

During the next 4 months, the Department of State forwarded to the subcommittee in a series of installments additional documentation dealing with the Aswan High Dam and chronological statements with supporting documents covering United States policy in the Middle East for the years 1946-1948. (Documentation concerning the response to the Senate request is in the project folder for Office of the Historian Research Project 396.) Finally on July 30, the special subcommittee met and decided to abandon its inquiry. Afterward, Fulbright told the press that the decision to discontinue had been made in view of the size of the task, and the fact that events since adoption of the Eisenhower Doctrine had made many of the questions obsolete. (Reported in the *Washington Post*, July 31, 1957)

The chronological statements with supporting documents sent to the subcommittee for 1946, 1947, 1948, as well as an unsent chronological statement for 1949 (Office of the Historian Research Projects 397, 398, and 399; Lot 79 D 251) are at the National Archives and Records Administration, Civil Reference Branch. The collection on the Aswan Dam (Research Project 396) is in Department of State, PA/HO Files: Lot 89 D 263.

---

45. **Telegram From the Mission at the United Nations to the Department of State**<sup>1</sup>

*New York, January 29, 1957—8 p.m.*

Delga 611. Re Suez—withdrawal of forces. Fawzi called at his request to give us Cairo's reaction to two resolutions which we gave him informally yesterday (Delga 598).<sup>2</sup> Fawzi said he appreciated U.S. efforts. He said there was no trouble with Resolution I, and directed his remarks to Resolution II. Without going into any detail, he said Aqaba matter still worries Cairo great deal. He said they found difficulty with operative paragraph 3 of our second resolution, and particularly with phrases which call upon "parties to the Armistice Agreement to refrain from asserting or exercising any belligerent rights in these areas, or from interfering in any way with the right of innocent passage therein". Fawzi made no reference to our intention put both resolutions to vote consecutively, a point which Lodge had made three times to Fawzi yesterday.

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: Department of State, Central Files, 974.7301/1-2957. Confidential; Priority. Received at 8:52 p.m.

<sup>2</sup> Document 43.