My fellow Americans:

Tonight I report to you as your President.

We all realize that the full and free debate of a political campaign surrounds us. But the events and issues I wish to place before you this evening have no connection whatsoever with matters of partisanship. They are concerns of every American—his present and his future.

I wish, therefore, to give you a report of essential facts so that you—whether belonging to either one of our two great parties, or to neither—may give thoughtful and informed consideration to this swiftly changing world scene.

The changes of which I speak have come in two areas of the world—Eastern Europe and the Mideast.

In Eastern Europe there is the dawning of a new day. It has not been short or easy in coming.

After World War II the Soviet Union used military force to impose on the nations of Eastern Europe, governments of Soviet choice—servants of Moscow.

It has been consistent United States policy without regard to political party—to seek to end this situation. We have sought to fulfill the wartime pledge of the United Nations that these countries, overrun by wartime armies, would once again know sovereignty and self-government.

We could not, of course, carry out this policy by resort to force. Such force would have been contrary both to the best interests of the Eastern European people and to the abiding principles of the United Nations. But we did help to keep alive the hope of these peoples for freedom.

Beyond this they needed from us no education in the worth of national independence and personal liberty. For, at the time of the American Revolution, it was many of them who came to our land to aid our cause.

Now, recently the pressure of the will of these peoples for national independence has become more, and more insistent.
A few days ago the people of Poland, with their proud and deathless devotion to freedom, moved to secure a peaceful transition to a new Government. And this Government, it seems, will strive genuinely to serve the Polish people.

And more recently, all the world has been watching dramatic events in Hungary, where this brave people, as so often in the past, have offered their very lives for independence from foreign masters.

We cannot yet know if these avowed purposes will be truly carried out.

But two things are clear.

First, the fervor and the sacrifice of the peoples of these countries, in the name of freedom, have themselves brought real promise that the light of liberty soon will shine again in this darkness.

And second, if the Soviet Union indeed faithfully acts upon its announced intention, the world will witness the greatest forward stride toward justice, trust and understanding among nations in our generation.

These are the facts. How has your Government responded to them?

Today, it appears, a new Hungary is rising from this struggle; a Hungary which we hope, from our hearts, will know full and free nationhood.

We have rejoiced in all these historic events.

Only yesterday, the Soviet Union issued an important statement on its relations with all the countries of Eastern Europe. This statement recognized the need for review of Soviet policies, and the amendment of these policies to meet the demands of the people for greater national independence and personal freedom.

The Soviet Union declared its readiness to consider the withdrawal of Soviet advisers, who have been, as you know, the effective ruling force in Soviet-occupied countries. And also to consider withdrawal of Soviet forces from Poland, Hungary and Rumania.

The United States has made clear its readiness to assist economically the new and independent governments of these countries. We have already—some days since—been in contact with the new Government of Poland on this matter. We have also publicly declared that we do not demand of these governments the adoption of any particular form of society as a condition upon our economic assistance. Our one concern is that they be free—for their sake, and for freedom's sake.

We have also—with respect to the Soviet Union—sought clearly to remove any false fears that we would look upon new governments in these Eastern European countries as potential military allies. We have no such ulterior purpose. We see these people as friends and we wish simply that they be friends who are free.

It is not a situation that calls for extravagant fear or hysteria but it invites our most serious concern.

I speak, of course, of the Middle East. This ancient crossroads of the world was, as we all know, an area long subject to colonial rule. This rule ended after World War II when all countries there won full independence.

Out of the Palestinian mandated territory was born the new State of Israel.

These historic changes could not, however, instantly banish animosities born of the ages. Israel and her Arab neighbors soon found themselves at war with one another. And the Arab nations showed continuing anger toward their former rulers, notably France and Great Britain.

The United States, through all the years since the close of World War II, has labored tirelessly to bring peace and stability to this area.
We have considered it a basic matter of United States policy to support the new State of Israel and, at the same time, to strengthen our bonds both with Israel and with the Arab countries. But, unfortunately, through all these years, passion in the area threatened to prevail over peaceful purpose, and, in one form or another, there has been almost continuous fighting.

This situation recently was aggravated by Egyptian policy including rearmament with Communist weapons. We felt this to be a misguided policy on the part of the Government of Egypt. The State of Israel, at the same time, felt increasing anxiety for its safety And Great Britain and France feared more and more that Egyptian policies threatened their life line of the Suez Canal.

These matters came to a crisis on July 26 of this year when the Egyptian Government seized the Universal Suez Canal Company. For ninety years, ever since the inauguration of the canal, that company has operated the canal—largely under British and French technical supervision.

Now, there were some among our allies who urged an immediate reaction to this event by use of force. We insistedly urged otherwise, and our wish prevailed, through a long succession of conferences and negotiations, for weeks—even months—with participation by the United Nations.

And there, in the United Nations, only a short while ago, on the basis of agreed principles, it seemed that an acceptable accord was within our reach.

But the direct relations of Egypt with both Israel and France kept worsening to a point at which first Israel, then France—and Great Britain also—determined that, in their judgment, there could be no protection of their vital interests without resort to force.

Upon this decision events followed swiftly.

On Sunday, the Israeli Government ordered total mobilization.

On Monday, their armed forces penetrated deeply into Egypt and to the vicinity of the Suez Canal—nearly 100 miles away.

And on Tuesday the British and French Governments delivered a twelve-hour ultimatum to Israel and Egypt, now followed up by armed attack against Egypt.

The United States was not consulted in any way about any phase of these actions. Nor were we informed of them in advance.

As it is the manifest right of any of these nations to take such decisions and actions, it is likewise our right if our judgment so dictates, to dissent.

We believe these actions to have been taken in error, for we do not accept the use of force as a wise or proper instrument for the settlement of international disputes.

To say this, in this particular instance, is in no way to minimize our friendship with these nations, nor our determination to maintain those friendships.

And we are fully aware of the grave anxieties of Israel, of Britain and France. We know that they have been subjected to grave and repeated provocations.

The present fact nonetheless seems clear. This action taken can scarcely be reconciled with the principles and purposes of the United Nations to which we have all subscribed. And beyond this we are forced to doubt that resort to force and war will for long serve the permanent interests of the attacking nations.

Now we must look to the future.

In the circumstances I have described, there will be no United States involvement in these present hostilities. I therefore have no plan to call the Congress in
special session. Of course, we shall continue to keep in contact with Congressional leaders of both parties.

I assure you your Government will remain alert to every possibility of this situation and keep in close contact and coordination with the legislative branch of this Government.

At the same time it is—and it will remain—the dedicated purpose of your Government to do all in its power to localize the fighting and to end the conflict.

We took our first measure in this action yesterday. We went to the United Nations with a request that the forces of Israel return to their own line and that hostilities in the area be brought to a close.

This proposal was not adopted because it was vetoed by Great Britain and by France.

It is our hope and intent that this matter will be brought before the United Nations General Assembly. There, with no veto operating, the opinion of the world can be brought to bear in our quest for a just end to this tormenting problem.

In the past the United Nations has proved able to find a way to end bloodshed. We believe it can and that it will do so again.

My fellow citizens, as I review the march of world events in recent years I am ever more deeply convinced that the United Nations represents the soundest hope for peace in the world. For this very reason I believe that the processes of the United Nations need further to be developed and strengthened.

I speak particularly of increasing its ability to secure justice under international law.

In all the recent troubles in the Middle East there have, indeed, been injustices suffered by all nations involved. But I do not believe that another instrument of injustice—war—is a remedy for these wrongs.

There can be no peace without law And there can be no law if we work to invoke one code of international conduct for those who oppose, and another for our friends

The society of nations has been slow in developing means to apply this truth. But the passionate longing for peace on the part of all peoples of the earth compels us to speed our search for new and more effective instruments of justice.

The peace we seek and need means much more than mere absence of war. It means the acceptance of law and the fostering of justice in all the world.

To our principles guiding us in this quest we must stand fast. In so doing, we can honor the hopes of all men for a world in which peace will truly and justly reign.

I thank you, and good night.
Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Congress.

First may I express to you my deep appreciation of your courtesy in giving me, at some real inconvenience to yourselves, this early opportunity of addressing you on a matter I deem to be of grave importance to our country.

In my forthcoming State of the Union Message, I shall review the international situation generally. There are world-wide hopes which we can reasonably entertain and there are world-wide responsibilities which we must carry to make certain that freedom—including our own—may be secure.

There is, however, a special situation in the Middle East which I feel I should, even now, lay before this body.

Before doing so it is well to remind ourselves that our basic national objective in international affairs remains peace—a world peace based on justice. Such a peace must include all areas, all peoples of the world, if it is to be enduring. There is no nation, great or small, with which we would refuse to negotiate, in mutual good faith, with patience and in the determination to secure a better understanding between us. Out of such understandings must, and eventually will, grow confidence and trust, indispensable ingredients to a program of peace and to plans for lifting from us all the burdens of these expensive armaments. To promote these objectives our Government works tirelessly, day by day, month by month, year by year. But until a degree of success crowns our efforts that will assure to all nations peaceful existence, we must, in the interests of peace itself, remain vigilant, alert and strong.

The Middle East has abruptly reached a new and critical stage in its long and important history. In past decades many of the countries in that area were not fully self-governing. Other nations exercised considerable authority in the area and the security of the region was largely built around their power. But since the First World War there has been a steady evolution toward self-government and independence. This development the United States has welcomed and has encouraged. Our country supports without reservation the full sovereignty and independence of each and every nation of the Middle East.

Now the evolution of independence has in the main been a peaceful process. But the area has been often troubled. Persistent cross-currents of distrust and fear, with raids back and forth across national boundaries, have brought about a high degree of instability in much of the Mideast. Just recently there have been hostilities involving Western nations that once exercised much influence in the area. Also the relatively large attack by Israel in October has intensified the basic differences between that nation and its Arab neighbors. All this instability has been heightened and, at times, manipulated by international communism.

Russia’s rulers have long sought to dominate the Middle East. This was true of
the Czars and it is true of the Bolsheviks. The reasons are not hard to find. Now these reasons do not affect Russia’s security, for no one plans to use the Middle East as a base for aggression against Russia. Never for a moment has the United States entertained such a thought.

The Soviet Union has nothing whatsoever to fear from the United States in the Middle East, or anywhere else in the world, so long as its rulers do not themselves first resort to aggression.

That statement I make solemnly and emphatically.

Now, neither does Russia’s desire to dominate the Middle East spring from its own economic interest in the area. Russia does not appreciably use or depend upon the Suez Canal. In 1955, Soviet traffic through the canal represented about three-quarters of one per cent of the total. The Soviets have no need for, and could provide no market for, the petroleum resources which constitute the principal natural wealth of this region. Indeed, the Soviet Union is a substantial exporter of petroleum products.

The reason for Russia’s interest in the Middle East is solely that of power politics. Considering her announced purpose of communizing the world, it is easy to understand her hope of soon dominating the Middle East.

This region has always been the crossroads of the continents of the Eastern Hemisphere. The Suez Canal enables the nations of Asia and Europe to carry on the commerce that is essential if these countries are to maintain well-rounded and prosperous economies. The Middle East provides a gateway between Eurasia and Africa.

This contains about two-thirds of the presently known oil deposits of the world and it normally supplies the petroleum needs of many nations of Europe, Asia and Africa. Now the nations of Europe are peculiarly dependent upon this supply, and this dependency relates to transportation as well as production. This was vividly demonstrated since the closing of the Suez Canal and some of the pipe-lines. Alternate ways of transportation and, indeed, alternate sources of power, can, if necessary, be developed. But these cannot be considered as early prospects.

But these things stress the immense importance of the Middle East. If the nations of that area should lose their independence, if they were dominated by alien forces hostile to freedom, that would be both a tragedy for the area and for many other free nations whose economic life would be subject to near strangulation. Western Europe would be endangered just as though there had been no Marshall Plan, no North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The free nations of Asia and Africa, too, would be placed in serious jeopardy. And the countries of the Middle East would lose the markets upon which their economies depend. All this would have the most adverse, if not disastrous, effect upon our own nation’s economic life and political prospects.

Thus we have these simple and indisputable facts:

The Middle East, which has always been coveted by Russia, would today be prized more than ever by international communism.

The Soviet rulers continue to show that they do not scruple to use any means to gain their ends.

The free nations of the Mideast need, and for the most part want, added strength to assure their continued independence.

Now our thoughts naturally turn to the United Nations as a protector of small
nations. Its charter gives it primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Our country has given the United Nations its full support in relation to the hostilities in Hungary and in Egypt. Now the United Nations was able to bring about a cease-fire and withdrawal of hostile forces from Egypt because it was dealing with governments and peoples who had a decent respect for the opinions of mankind as reflected in the United Nations General Assembly. But in the case of Hungary, the situation was different. The Soviet Union vetoed action by the Security Council to require the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces from Hungary. And it has shown callous indifference to the recommendations, even the censure, of the General Assembly. The United Nations therefore can always be helpful, but it cannot be a wholly dependable protector of freedom when the ambitions of the Soviet Union are involved.

Now, under all the circumstances I have laid before you, a greater responsibility now devolves upon the United States. We have shown, this country has shown, so that none can doubt, our dedication to the principle that force shall not be used internationally for any aggressive purpose and that the integrity and independence of the nations of the Middle East should be inviolate. Seldom in history has a nation's dedication to principle been tested as severely as ours was tested during recent weeks.

There is general recognition in the Middle East, as elsewhere, that the United States does not seek either political or economic domination over any other people. Our desire is a world environment of freedom, not servitude. On the other hand, many, if not all, of the nations of the Middle East are aware of the danger that stems from international Communism and welcome closer cooperation with the United States to realize for themselves the United Nations goals of independence, economic well-being and spiritual growth.

Now if the Middle East is to continue its geographic role of uniting rather than separating East and West; if its vast economic resources are to serve the well-being of the peoples there, as well as that of others, and if its cultures and religions and their shrines are to be preserved for the uplifting of the spirits of these peoples, then the United States must make more evident its willingness to support the independence of the freedom-loving nations of the area.

Under these circumstances I deem it necessary to seek the cooperation of the Congress. Only with that cooperation can we give the reassurance needed to deter aggression, to give courage and confidence to those who are dedicated to freedom and thus prevent a chain of events which would gravely endanger all of the free world.

Now there have been several Executive declarations made by the United States in relation to the Middle East. There is the Tripartite Declaration of May 25, 1950, followed by the Presidential assurance to the King of Saudi Arabia on Oct. 31, 1950. There is the Presidential declaration of April 9, 1956, that the United States will within constitutional means oppose any aggression in the area. There is our declaration of Nov. 29, 1956, that a threat to the territorial integrity or political independence of Iran, Iraq, Pakistan or Turkey would be viewed by the United States with the utmost gravity.

Nevertheless, weaknesses in the present situation and the increased danger from international communism convince me that basic United States policy should now find expression in joint action by the Congress and the Executive. Furthermore,
our joint resolve should be so couched as to make it apparent that if need be our words will be backed by action.

Now it is nothing new for the President and the Congress to join to recognize that the national integrity of other free nations is directly related to our own security.

We have joined to create and support the security system of the United Nations. We have reinforced the collective security system of the United Nations by a series of collective defense arrangements. Today we have security treaties with forty-two other nations which recognize that their, and our, peace and security are intertwined. We have joined to take decisive action in relation to Greece and Turkey and in relation to Taiwan.

Thus, the United States through the joint action of the President and the Congress, or, in the case of treaties, with the Senate, has manifested in many endangered areas its purpose to support free and independent governments—and peace—against external menace, notably the menace of international communism. Thereby we have helped to maintain peace and security during a period of great danger. It is now essential that the United States should manifest through joint action of the President and the Congress our determination to assist those nations of the Middle East area which may desire that assistance.

32 Proposed Resolution on the Middle East: United States

January 5, 1957

To authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Whereas a primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international Communism and the nations it controls seek by threat of military action, use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent; and

Whereas such danger now exists in the general area of the Middle East. Therefore be it

Sec. 1. Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the President be and hereby is authorized to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

Sec 2 The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the
Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore, he is authorized to employ the armed forces of the United States as he deems necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international Communism; provided, that such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations and actions and recommendations of the United Nations, and, as specified in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, measures pursuant thereto shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Sec. 3 The President is hereby authorized, when he determines that such use is important to the security of the United States, to use for the purposes of this joint resolution, without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation, not to exceed $200,000,000 from any appropriations now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations.

Sec. 4. The President shall within the month of January of each year report to the Congress his action hereunder.

Sec. 5. This joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise.

Resolution on the Middle East:
United States Senate and House of Representatives

Adopted March 5, 1957

Joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East.
Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
That the President be and hereby is authorized to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

Sec. 2. The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines
the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist
any such nation or group of such nations requesting assistance against armed ag-
gression from any country controlled by international communism: Provided that
such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United
States and with the Constitution of the United States.

Sec. 3. The President is hereby authorized to use during the balance of fiscal
year 1957 for economic and military assistance under this joint resolution not to
exceed $200,000,000 from any appropriation now available for carrying out the
provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, in accord with the
provisions of such act. Provided, that whenever the President determines it to be
important to the security of the United States, such use may be under the authority
of section 401(A) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, (except that
the provisions of Section 105(A) thereof shall not be waived) and without regard
to provisions of Section 105 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1957:
Provided further, that obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes of the first
sentence of Section 2 of this joint resolution shall be paid only out of appropria-
tions for military assistance, and obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes
of the first section of this joint resolution shall be paid only out of appropriations
other than those for military assistance.

This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to
the use of such appropriations. None of the additional authorization contained in
this section shall be used until fifteen days after the Committee on Foreign Rela-
tions of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representa-
tives, the committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Repre-
sentatives and, when military assistance is involved, the committees on Armed
Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been furnished a
report showing the object of the proposed use, the country for the benefit of which
such use is intended, and the particular appropriation or appropriations for carry-
ing out the provisions of the mutual security act of 1954, as amended, from which
the funds are proposed to be derived. Provided, that funds available under this
section during the balance of fiscal year 1957 shall, in the case of any report
submitted during the last fifteen days of the fiscal year, remain available for use
under this section for the purposes stated in such report for a period of twenty
days following the date of submission of such report. Nothing contained in this
joint resolution shall be construed as of itself authorizing the appropriation of
additional funds for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the first
section or of the first sentence of Section 2 of this joint resolution.

Sec. 4 The President should continue to furnish facilities and military assist-
ance, under the provisions of applicable law and established policies, to the United
Nations emergency force in the Middle East, with a view to maintaining the truce
in that region.

Sec. 5. The President shall within the months of January and July of each year
report to the Congress his actions hereunder.

Sec. 6. This Joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine
that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East
are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United
Nations or otherwise except that it may be terminated earlier by a concurrent
resolution of the two houses of Congress.
Whereas peace with justice in the defense of human rights and fundamental freedoms require international cooperation through more effective use of the United Nations and otherwise, and
Whereas peace with justice is not now assured in the Middle East.
Therefore, be it resolved That the Senate reaffirm the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security in the Middle East, so that armed force shall not be used except in the common interest and that the President be advised that the sense of the Senate is that this Government, by Constitutional process, should particularly pursue the following objectives in the Middle East within the United Nations Charter:

1. In furtherance of the traditional policy of the United States to foster international trade and the unobstructed international movement of the world commerce, negotiate arrangements which will assure free passage on equitable terms in war and in peace of the Suez Canal to all nations.

2. In furtherance of the United Nations Charter to strive for a reduction in tensions between Israel and the Arab states, assist as may be possible in the negotiation of mutually acceptment of refugees, the protection of holy places, and the conclusion of treaties of peace; and until these purposes are accomplished, seek the continued intervention of the United Nations police forces between Israel and Egypt.

3. In support of programs developed by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and otherwise, contribute its fair share of resources, including technical assistance, to long-range economic development and to the development of independent and progressive social institutions in the Middle East area.

4. Contribute to the maintenance of peace by reaffirming, with particular reference to the Middle East, the determination of the United States to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under Article 51, should any armed attack occur affecting its national security.
We cannot hesitate, and we dare not falter in what we must do in the Middle East. The peace and economy of the whole world depend upon the resources concentrated in that area. So long as these resources are available to all nations, unhampered by capricious and tyrannical barriers, the chances for peace will be good.

We must do all that we can to insure free access of this area to all nations. But Russian intrigues and designs to move into the Middle East would deny the world the free access it must have to survive and would inevitably lead to war. Let us make no mistake. This is what Russia is after — control of these resources.

The proposals made by the President, when approved by the Congress, will strengthen the position of the free world. But I do not think they go far enough. I suggest that certain further steps need to be taken to undo the Russian encroachments in the Middle East and check new penetrations there. Recurring armed clashes and flare-ups, arising from ancient and special troubles in this area, must be settled soon, or else Russia will continue to exploit these troubles for her own expansionist purposes.

These are the steps I have in mind.

First. An embargo ought to be imposed on the shipment of all arms and ammunition by Russia to the Middle East. It would be desirable to have an embargo on shipments of all arms to the Middle East by all nations until tensions subside and security pacts and disarmament agreements in the area can be worked out.

Arms and ammunition shipped into the area should go only to the emergency forces of the United Nations stationed in that area. I hear the Russians are continuing shipment of arms to Syria, and I expect they will resume shipments to Egypt. Russia must be warned that these must stop.

When Russia began penetration of the Middle East by sending arms to Egypt more than a year ago we should have warned the Kremlin that we would not stand for this trouble-making maneuver. All we had to do was to say “You can’t do that” and be ready to back it up. All we would have needed to back up this warning was to put a couple of cruisers at the end of the Black Sea Straits and a couple of cruisers and air carriers in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Our past experience—as in the case of the Berlin Airlift—showed that the Russians would not dare to risk open war by shooting down our planes, once we had made clear that we intended to maintain that airlift and that we were not bluffing.

Second. The United Nations emergency forces should be enlarged and strengthened to whatever size events may prove necessary to maintain order until the
Suez Canal problem has been completely resolved and a peace treaty between Israel and Egypt has been concluded.

The Suez Canal is the economic jugular vein of the European economy and one of the vital waterways of the world. A stoppage of traffic through the canal of only a few weeks has paralyzed the European continent and even the Middle East. We have had to ship oil from this country to meet the emergency, although we have been trying to build up our own dwindling oil reserves here to meet future emergencies.

I believe very strongly that all the vital waterways of the world, upon which the peace and economy of the world depend, should be freely opened to all commerce.

At the Potsdam conference I tried to get recognition of this problem of open traffic on the waterways of the world. I urged that the Black Sea Straits, the Kiel Canal, the Rhine and Danube rivers, the Suez Canal, Gibraltar and the Panama Canal be made free waterways for merchant shipping.

I suggest that we ought to keep on working to relieve world tensions. And the first practical step we can take along that line is to achieve a permanent settlement of the Suez Canal, for we cannot leave it to the caprices of a military dictator or the political whims of any one nation.

And we must realize that it is naive and fantastic to hope that we can achieve any kind of peace in the Middle East as long as there are bitterness and open clashes between the Arabs and the Jews. The nation of Israel is here to stay.

The United States, as well as the United Nations, should do everything possible to cool the passions of those extremists who want to destroy Israel. The boundary lines between Israel and Egypt must be settled and those boundaries guaranteed. The United Nations Emergency Forces could play a highly constructive role in this.

Third: In our own interests and in the interest of the peace of the world we should never again allow ourselves to become separated from our allies. We cannot be part internationalist, part isolationist, part pacifist and part appeasers.

We fought two world wars to keep Britain, France and Western civilization from being destroyed by an ambitious Kaiser and a madman Hitler. At the end of the second World War we set up a number of important barriers to see that Britain, France and the free world were safe against the threat of international communism. Vacillation, indecision and failure to state clearly our foreign policy during the past few years and neglecting to keep our allies informed of our aims and intentions contributed to the recent tragic events in the Middle East and almost brought us to a third World War.

Perhaps this is no time to remind ourselves that we must assume some responsibility for the panic military moves of the British, French and Israelis in Egypt. Yet we had better draw a lesson from what happened I would ask what the American people would think we would do if the Panama Canal were seized in violation of treaties and made subject to the will of a dictator. I know what I would do.

I feel certain that if we had kept close diplomatic contact with our allies and maintained a frank and forthright understanding of what was involved in the Middle East, we could well have avoided the debacle that followed. I think it is a historic blunder to have found ourselves on the same side with expansionist and
Communist Russia in a move to rebuke and weaken our allies with whom we had to fight jointly two World Wars, because their security and ours are inseparable.

During my administration we kept an intimate understanding with the leaders of our allies. France and Britain have, for over a century, been with us, and we have managed to get along and cooperate on all major world problems.

It was inevitable that, at times, we would find ourselves disagreeing on certain issues, sometimes with Britain and sometimes with France. On some occasions we even found ourselves in sharp contention. But we never failed to treat them as free and independent allies.

We always got along and worked together for our mutual security and peace. We conducted our relations in a free and candid manner. We never failed to tell each other what we intended to do, and we always did exactly what we said we would do.

As President of the world's leading power, I thought it not only essential but proper to keep the doors of the White House open to all our allies at all times with equal treatment for all. As President, I welcomed the visits of all heads of state, as well as Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers.

At the end of the Potsdam Conference I informed Stalin that if any further joint conferences of heads were to be held, they would have to take place in Washington, since President Roosevelt and I had already come to meet them in Europe. Now that we have a promise of a new foreign policy, I hope that all the Allied leaders will soon again be invited to come to Washington and that invitations for such visits will not be limited to a few men we favor or court.

As we back the President in his announced program for the Middle East, let us also make sure that we restore the strength, dignity and prestige of our allies, without whom we cannot be certain of the maintenance of peace for all the people of the world.

Alternative Resolution:
Michael Mansfield

January 29, 1957

Whereas the preservation of the independence and territorial integrity of the nations of the Middle East is vital to the interests of the United States;

Whereas the welfare of the United States and other nations is related to the prevention of further hostilities in the region of the Middle East, and the resumption of passage of ships of all nations through the Suez Canal;

Whereas the present truce maintained by the United Nations in the Middle East may prove temporary if there is no lasting settlement of the Suez dispute and the Arab-Israeli conflict and if economic instability in the region persists,

Whereas the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls seek by threat of military action, use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other
means to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent; and

Whereas such danger now exists in the general area of the Middle East:

Therefore be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled

1. That the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and territorial integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism. Provided, that such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations

2. Notwithstanding any limitations in existing law, the President may use appropriations made pursuant to the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, to furnish facilities and military assistance, on such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, to the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East;

3. The President should call upon the United Nations General Assembly to establish at once a Special Commission on Arms Traffic in the Middle East with a view to recommending measures for regulating the flow of military materiel into that region;

4. The President should recommend to the Congress an economic program of specific nature, amount and duration, which in his judgment will facilitate a settlement of the Suez dispute and the Arab-Israeli conflict and otherwise promote stability in the Middle East and the peaceful progress of the nations of that region.

From a Statement of Turkey’s Middle East Policies: Fuat Koprulu

April 5, 1956

The “recent events” in the Middle East to which you allude can neither weaken the Baghdad Pact nor prevent its development, for the clear-cut aim of this Pact is to create an effective system of defense in the Middle East area in conformity with Art. 51 of the United Nations Charter against those who nurture aggressive designs.

Penetration by the Soviets into the Middle East and their attempts to create confusion there dates from long before the Baghdad Pact. If Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Syria oppose the Pact and have started to move towards the Soviets, we are of the opinion that this indicates that the big and common danger is being inadvertently neglected due to certain considerations of prestige and petty rivalry.

I am of the opinion that the day will come when the emotional and impulsive state of affairs in the Middle East will be replaced by reason and moderation, and
that regional disputes can be resolved, so that the Baghdad Pact may become identified with every state in the area.

I do not believe that there is any need to orient the Baghdad Pact in a new direction in the face of the political and economic penetration of the Middle East by the Soviets. The direction of the Pact is manifest, and it behooves us only to work in that direction.

With respect to the suggested need for increased cooperation in the field of economy, this necessity is already embodied in the Baghdad Pact itself. On the other hand, efforts in this respect cannot be taken as involving any neglect or reduction of political and military endeavors.

Should the United States of America also adhere to the Baghdad Pact in the near future, and remember that this Pact is in complete conformity with the principles of American foreign policy, such a move would undoubtedly constitute an important event from the viewpoint of the growth of the Pact. . . .

It would be appropriate to make a distinction between Turkey's efforts on behalf of the Baghdad Pact on the one hand and Turkish-Israeli relations on the other. As already clarified on different occasions, since the beginning of the Palestine problem the Turkish Government has acted within the framework of the United Nations and in loyalty to the decisions adopted by that body. Not for the sake of peace in the Middle East alone but also for world peace and tranquility as a whole, Turkey hopes that an equitable solution will be found with the least possible delay to this dispute which is still creating tension and in respect to which it is hard to say that it may not lead to war. Recent developments in particular have made it clear for all to see that the flames of this dispute are fanned solely by those who nurture hidden aspirations regarding the Middle East. Turkey has not abandoned the hope that this dispute may yet be resolved in a conciliatory manner and within the framework of the United Nations. . . .

Statement on Egypt's Middle East Policy:
Gamal Abdul Nasser

November 21, 1956

The policy of Egypt is a policy of national independence. Egypt and Egyptians value this independence more than life itself. I will not become the stooge or satellite or pawn or hireling of anybody. Just as Egypt is determined to have political independence so also Egypt is determined to have and maintain ideological independence from all foreign ideologies such as Marxism, Fascism, Racism, Colonialism, Imperialism and Atheism, all of which incidentally are European in origin. The revolutionary government of Egypt is dedicated to the universal ideals of justice between men and justice between nations, the equality of all men and all nations before the world and individual and personal freedom, and to achieve these ideals the new Egypt will work in accordance with her own special circumstance, in accordance with her own religious teachings and cultural heritage. Dedi-
... I should like to tell the General Assembly quite frankly what is the philosophy which underlies our present approach to this problem or the withdrawal of Israeli forces in accordance with our undertaking of 8 November. (The General Assembly will recall that in response to the resolution of 2 November and the subsequent resolutions the Government of Israel notified the Secretary-General on 8 November as follows: "... The Government of Israel will willingly withdraw its forces from Egypt immediately upon the conclusion of satisfactory arrangements with the United Nations in connection with the emergency international force ") Many representatives have spoken as if, in their view, the only important consideration is when we withdraw. Of far greater moment is the question. How do we withdraw? What situation will the withdrawal create? What comes in its place? Will the withdrawal become an integral stage in the promotion of peaceful conditions? Or will it pave the way to a return to the previous state of siege and of anarchy? This is perhaps the most fateful practical question which the United Nations now faces in the conduct of its work.
There are two possible approaches to this problem of withdrawal. One is a system, which I am certain the General Assembly will instantaneously reject, under which we would carry out the withdrawal without any coordination with the movements of the United Nations Force, without any care for the future and without any guarantee of Egypt's future conduct toward Israel. Sinai would then become again a base for Nasser to renew against Israel the deadly menace which I have but briefly described. Once again the peaceful desert would become a source of blood and of peril.

Let me again say that an Egyptian military base in the Sinai Peninsula cannot possibly have any other purpose except to sustain an assault against Israel. Armor and weapons would again pour into the peninsula in preparation for the next round. Egypt and Israel would again face each other near Gaza, which Egypt seized by aggression eight years ago. From that position the fedayeen commando squads would again roam through the countryside, which has known a blessed tranquillity in the past few weeks. The illicit blockade would again be established on the Gulf of Agaba, for the first time an international waterway open today to the ships of all nations without distinction of flag, and thereby another grotesque situation would have been brought about. The United Nations would have been active in restoring to a state of blockade what had hitherto been an open waterway. Egypt has blocked one waterway, the Suez Canal, contrary to the 1888 Convention.

Under this system, which I propose that the General Assembly reject, of a reckless and unplanned withdrawal, the United Nations would find itself inadvertently responsible for bringing Egypt back to block the other waterway, so that the protection of blockade would become an international objective. Thus, belligerency will be restored, acts of war by sea or land will again arise until they provoke the inevitable explosion and who knows how far or how much any such explosion will be localized. This is a startling prospect, but it is exactly what will happen if the method of effecting and implementing the withdrawal of troops is not approached with minimum care and precision. This return to the status quo of belligerency is precisely what Nasser wants. It is what some delegations quite inadvertently may be proposing when they urge that the withdrawal take place in disregard of what will ensue and in detachment from the plans now under way for defining the tasks of the United Nations Emergency Force now entering the Canal area. This question of a return to the status quo of insecurity was frankly discussed in the General Assembly during the first debates on the establishment of the United Nations Force. On that occasion, too, the Canadian representative invited our attention to that problem. He said:

What then, six months from now? Are we to go through all this again? Are we to return to the status quo? Such a return would not be to a position of security, or even to a tolerable position, but would be a return to terror, bloodshed, strife, incidents, charges and counter-charges, and ultimately another explosion. . . .

These, too, are instructive words, except that one might have a reservation whether peace could endure for six months in an atmosphere of renewed belligerency.
It was in order to avoid such a blind procession back to disaster and belligerency that the General Assembly devised machinery in the form of the United Nations Emergency Force.

I have then portrayed one method of effecting a withdrawal which would contain within it the seeds of a future conflict.

But there is another system of withdrawal fully consistent with the resolutions of the General Assembly, but also with the purpose and objectives of the United Nations and its Charter. Let me again stress that the Government of Israel will carry out the undertaking for the withdrawal of its troops from Egypt as defined in its communication of 8 November. We shall do this. But is it essential or wise or permissible that Sinai must again become remilitarized as a base for future assaults? Are there no other alternatives whereby the very emptiness of that historic desert may become a bridge of peace between two countries? There are ways of reconciling Israel's obligation to withdraw with the avoidance of this danger. I will not make detailed proposals at this forum, but we have constructive proposals which would fulfill both of these objectives, the principle of withdrawal and the avoidance of the perils emanating from the re-creation of this base. Similarly, is it essential or wise or permissible that maritime belligerency shall be restored in the Gulf of Aqaba in defiance of United Nations decisions against belligerency and of the international law governing narrow waterways? What shall we have achieved if we leave behind a position at the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba in which acts of maritime war can be achieved, evoking in the course of time a natural response and re-creating that vicious circle of violence from which it is our passionate desire to break loose?

There are ways of reconciling the resolutions of 2, 5 and 7 November with the creation of such conditions as will preclude that danger, and we shall make proposals accordingly in the proper contexts.

There are solutions for Gaza other than the renewal of this Egyptian salient in a position which would make Egyptian-Israel peace impossible.

There is the problem of the Suez Canal. This is not affected one way or the other by Israel's policy on the withdrawal of troops from Egypt. But we have a special interest and a special experience. Under the 1888 Convention this waterway was to be opened to the ships of all nations in time of peace and in time of war. Article 4 of the Convention emphasizes that the obligation to keep the Canal open even in time of war rests upon Egypt even when Egypt is a belligerent, and therefore, the present situation in which the Canal is blocked is a violation of that convention.

But even before that violation there was another long-established violation through the discriminatory closing of the Canal to Israel's ships and cargoes. The Canal is now closed to all nations. May we not hope that when it is opened it shall be opened to all nations without distinction of flag in conformity to the Constantinople Convention and the resolutions of the Security Council?

This, then, is the summary of our position. We are still convinced of the necessity, the justice, the rectitude of what we had to do for Israel's defense against an open threat to destroy it. This salutary resistance may be written in history as a triumphant assertion that small democracies have a right to live and not only large dictatorships supported by larger Powers.
We shall carry out our 8 November undertaking, but there is a way of carrying it out which might lead to war. There is a way of carrying it out which gives a chance of peace. We choose, urge and advocate the latter course. These problems must be seriously and constructively and rapidly discussed.

We invite the United Nations authorities concerned with the implementation of these resolutions to consider with us the proposals which we have conceived and might continue to present for carrying out the agreed principle of withdrawal from Egypt in a manner conducive to peaceful conditions in the area to be affected by the withdrawal. In the meantime we would urge the necessity of avoiding any increase of tension, including such increase of tension as arises from false reports.

I will again repeat the denial which I gave from this rostrum yesterday of mischievous reports asserting an imminent danger to Syria from troop concentrations in Israel. There is no foundation whatever for those reports which have unfortunately been transmitted not only by Syria but by other representatives here. We have invited United Nations observers to study the scene on the Israel-Syrian frontier. Their report, which entirely disputes the Syrian contention, has now been made available and it is the hope of my delegation that the Secretary-General will find means of making it known to all Members of the General Assembly.

A final consideration brings us back to the crux of our problem, whether the implementation of the General Assembly’s resolution is to be succeeded by a state of war. This belligerency, this state of war, is the great paradox of this discussion. A nation claims and exercises a state of war against its neighbor and then complains about the absence of peace. Egypt behaves to Israel as though there is war. Israel is called upon to behave towards Egypt as though there is peace. Egypt comes in full belligerency to the United Nations and says, “I seek your protection; I am only working for Israel’s destruction; I am at war with Israel; I wish to send people to Israel to kill and to plunder; I will seize Israel’s ships in international waterways; I will build up armaments for Israel’s destruction; I will concert alliances to bring about Israel’s downfall. I ask the United Nations to protect me while I do all of this.”

The complete incongruity of belligerency in the system of the Charter is the shocking and tragic spectacle that we have seen.

In conclusion we seek the understanding and counsel of the General Assembly on the need for carrying out our 8 November undertaking in conditions which will prevent a recurrence of the conflict. We call for this prudence out of the depths of our heart because we know what is here at stake. The thousands who fell in our War of Independence, the hundreds slain in homes and fields by Nasser and his fellow potentates, the lives lost in the effort to push disaster away a few weeks ago—these are all vividly before us. We speak out of the deep pathos of a people which more than any other has faced the prospect of physical extinction in its journey across history and which during eight years of its statehood has unreasonably been called upon to live under the dark and dreadful shadow of physical destruction. It is then in the name of that sentiment that we say: Let Sinai become a place of peace and not a base of war. Let the closed waterway of Suez be opened. Let the open waterway at the Gulf of Aqaba not be closed. Let us find means of avoiding that explosive proximity of Egyptian and Israel forces which is fatal for peace.
The danger and opportunity walk here hand in hand. It is within our capacity in a matter of days so to arrange affairs that the recent struggle might be the last page in the chapter of Egyptian-Israel conflict.

Joint Declaration on Middle East Policy: USSR and Communist China

January 8, 1957

In the course of an all-around exchange of opinion, both sides have recorded complete unanimity of views on the present day international situation and major international problems. Following the Geneva conference of 1954, the four-heads-of-Government conference of 1955 and the Bandung Conference of Asian and African countries, an obvious tendency toward a detente appeared in the international situation, and ideas of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems began to prevail in the minds of the people.

As a result of the armed attack of the imperialist aggressive forces against Egypt and their subversive activities in Hungary, the tendency of easing the international situation has run up against the obstacles and destructive resistance of these forces.

With the support of the Socialist states and the other peaceable states and nations of the world, the peoples of Egypt and Hungary have achieved victory in their heroic and resolute struggle. The conspiracies of the imperialist aggressive circles have suffered utter defeat. The imperialists, however, cannot reconcile themselves to this and continue their aggressive subversive activity.

The facts indicate that the development of international events is proceeding along tortuous roads. All the peace-loving peoples of the world must be constantly on the alert and prepared to wage a consistent and prolonged struggle against the mechinations of the aggressive imperialist forces.

Both sides emphasize that, unlike the policy of aggression and war preparation pursued by the imperialist camp headed by the monopoly groups of the United States, the countries of the Socialist camp are steadfastly following a policy of upholding and safeguarding world peace.

At the same time, there are many nationally independent states in Asia and Africa, and primarily such a great power as India, which firmly abide by the policy of peace and neutrality.

There are not a few states in Europe and other areas of the world that also come out for peace and neutrality, or are beginning to show a tendency for such a policy. Public forces championing peace and opposed to war are growing with every day on all continents.

Contradictions and disagreements in the camp of imperialism arising from the struggle for raw material sources, markets and spheres of influence are growing more deep and acute with every day.

With the exception of the aggressive forces in a few imperialist states the peoples of all the world yearn for peace and come out against war.
The united forces of peace in the Socialist states, the nationally independent and other peaceable countries and nations are far superior to the forces of aggressive imperialist blocs. If all the peaceable forces in the international arena unite, join efforts in a resolute struggle, any intrigues of the aggressive imperialist quarters will definitely be frustrated.

Both sides note that after Britain, France and Israel had suffered defeat in their aggression against Egypt, American imperialism is trying to make use of the situation so as to take the place of the colonalist powers—Britain and France—in the Near and Middle East, to suppress the movement for national independence and enslave the peoples of these countries, and is also striving to step up the policy of aggression and war preparations in this area.

This is precisely the essence of the so-called Eisenhower doctrine. This colonialist policy of the United States in the Near and Middle East creates fresh tensions in this area, recently the arena of hostilities caused by the aggression against Egypt.

The Governments of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China resolutely condemn this policy of the United States and are ready to continue rendering the necessary support of the peoples of the Near and Middle East so as to prevent aggression and interference in the affairs of the countries in this area.

With a view to completely eliminating the consequences of imperialist aggression in Egypt, both Governments hold that it is necessary to satisfy the Egyptian Government's lawful demand for complete compensation by Britain, France and Israel of the damage caused by their aggressive actions.

Both Governments resolutely come out against any imperialist machinations aimed at placing the Suez Canal under "international control" and are for the settlement of the question of free passage of shipping through the Suez Canal by way of negotiations between the states concerned on the basis of complete respect for Egyptian sovereignty.

The Governments of the Soviet Union and China wholeheartedly support the countries and nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America in their striving to fight against colonialism, to uphold and consolidate their national independence, sovereignty and freedom, to achieve industrial progress and economic independence.

In the struggle against war, against colonialism and in defense of world peace, the Socialist states and the nationally independent countries can effect all-round cooperation in conformity with the five principles of peaceful coexistence.

The facts show that this sincere cooperation has already played an important part in present-day international affairs. Friendly cooperation of the Socialist states with countries that have won their national independence accords both their mutual national interests and the interests of world peace.

Both government delegations note that in suppressing the national liberation movement and perpetrating aggression against the nations that have won national independence, the aggressive imperialist alignments do not give up their attempts to conduct subversive activity against the Socialist states.

Of late, the aggressive imperialist alignments are intensifying the "cold war" and conducting subversive activities against the Soviet Union, against communism and the cause of peace.

It is necessary to be vigilant in the face of these schemes. The Soviet Union
and China are united with all the Socialist states by their fraternal friendship and mutual assistance commitments.

Any provocative actions of the aggressive imperialist forces aimed at undermining the Socialist states will meet with the most resolute rebuff.

Soviet Proposals for the Middle East:
From a note handed to U.S. Ambassador Charles E. Bohlen

February 13, 1957

As a result of the efforts of the peace-loving peoples, supported by the United Nations, the aggressive actions against Egypt were liquidated, and favorable conditions arose and real possibilities emerged for insuring peace and also for the solution of international problems in the Near and Middle East.

The liquidation of the hot-bed of war in this region provided prerequisites for the strengthening of national independence, sovereignty and economic development not only in Egypt but in all the countries of the Near and Middle East, and also opened the way for the broad cooperation of the countries of this region with all countries on the principles of equality in relations between states as formulated in the decisions of the Bandung conference [of Asian-African nations in 1955].

The peace-loving peoples justly expected that henceforth peace in the Near and Middle East could be preserved and strengthened, and that an end would be put to the policy of foreign interference in the internal affairs of this region, that the sovereignty and independence of the countries of the Near and Middle East would be sincerely respected, and that the countries of this region, and in particular the victim of aggression—Egypt—will be given selfless economic aid.

However, the period of amelioration of the tense situation in this region was regrettably short, and the hopes of the peoples were not justified. As a result of the unilateral steps taken by certain powers, the situation in the Near and Middle East has recently become very much more acute. This is mainly caused by the fact that it is still intended to use—without the consent of the United Nations and in a unilateral manner—the armed forces of one of the great powers in the Near and Middle East, at the discretion of that power, in order to interfere in the internal affairs of this region.

There is also the proposition for providing economic aid for the countries of the Near and Middle East, along with the imposition upon them of conditions by which these countries are to renounce any ties with certain countries which are members of the United Nations—that is, to accept political conditions for such aid that are incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of these countries and with the high principles of the United Nations.

One cannot fail to be aware that the carrying out of such a policy, outside the framework of the United Nations, would lead to a new and dangerous worsening of the situation in the region, which has so recently been the theatre of military action resulting from the aggression against Egypt, and would represent a threat to the cause of peace throughout the world.
The aforementioned plan is nothing but a continuation of a policy of isolated, aggressive military blocs such as NATO, SEATO and the Baghdad Pact, and the setting up of artificial economic and political barriers between states.

At the basis of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union lies the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states, irrespective of differences in their social or state system. It is a known fact that, in establishing its friendly relations with the Arab countries, the Soviet Union not only did not seek any deterioration in the relations of those countries with other great powers, but on the contrary upheld the need for broad international cooperation, and the need to insure stable peace and the creation of an atmosphere of trust in the area of the Near and Middle East.

The Soviet Union does not possess, and does not wish to possess, military bases or any kind of concessions in countries of the Near and Middle East for the purpose of making profits, nor does it seek to obtain any kind of privileges in that area, because all that is incompatible with the principles of Soviet foreign policy.

The Soviet Union is vitally interested that there should be peace in the area of the Near and Middle East, situated in direct proximity to its borders. It is sincerely interested in the consolidation of the national independence of the countries of that area and in their economic prosperity.

In the opinion of the Soviet Government the preservation of peace in the Near and Middle East is a necessary condition not only for the development of the countries of the Near and Middle East, but, as recent events have shown for safeguarding the economic prosperity of many other countries. The need to strengthen peace and security in the Near and Middle East demands a broad development of political, economic and cultural ties between all countries, and joint action by the great powers primarily responsible for peace, this being particularly in accord with the United Nations Charter.

The Soviet Government considers that, by joint efforts on the part of the great powers, the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., Britain and France, the permanent United Nations Security Council members, it would be possible to secure lasting and stable peace in that area if all the afore-mentioned great powers built their relations with countries of the Near and Middle East on the basis of the general principle of a policy of noninterference in their internal affairs and respect for their national independence and sovereignty.

Proceeding from the above-mentioned, the Soviet Government addresses to the governments of the U.S.A., Britain and France the proposal to work out and to proclaim basic principles in matters of peace and security in the Near and Middle East and of noninterference into the internal affairs of the countries of this region.

These principles could be made the foundations of a joint declaration, the adoption of which would exclude the possibility of any dangerous, unilateral action by this or that great power in regard to the countries of Near and Middle East, and would help to strengthen peace and security in this most important region, to develop national economy and to consolidate the independence of these countries. It is self-evident it would be open to any state interested in peace and security, which desires to build its relations with the countries of the Near and Middle East on the basis of the mentioned principles, to subscribe to this declaration.

Proposals regarding the obligations of the member-powers under the declaration could at once be conveyed to the governments and peoples of the Near and Middle East countries.
The Foreign Ministry appends the basic stipulations of the draft declaration by the four powers—the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., Britain and France—as proposed by the U.S.S.R. Government, and would be grateful to the United States Embassy for information regarding the acceptability to the United States Government of the draft of the basic principles expounded in the declaration regarding peace and security in the Near and Middle East and non-interference into the internal affairs of the countries of this region.

The Soviet Government would have no objection to the Governments of the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union coming out with separate declarations (of similar context) regarding their relations with the countries of the Near and Middle East, based on the principles expounded in the attached draft.

Draft of the basic principles of declarations by the Governments of the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., Britain and France regarding the question of peace and security in the Near and Middle East and non-interference in the internal affairs of the countries of this region

U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., the United Kingdom and the French Republic, guided by lofty peace-loving aims and the principles of the United Nations as expressed in its Charter, declare their agreement that at the basis of their policy in respect of the countries of the Near and Middle East lies the desire to establish peace and security in the Near and Middle East and throughout the world; acknowledge and respect the lofty principles of relations between states formulated at the Bandung conference of Asian and African countries; strive to create favorable conditions for the strengthening of the national independence and national sovereignty of the countries of the Near and Middle East; express a sincere desire to contribute disinterestedly, by common efforts, to the economic development of the countries of this area, and are in this proceeding from the fact that the natural wealth of the underdeveloped countries is the inalienable national property of the peoples of these countries, which have the full right to dispose of and use it in the interests of the development of their national economy and progress.

The Governments of the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., Britain and France, desire to contribute to the all-round development of economic, business and cultural relations of the countries of the Near and Middle East with all countries, on the basis of equality and mutual advantage; are of the opinion that wide economic and trade relations for the countries of this area accord not only with the interests of these countries but also with the securing of the economic prosperity for other countries of the world, and recognize the need for a peaceful settlement of all outstanding international problems and questions relating to the Near and Middle East by way of negotiations.

Aware of the importance of the responsibility they bear for the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world, the Governments of the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., Britain and France pledge themselves to follow, in their policy in respect of the Near and Middle East, the principles stated below:

1. The presentation of peace in the Near and Middle East by settling questions at issue exclusively by peaceful means, on the basis of the method of negotiations.

2. Noninterference in the internal affairs of the countries of the Near and Middle East. Respect for the sovereignty and independence of these countries.
3. Refusal to undertake any attempts to draw these countries into military alignments with the participation of the great powers.
4. The liquidation of foreign bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of countries of the Near and Middle East.
5. Joint refusal to supply arms to countries of the Near and Middle East.
6. Assistance in the economic development of countries of the Near and Middle East, without putting forward any political, military or other conditions incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of these countries.

The Governments of the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A, the United Kingdom and the French Republic express the hope that other states as well will, in their relations with countries of the Near and Middle East, adhere to the same principles.

From Address to National Press Club:
Guy Mollet

February 27, 1957

... Of course, the President [Eisenhower] and I have broached the subject of the Middle East. Without concealing our disagreements of the past months, we have recorded that our respective positions have always been clear-cut so that our mutual confidence has remained unchanged. We have one common purpose, which is the restoration of a lasting peace in the Middle East, a peace based on justice and international law.

The worst possible formula would be to return purely and simply to the situation as it existed prior to the so-called Israeli aggression. This would even constitute a crime against peace. All of us have had the weakness, for eight years, to allow disturbances to develop and to accept an undeclared war, as the United Nations' resolutions were repeatedly flaunted. Our peoples would not allow us to repeat the same tragic error.

We must strike at the very factors of this state of tension, at all the factors. A piecemeal or temporary solution in the Middle East will always be a bad solution. Some of the factors of the present situation are geographic, others are purely political.

The first of these "geographic" factors concerns the frontier of Israel and in fact the very existence of the State of Israel. Let us not forget that Israel, encircled as it is by ill-intentioned neighbors and subjected to repeated aggressions chiefly instigated by Egypt, was forced to resort to its elementary right of self-defense. I refuse to brand this State as an aggressor.

Israel was born under the auspices of the United Nations. It is entitled to have the question of its frontiers definitely settled and its territorial integrity guaranteed. At the same time as this problem is settled, the problem of the Arab refugees in Gaza, until yesterday a base for attacks against Israel, must also be settled.

The second of these factors is the Gulf of Aqaba. Bordered by four States, the Gulf of Aqaba is an international waterway. To guarantee free passage through
the Straits of Tiran, and thus to prevent the choking of Israel. is nothing but implementing international law.

The third factor is the Suez Canal. The deliberate sabotage of the Canal by Egypt without any military justification, as well as the blackmail of the past two months with respect to the clearing up of a channel, are proof that we can place little trust in the signature of the Egyptian Government.

The Suez Canal, an international waterway, like the Gulf of Aqaba, must be kept free, in accordance with the resolution of the Security Council, from political interference on the part of any country and, first of all, on the part of Egypt.

The economic life of Europe and of many countries of Southeast Asia cannot possibly depend on the goodwill of an Egyptian dictator.

The elimination of these three factors of tension may be obtained through the customary international procedures. Some have already been started. We must not relax our efforts before a general settlement has been reached.

The problems which I have called "political" are even more serious. Among them, I shall rate first the Pan-Arab activities of Egypt and Soviet infiltration in the Middle East.

A year ago, when the French Government was denouncing the Pan-Arab ambitions of Colonel Nasser, the response it met with was at times rather skeptical. A definite scheme had, however, been outlined in "The Philosophy of the Revolution." In this book, Nasser has proclaimed his will to unify the Arab world from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf around a "hero," himself, and to use for this aim against the West the instrument of blackmail which the geographic position of his country has put into his hands. the Suez Canal and the oil of the Middle East. Subsequent events have proved that these were not empty threats.

Denouncing Pan-Arabism does not mean attacking the Arab world and even less so the Moslem community. Isn't France, in any case, a Moslem power? Pan-Arabism is not the expression of the feelings of a people. Like Pan-Germanism and Pan-Slavism which other dictators have made famous, it is a myth, in the name of which the independence of peoples is being threatened.

It would be the worst possible mistake to answer this Arab propaganda spreading from Cairo and Damascus with concessions or counter-propaganda. The free nations must make a stand; they must show the rest of the world that provocations never pay and that one cannot compromise when the respect of international obligations is at stake. Such a task will require time, much firmness and a large dose of confidence.

Yet such effort is all the more necessary as Pan-Arabism is the best tool of Communist infiltration. Following Lenin's advice, the leaders of Soviet Russia bring aid to all movements of extreme nationalism. Cairo and Damascus, fountains of Pan-Arabism, are also the strongest bridgeheads of the Soviet Union.

The French Government has acknowledged the extreme importance of President Eisenhower's message on the Middle East. The United States has acted with leadership. It has served well the cause of peace and we know that Soviet Russia is not indifferent to warnings such as the one she has just received.

I do not want to abuse your patience in dealing in greater details with these problems, however much they deserve a more thorough analysis. Their settlement requires that the free world engage in a joint and long-range policy. This, I indicated to the President of the United States. . . .
A meeting was held between the 25th of the month of Rajab, 1376, corresponding to the 25th of February, 1957, and 27th of the month of Rajab, 1376, corresponding to the 27th of February, 1957, between His majesty King Saud Ibn Ebdum Aziz al Saud, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, His Majesty King Hussein I, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; His Excellency Shukri al-Kuwatly, President of the Republic of Syria; His Excellency Gamal Abdel Nasser, President of the Republic of Egypt, and their statesmen.

This was the fourth in a series of meetings that they hold from time to time in order to study the international situation and to discuss problems affecting the Arab nations, the course of their life, progress, and very existence.

The participants [in the conference] were informed of the laudable efforts made by His Majesty King Saud Ibn Abdul Aziz in the course of his visit to the United States of America, the elucidations made by His Majesty to statesmen [in the United States] on the Arab points of view with regard to Middle East problems and the subjects of the discussions.

His Majesty also gave an account of explanations given by him to President Eisenhower with particular reference to Arab rights and problems, including the recent aggression against Egypt and its results, as well as Egypt’s rights to sovereignty over the Suez Canal, and the seriousness of Israel’s noncompliance with the United Nations resolutions that stipulate an unconditional withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and the Gulf of Aqaba beyond the armistice lines without Israel’s gaining any advantages as a result of the triple aggression.

The conferees affirm their anxiousness to play their part in the international sphere and to contribute to the creation of international relations on a basis conducive to peace, justice and well-being and respect for their sovereignty and interests.

Their strength having grown through the unity of their people, their faith in the safety of their aims having grown, the Arab countries meeting at the conference reaffirm their earlier declared determination to protect the Arab nation from the harm of the “cold war” and its dispute and to abide by the policy of positive neutrality thus preserving its real national interests.

They also affirm the fact that the defense of the Arab world should emanate from the Arab nation in the light of its real security and outside the scope of foreign pacts.

The participants note that, despite the United Nations Resolution and in defiance of unanimous world public opinion of the necessity of Israel’s withdrawal beyond the armistice lines, the triple aggression against Egypt still exists in all its
effects and aspects since Israel has not complied with the United Nations resolutions on unconditional withdrawal.

The participants [in the conference] hold, moreover, that peace and security in the Middle East is in jeopardy while the population of Gaza continues to suffer acute oppression and maltreatment at the hand of Israel.

Therefore, the conferees have decided:

1. To work for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel beyond the armistice lines.
2. To uphold in full the rights of the Palestine Arabs and the Arabs' sovereignty over the territories and territorial waters.
3. The necessity on the part of the aggressive states to compensate Egypt for all damages and losses caused through their aggression.
4. To reject all attempts made with the view to reducing Egypt's sovereignty and rights over the Suez Canal as the Suez Canal is an integral part of Egypt, her sovereignty over the canal is absolute, and the freedom of navigation in the canal is regulated in accordance with the provisions of the 1888 Constantinople Convention.
5. To condemn British aggression against the territories of Yemen and to assume an attitude of solidarity with Yemen in stemming this aggression.
6. To support absolutely the rights of the Arabs of Algeria to freedom and independence and the courageous struggle against imperialist force.

The conferees hold that their liberal policy, emanating from their faith in the right of their nation to a free and independent life and rooted in their Arab patriotism which has proved to the world its real existence, increases their solidarity in order to attain the Arab nation's aspirations of freedom, unity and progress.