and Government  
Delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic,  
February 1, 1971**

The Soviet Union firmly and consistently supports the just cause of the Arabs and is rendering them all-round assistance. We demand that the consequences of Israel's aggression be completely eliminated. The policy of Israel, which relying on the forces of imperialism and reaction, strives to retain the occupied territories, is an infringement on the independence and sovereignty of the neighbouring Arab countries. This policy ruins the prospects for the peaceful development and co-operation of the Middle East peoples giving rise to the constant threat of a new conflict. Moreover, it is amply evident that the Middle East crisis is fraught with the danger of serious international complications. Certainly questions connected with the situation in the Middle East and elimination

of the consequences of Israeli aggression play an important part in our talks.

Developments in the Middle East have now reached a crucial stage. Because of the pressure of world public opinion and the constructive policy of the UAR Government, Israel has agreed to resume contacts with the UN Secretary-General's envoy, Dr. Gunnar Jarring. The Soviet Union firmly believes that in view of the existing the state of affairs the only realistic way to settle the Middle East crisis is to observe the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, with due account paid to the legitimate rights of all Middle East peoples, including those of the Palestinian Arabs. Any further procrastination, any fresh attempts at wrangling from the position of brute strength will not solve the problem and will only aggravate matters. If a state of peace is to be reached, a state whereby all peoples of the Middle East can live like good neighbours, then the criterion should be the real, vital interests of the peoples and not the ideas of extremist politicians. At present the peoples are expecting concrete peace actions from Israel.

Seeking to establish a just and stable peace, the Soviet Union is developing co-operation with the friendly Arab countries and is giving them the necessary assistance. This also applies to its relations with Syria.

The current situation in the world makes the use of force in solving political issues futile. And like the Middle East, this also holds true for Indochina and other parts of the world.

We expect that the Arab countries will pool their efforts still more in the anti-imperialist struggle and in the campaign to eliminate the conse-

quences of Israel's aggression. Throughout the past few years and at all the stages of the Middle East crisis the imperialists have counted on the division of the Arab world. They counted on it when they unleashed the aggression, and, to a considerable extent, they are counting on it now when they are trying to drag out the process of eliminating the consequences of the aggression. The Soviet Union hails the efforts of the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Sudan and the Libian Arab Republic for strengthening joint action in the anti-imperialist struggle, and is confident that the other countries of the Middle East will also make their contribution to strengthening Arab unity.

*Pravda*, February 2, 1971

### **Soviet Government's Statement of February 28, 1971**

The elimination of the consequences of Israel's aggression and the attainment of a political settlement in the Middle East continues to be one of the outstanding, burning international issues determining the general international situation. Recently fresh efforts were made to reach a Middle East settlement. But today the situation is again deteriorating, jeopardising the chances of obtaining a political settlement. This is what the Israel ruling quarters seem to desire.

On Februray 21 this year the Israeli Government published an official statement to the effect that it would not withdraw its troops from occupied Arab territory, and particularly from the

territory of the United Arab Republic, that Israel "will not retreat to behind the truce line of June 4, 1967."

The Israeli extremists never attempted to conceal their plans for conquest and their striving to retain the Arab territories occupied during the 1967 aggression. But even so, the circumstances in which the Israeli Government made this statement make it particularly meaningful.

A situation more favourable than ever for attaining agreement on a political settlement—a settlement based on observing to the letter the well-known Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967 by all the parties concerned—has been shaping up these last few weeks. The consistent policy pursued by the United Arab Republic played a decisive role in bringing this situation about.

The efforts by the UAR and a number of other Arab countries, supported by a great majority of the nations of the world, resulted in the resumption six weeks ago of the contacts between the UN Secretary-General's special envoy, Dr. Gunnar Jarring, and the parties to the conflict. For the first time these contacts from the very beginning developed into discussions of the specific measures making up the complex of measures for reaching a political settlement. Despite the fact that part of their territory has been occupied by Israel for over three years now, the Arab countries, guided by the desire to create a favourable atmosphere for the success of the talks, expressed readiness to continue observing the cease-fire. The UAR Government also proposed the resumption of international navigation along the Suez Canal provided that Israel began to withdraw her troops from the Sinai Peninsula.

Such were the factors contributing to the development of the contacts. On February 8, Dr. Jarring, noting the potentialities shaping up for making progress in reaching a Middle East settlement, addressed the two parties to the conflict suggesting that they inform him of their readiness to assume the specific obligations concerning the two key questions involved in the political adjustment—the withdrawal of troops from the occupied territories and the peace terms to be established in the Middle East.

The UAR's position on these two questions was clear and positive. According to statements by UAR representatives, particularly those made in connection with the appeal by the UN special envoy Dr. Jarring, the United Arab Republic was willing to conclude a peace treaty with Israel if the latter pledged to withdraw her troops from all the occupied territories and comply with the UN resolution concerning the Palestinian refugees. The UAR was prepared to have the peace treaty stipulate the obligations of both sides with regard to putting an end to the state of war; respect for each other's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence, recognition and respect of the right of each of the sides to live in peace within safe and recognised boundaries; and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. The UAR agreed to ensure freedom of navigation along the Suez Canal within the framework of the political settlement and in accordance with the Constantinople Convention of 1888, as well as free navigation along the Strait of Tiran in accordance with the standards of international law. Finally, the UAR accepted the idea of setting up demilitarised zones along both sides of the bor-

der, and of stationing UN forces in some regions for the maintenance of peace.

The UAR Government's positive platform was welcomed with profound satisfaction by all who really wished for peace in the Middle East. Even the quarters far from sympathising with the Arab national-liberation struggle, with the United Arab Republic and the other Arab states that have taken the road of progressive development, had to grant that the position of the UAR both in its entirety and in details accorded with the programme of the political settlement worked out by the Security Council. The courageous and realistic stand strengthened the international prestige of the United Arab Republic. It completely exposed the allegation by the enemies of the Arab national-liberation movement that the UAR was not ready to accept Middle East peace terms which would be fair to all, Israel included.

It became evident that the talks had approached a decisive stage. Had the Israeli Government declared it was ready to assume its part of the obligations in line with the political settlement, including the obligation with regard to the withdrawal of troops from all the occupied territories, there would have been a real turn to peace in the Middle East.

But that was **not to happen**. In its statement of February 21 the Israeli Government actually gave a negative reply to the appeal of the Secretary-General's special envoy regarding the main question, upon which peace in the Middle East hinged, the question of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories. Thus Israel has openly acted as an aggressor, once again demonstrating to the world at large that she is not

going to give up her predatory aspirations and is not going so far as to scorn the United Nations and all peoples of the world.

There is no secret as to what the Israeli Government hopes for in pursuing a course of frustrating the political settlement and further aggravating the situation in the Middle East. It counts on support from the United States, which invariably encourages Israel's aggressive policies with respect to the Arab countries, protects Israeli expansionists in every way and supplied them with the latest type of arms.

The American representatives have time and again come out with statements concerning their government's interest in reaching a Middle East settlement. But words do not tally with deeds in American politics. In words the United States stands for peace in the Middle East and for reaching a political settlement. In deeds, Israel continues to be the instrument of American imperialism in frustrating the political settlement and creating new dangerous complications in the Middle East. In words the US Government recognises the legitimate interests of the Arab states but in deeds it supports Israel's aggressive policy.

Consequently, the United States shares full responsibility with Israel for the situation which is taking shape in the Middle East. It also shares the responsibility for Israel's latest obstructionist step—refusal to withdraw its troops from the Arab territories and for the possible consequences it entails.

The question is, what turn will the developments in the Middle East take now? Every government and every responsible politician must fully realise that the alternative to a political set-

tlement in the Middle East is military conflict. Therefore the Soviet Government believes that at present it is especially important for all states interested in peace to work actively to prevent Israel and her backers from frustrating the cause of political settlement. Such a settlement in the Middle East can be attained if the peace-loving states pool their efforts.

However, if the Israeli rulers hope their policy of sabotage will enable them to achieve the goal that motivated the anti-Arab aggression in 1967—to smash the Arab national-liberation movement and overthrow the progressive regimes in the UAR and other Arab countries—they should know that such hopes are futile. The Soviet Union, friend of the Arab peoples, is rendering them the necessary political and material assistance in their struggle to liberate the lands seized by the Israeli aggressors. And it will continue to render such assistance.

The Soviet Government strives persistently for a political settlement of the Middle East conflict. It will continue to do everything in its power to enable the policy of peace to triumph in the present struggle between the forces of peace and the forces of aggression in the Middle East.

*Pravda*, February 28, 1971

**From Report by CPSU Central Committee to  
24th Congress of CPSU Delivered  
by L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of CPSU CC,  
on March 30, 1971**

At the same time, comrades, imperialism is being subjected to ever greater pressure by the for-

ces which have sprung from the national-liberation struggle, above all by the young independent and anti-imperialist-minded states of Asia and Africa.

The main thing is that *the struggle for national liberation in many countries has in practical terms begun to grow into a struggle against exploitative relations, both feudal and capitalist.*

Today, there are already quite a few countries in Asia and Africa which have taken the non-capitalist way of development, that is, the path of building a socialist society in the long term. Many states have now taken this path. Deep-going social changes, which are in the interests of the masses of people, and which lead to a strengthening of national independence, are being implemented in these countries, and the number of these changes has been growing as time goes on.

The offensive by the forces of national and social liberation against domination by imperialism is expressed in various forms. Thus, in the countries oriented towards socialism the property of the imperialist monopolies is being nationalised. This makes it possible to strengthen and develop the state sector, which is essentially an economic basis for a revolutionary-democratic policy. In a country like the United Arab Republic, the state sector now accounts for 85 per cent of total industrial production, and in Burma, the state sector controls over 80 per cent of the extractive and almost 60 per cent of the manufacturing industry. New serious steps in nationalising imperialist property have been taken in Algeria. Many foreign enterprises, banks and trading companies have been handed over to the state in Guinea, the Sudan, Somali and Tanzania.

Serious steps have also been taken to solve the

land problem, which is complicated and has a bearing on the lot of many millions of peasants. Taking the past five-year period alone, important agrarian transformations have been carried out in the UAR and Syria, and have been started in the Sudan and Somalia. An agrarian reform has been announced for this year in Algeria. In the People's Republic of Congo (Brazzaville), all the land and its minerals have been handed over into the ownership of the state.

Needless to say, it is no easy thing to bring about a radical restructuring of backward social relations on non-capitalist principles, and in an atmosphere of unceasing attacks by the neo-colonialists and domestic reactionaries. This makes it all the more important that despite all these difficulties the states taking the socialist orientation have been further advancing along their chosen path. . .

The Middle East is another "hot spot" in world politics.

The crisis which has arisen as a result of Israel's attack on the UAR, Syria and Jordan has been one of the most intense in the development of international relations over the past period.

Together with the fraternal socialist countries we did everything necessary to stop and condemn the aggression. We raised this question in the UN Security Council in the most resolute terms. An extraordinary session of the General Assembly was called on our demand. The USSR and other fraternal countries have broken off diplomatic relations with Israel, which has ignored the UN decision for a cease-fire. Our country has helped to restore the defence potential of the Arab states which were subjected to invasion, the UAR and

Syria in the first place, with whom our co-operation has been growing stronger from year to year.

The United Arab Republic recently came out with important initiatives. It announced its acceptance of the proposal put forward by the UN special representative, Dr. Gunnar Jarring, and readiness to conclude a peace agreement with Israel once the Israeli troops are withdrawn from the occupied Arab territories. The UAR has also proposed steps to resume navigation along the Suez Canal in the very near future. Thus, the attitude of the Arab side provides a real basis for settling the crisis in the Middle East. The Israeli Government's rejection of all these proposals, and Tel Aviv's now openly brazen claims to Arab lands clearly show who is blocking the way to peace in the Middle East, and who is to blame for the dangerous hotbed of war being maintained in that area. At the same time, the unseemly role of those who are instigating the Israeli extremists, the role of US imperialism and of international Zionism as an instrument of the aggressive imperialist circles, is becoming ever more obvious.

However, Tel Aviv ought to take a sober view of things. Do Israel's ruling circles really expect to secure for themselves the lands of others they have occupied and to go scot-free? In the final count, the advantages obtained by the invaders as a result of their piratical attack are illusory. They will disappear as mirages pass from view in the sands of Sinai. And the longer the delay in reaching a political settlement in the Middle East, the stronger will be the indignation of world public opinion, and the Arab peoples' hatred of the aggressor and its patrons, and the greater the harm the Israeli rulers will inflict on their people

and their country.

The Soviet Union will continue its firm support of its Arab friends. Our country is prepared to join other powers, who are permanent members of the Security Council, in providing international guarantees for a political settlement in the Middle East.

Once this is reached, we feel that there could be a consideration of further steps designed for a military *détente* in the whole area, in particular, for converting the Mediterranean into a sea of peace and friendly co-operation.

*Pravda*, March 31, 1971

## **For a Just and Lasting Peace in Middle East**

### *Statement by the 24th Congress of the CPSU*

We who represent 14 million Soviet Communists, expressing the will of the peoples of the Soviet Union, strongly condemn Israel's imperialist aggression against the Arab states conducted with US imperialist support and declare our fraternal solidarity with the courageous struggle of the Arab peoples for the elimination of the consequences of the Israeli aggression, for the triumph of the ideals of freedom, independence and social justice.

The struggle of the peace-loving forces against the Israeli aggression has now entered a phase in which the expansionist aspirations of Israel's ruling group and Zionist circles have been fully exposed. The international isolation of the Israeli aggressors and their patrons—the US imperialist circles who hypocritically declare their wish for

peace but who, in effect, encourage the Israeli extremists—is becoming greater.

The constructive stand of the Arab countries, primarily of the United Arab Republic, provides favourable conditions for the full implementation of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967.

The persistent refusal of the Israeli rulers to withdraw their troops from captured Arab territories is an open challenge to world public opinion and the decisions of the United Nations.

Therefore, it is the duty of all peace-loving forces to concert efforts in curbing the Israeli aggressors, force them to respect the universally accepted standards of international life and the legitimate rights of the Arab states, and to withdraw their troops from captured Arab territories.

The 24th Congress of the CPSU expresses its firm conviction that the attempts of the imperialists and their henchmen to impose their *diktat* on the peoples of the Arab countries, to subvert the progressive regimes in the Middle East and to defeat the national-liberation movement in that part of the world are doomed to failure. The legitimate rights and interests of all Arab peoples, including the Arabs of Palestine, will triumph.

The Israeli aggressors will be compelled to get out of the Arab territories seized by them in 1967. The guarantee of this is the unbending will of the Arab peoples, their striving for independence, freedom, peace and social progress, their close alliance with the peoples of the Soviet Union and those of the other socialist countries, with all anti-imperialist, peace-loving forces.

The 24th Congress of the CPSU declares that, consistently pursuing the Leninist policy of inter-

national peace and friendship, the Soviet Union will continue to support the just cause of the Arab peoples who suffered from Israeli aggression, to support their efforts in regaining their violated rights, to secure a fair political settlement in the Middle East, and to protect the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

We call on all fraternal parties, on all peace-loving peoples and states to redouble their solidarity with the peoples of the Arab countries and to render them active support in their struggle.

For united action by all forces opposing imperialist aggression, for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East!

Long live the inviolable Soviet-Arab friendship!  
May it go from strength to strength!

*Pravda*, April 9, 1971

**СССР И БЛИЖНИЙ ВОСТОК**  
*на английском языке*  
Цена 75 коп.

