

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



**PLENARY MEETING 562nd**

Thursday, 1 November 1956,  
+ Fri 2nd at 9.50 p.m.

**FIRST EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION**

**New York**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
Agenda item 5:	
Question considered by the Security Council at its 749th and 750th meetings, held on 30 October 1956 (continued) .....	13

**President: Mr. Rudecindo ORTEGA (Chile).**

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

**Question considered by the Security Council at its 749th and 750th meetings, held on 30 October 1956 (continued)**

1. Mr. SERRANO (Philippines): We have met in extraordinary session to consider a situation of extraordinary urgency. We are here met to try to hold in check, if we can, awesome events of catastrophic possibilities. The peace we have thus far been seeking desperately to preserve has been breached deeply and fearfully. We must heal that breach determinedly, by every pacific method the Charter permits, as we should; and by every effective method the situation requires, if we must. Now, more than ever, this United Nations must prove that it can be equal to the peril that is a challenge both to its own existence and to the peace of the world, which it was organized to keep. This, truly, is a moment of decision. The crisis calls for prompt remedial action, not idle words. I shall, therefore, be brief.

2. There are two ways of approaching the problem before us: First, to attend to right first and peace afterwards; secondly, to attend to peace first and right afterwards.

3. The first procedure is to ascertain the facts, determine which of the parties is in error, and then tell him to do what is right. This is the normal procedure in an atmosphere of calm and quiet.

4. The second procedure is to ask the parties, first, to go back to their original positions, provide an acceptable *modus vivendi* in the interim, and, after tranquillity has been restored, determine who is right and who is wrong. This is the usual procedure in an environment in flames.

5. If we adopt the first, I fear we shall get nowhere. No party in the thick of the fight will ever admit that he is wrong. Indeed, the more strongly you point to his error, the more stubbornly he would plunge into it. If we adopt the second course, we have every chance of saving the peace—which, for the present, is our primary and immediate concern.

6. Postulates of right and wrong must yield first to the exigencies of the moment. It pays to know who is right or who is wrong only if we survive. War—and the inevitable death to which it leads—does not linger on the witness-stand to gaze leisurely at the symbol of justice.

7. My Government certainly has its own views on the rights and wrongs of the crisis before us, but we will concern ourselves solely with how peace can be restored. We offer no formal proposal, but we will throw out some of our views for what they may be worth. It is the view of my Government that the world's peace can be salvaged within the framework of the following formula: First, restoration of the parties directly involved in the crisis to the *status quo* before the outbreak of the hostilities; secondly, the establishment immediately thereafter of a *modus vivendi*; and thirdly, resumption of peaceful negotiations on the issues involved. These are consecutive stages, and each stage involves its own practical measures.

8. At the first stage, to effectuate the restoration of the *status quo ante*, two steps are necessary. First, the United Kingdom, France, Egypt and Israel should immediately observe a cease-fire. This accomplished—and this is the second step—the United Kingdom and France, on the one hand, should be asked to withdraw their forces from Egyptian territory within a specified period, and, on the other hand, Israel and Egyptian forces should be withdrawn, simultaneously wherever possible, to their respective demarcation lines under the Egyptian-Israel General Armistice Agreement.

9. At the second stage—the establishment of an acceptable *modus vivendi* in the interim—two issues, if we are to be realistic, are immediately involved: the administration of the Suez Canal and the enforcement of the General Armistice Agreement.

10. The United Kingdom and France justified their action on the plea of protecting the international waterway, while Egypt, on the other hand, views with hostility the operation of the Suez Canal Users' Association.

11. As a first step in the establishment of this *modus vivendi*, temporarily—and I say "temporarily" with emphasis—the United Kingdom and France, on the one hand, and Egypt, on the other, could be asked to yield the administration of the Canal to an international commission to be created by the United Nations. During this interim arrangement, the proceeds of the Canal operation, after deducting the operational expenses and other obligations, would be held in trust, subject to disposition after the parties had come to a final settlement in the resumption of peaceful negotiations envisaged in the last stage of this proposal. This should not be a cause of alarm to Egypt, because, as I emphasize here, this would be no more than a temporary expedient. As soon as a final settlement was arrived at by the parties in the negotiations contemplated in the last stage, the international commission to be created by the United Nations would yield the administration back again to the machinery agreed upon by the parties.

12. Between Egypt and Israel, after withdrawal of their forces to the respective demarcation lines envisaged in the first part of this proposal, the Secretary-General would promptly resume his functions under the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 4

April 1956 [S/3575]. It would then be his task, among other things, to confer promptly with the Governments concerned with a view to tracing the causes of the unfortunate incidents which have brought about the hostilities and to seek such measures as he might deem appropriate to ensure the effective enforcement of the General Armistice Agreement.

13. We come now to the third and last stage. As the machinery of the *modus vivendi* envisaged in the second part of this proposal commenced to operate, and as calm and tranquillity were sufficiently restored, then, as the first step, the United Kingdom, France and Egypt would resume their peaceful negotiations on the Suez Canal question, with due regard to the six principles already agreed upon between them, until a satisfactory solution had been reached. At that juncture, the advisability of adding two disinterested countries to the negotiation group might be considered, so as to introduce into the negotiation moderating and conciliatory elements which could help to facilitate agreement.

14. Lastly, the Security Council could reconvene to consider more effective measures to ensure faithful compliance with the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Egypt and devise additional measures to cope with the alleged causes of the repeated breaches of that agreement.

15. We wish to emphasize, in closing, that the formula we have outlined is no more than a temporary expedient to restore the peace. It is not by any means designed as a permanent solution of the outstanding issues between the parties. No prejudgement of their claims is contemplated. It is not intended to pre-empt any of their rights. It is clearly understood that the parties would be at perfect liberty to prosecute their respective contentions after peace had been restored.

16. My delegation is pleased that, except for the second stage of our proposal, the draft resolution presented by the Secretary of State of the United States [A/3256] agrees substantially with it and is animated by the same objective: the need for the immediate restoration of peace through the cessation of hostilities.

17. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan): This emergency special session of the General Assembly will be remembered by future generations as one held to save right, peace and justice from being downtrodden by aggression and colonialism. It will go into the annals of history as a great accomplishment of nations uniting for peace.

18. We meet today to consider an exceedingly grave situation that has been created by a premeditated, unprovoked open aggression against Egypt. The champions of this aggression carried out their plan in complete disregard of human intelligence, apart from their violations of their international undertakings, of the principles of the United Nations Charter and of the standards of civilization.

19. The plot, horrible and dismaying as it is, is so obvious that nothing could hide it. Israel, whose Government was condemned by every evidence and by the Security Council as an aggressor, was used as a tool to facilitate a still wider aggression against peaceful, independent Egypt. Consequently, Egypt became suddenly the target of a triple aggression by Israel, the United Kingdom and France. The conscience of the world was indeed shocked to see Egypt and the Egyptians come overnight under combined heavy fire and bombardment from the air, from the sea and from the land for no sin which they had committed.

20. It was in face of this intolerable situation that a high sense of manhood and honour moved Mr. Eisen-

hower, President of the United States of America, to press for an emergency meeting of the Security Council to deal with the situation when it first started with the Israel aggression against Egypt. It was most regrettable, however, that the noble efforts of the majority of the members of the Security Council failed to achieve the adoption of a resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of Israel forces from Egyptian territory, because of the vetoes of the United Kingdom and France.

21. The issue before us is most serious, and calls for the speediest action by this Assembly. The world is now witnessing a flagrant aggression carried out by Israel against Egypt, and an armed expedition carried out by France and the United Kingdom against Egyptian territory and its inhabitants. In violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter, Israel, on the one hand, is aiming to gain more territory of Palestine, while the United Kingdom and France aim to occupy the Egyptian territory of the Suez Canal zone by force of arms.

22. Will the international community leave the victim at the mercy of aggression? Will the elements of virtue and righteousness throughout the world retreat in the face of violence and destruction? Fellow representatives, my Government appeals to you all, to your Governments and to your nations to hasten to join in a collective effort to stop this invasion of Egypt. Apart from any moral consideration, let me summarize to you the consequences of the present triple military action against Egypt.

23. Israel is driving militarily to occupy the Gaza strip, which is the only remaining part of southern Palestine under Egyptian administration. This strip is an area of vulnerable fertile plain-land along the coast of the Mediterranean, fifty miles long and five miles wide. It is indefensible; therefore it is difficult for any army to hold out trying to defend it. There live in this strip of land 300,000 Palestinian Arabs. The Israel aggression, if not halted immediately, will seal their fate. Once Israel succeeds in occupying the Gaza area with its large attacking force, the Arab inhabitants there will be thrown out either across the borders into the surrounding desert to meet death and destruction once again, or into the sea, or they will be liquidated and annihilated under a new Israel suppression. Israel will then get more space for the Zionist immigrants converging on it from the four corners of the globe.

24. As to the aims of the United Kingdom and France, they are well known. They want to occupy the Suez Canal zone by force. However, an immediate objective of these two States is to complicate matters for the present Egyptian Government, headed by President Nasser, who they allege is inflaming the Arab world with nationalism and the call for freedom. Thus, by breaking him, according to their illusions, they will be in a position to put down the progressing nationalistic movement in all other Arab countries and territories.

25. This is the situation in brief. This aggression by Israel, on the one hand, and the military action by France and the United Kingdom, on the other hand, are therefore directed not against Egypt alone but against the Arab homeland and the Arab nation as a whole.

26. The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is pledged to stand by the side of Egypt, its Arab sister State, in defending peace and stability in our area and in repelling the aggression and invasion led against the Arab peoples and the Arab territories. Jordan and

Egypt are both members of the Arab League of States, both are parties to a regional collective defence pact, and both are parts of the Arab homeland and the Arab nation. We have our undertakings to Egypt, and we will live up to those undertakings. We shall stand together to defend our safety, our existence, our freedom and our future. The Arab countries will meet the situation and will meet it boldly, because we have faith in right, in justice and in God.

27. That is our pledge. But there is a greater pledge, a pledge which we share with all the Members here, a pledge in which we are all united and to which we are all devoted. It is the pledge of our holy Charter, of brotherhood and peace among all nations. In the name of this common cause, my delegation respectfully requests the Members of the United Nations to settle the present grave situation.

28. The delegation of Jordan has examined the draft resolution submitted by the United States [A/3256]. We feel that a draft resolution appropriate to meet the present situation should have gone further and should have included the following points: a condemnation of the military action taken by Israel, France and the United Kingdom against Egypt; the application of sanctions against Israel for its consistent aggression and continued violations; in case an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of the attacking forces from Egyptian territory were not effected, provision for United Nations assistance to Egypt, the aggrieved party. Nevertheless, in view of the urgency of the present situation, my delegation is prepared to vote in favour of the United States draft resolution as an immediate measure to deal with the situation.

29. Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): When we Latin American countries were invited to San Francisco, we had before us the agreements concluded by the great Powers at Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta, which in reality constituted a tripartite alliance aimed essentially at the absolute prohibition of the use of force by any country in the world, even in defence of its lawful rights, except with the express authorization of the Security Council. We opposed that principle, because we considered that the exercise of certain rights, such as that of self-defence, was so sacred that it should not be made subject to a veto in the Security Council. The great Powers accepted our point of view, but with the express limitation that the right to use force without the authorization of the Security Council should apply only to cases of self-defence, and not to self-defence simply but to self-defence in the case of an armed attack. It was in the light of that principle that Article 51 of the Charter was drafted by Mr. Dulles, Senator Vandenberg and Mr. Rockefeller, together with the representatives of the Latin American countries.

30. Today, however, we are faced with the situation which I shall now describe. We do not want to embark on a discussion of the rights which Israel, France and the United Kingdom may or may not have. They may indeed consider themselves entitled to demand compliance with the treaties of 1888 or 1949, but, as far as the United Nations is concerned, those rights, whatever they may be, must never be secured by the use of force. Ever since the ratification of the United Nations Charter, the use of force or armed intervention to secure rights, even lawful rights, has been strictly prohibited unless expressly ordered by the Security Council.

31. Nor can France and the United Kingdom allege that they are acting under Article 51 of the Charter, because, even if they themselves had been victims of some kind of aggression, the power to take action under Article 51 was expressly limited at San Francisco to cases of armed attack, and we have no information that there had been any armed attack on France and the United Kingdom.

32. Might has never been the source of right, but the United Nations was founded on a new principle, expressly accepted by all the Members of the United Nations on their signature of the Charter, namely, that, except in cases of collective action undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, no country might secure its rights, however legitimate, by the use of force.

33. The United Kingdom representative explained to us a few minutes ago that, on account of special circumstances, his country had been obliged to act independently, that is, outside the framework of the Charter. However, that is precisely what the Charter prohibits. Independent action outside the United Nations is prohibited, and it is prohibited precisely because Sir Winston Churchill, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Stalin so agreed at Yalta, and because the Charter so stipulates. For good or ill, that is an obligation which is in force and which no one has denounced.

34. We all agree that treaties, such as the Convention of 1888 and the 1949 armistice agreements, must be respected; it is not for the parties, however, but for the United Nations, or the International Court of Justice, to say whether those treaties have been complied with or violated. No country may take the law into its own hands, and a nation loses its right to demand compliance with other treaties if it starts off by ignoring its obligation under the Charter.

35. The representative of China is quite right in suggesting that we must try to look at the Palestine question from a new angle. Obviously, we cannot go on dealing only with incidents which are merely the effects of a single main cause, that cause being the general situation in Palestine. We have already suggested in the Security Council that the problem should be reconsidered as a whole, and it may be that in the end this crisis will lead to a comprehensive solution and a lasting peace.

36. As everyone knows, my delegation has defended the legitimate rights of Israel, France and the United Kingdom on the various occasions when it has been called upon to take a stand, and we shall continue to defend them whenever we consider it necessary. In the case of Israel and Egypt, we shall support any just solution, but only on the condition that such a solution is compatible with the principles of the Charter and is discussed in the light of those principles.

37. We should not be able to support any resolution calling for sanctions. When the Assembly was discussing resolution 377 (V), entitled "Uniting for peace", we emphatically stated that the Assembly could not take decisions but could only make recommendations. We therefore think that the draft resolution now proposed by the United States [A/3256] is extremely appropriate, in that it simply repeats the principles expressly stated in the Charter. We should adopt this draft resolution as soon as possible.

38. I should like, however, to make one point clear, namely, that we shall vote for it on the understanding that paragraph 1 of the operative part does not imply

any obligation upon Egypt to withdraw troops, because that would be tantamount to denying that country the right of self-defence allowed under Article 51 of the Charter. As we see it—and I think that that is what the paragraph says—the intention is to prevent the movement of major forces to the frontier, because, if a cease-fire is requested, it is only logical to provide that there shall be no movements of stronger forces to the danger spots.

39. This draft resolution does not close the door to further negotiations. I think that, on the contrary, if accepted in good faith, it may serve to initiate a new approach to the problems of the Middle East, which, as we all hope, will lead to a lasting and just peace in that region.

40. Mr. ASHA (Syria): It is with profound indignation that I speak today, not only in my capacity as representative of a Member State of the United Nations, but also as a human being deeply alarmed by the combined aggression of France, Britain and Israel.

41. This is an unprecedented session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The most dishonourable conspiracy in the history of our Organization has been engineered by two permanent members of the Security Council, which employed as the tool of their machinations Israel, that abortive issue of the United Nations which calls itself a State. Israel was born in aggression, nurtured in aggression and lives on aggression. Israel is now being used as a stooge for aggression.

42. The three conspirators have unashamedly exposed their infamous plot. It was a plot contrived behind the back of their most faithful ally, the United States, a country whose sons sacrificed their lives to defend them against aggression. That country came to their rescue in two world wars, only to have them perpetrate the faithless scheme now unfolded against a peaceful country striving solely for its freedom and independence from foreign domination.

43. In these tormenting hours in the history of mankind and of the United Nations, of peace-loving peoples everywhere, there is little use in talk. The human conscience is already aroused to a high pitch of indignation against the most flagrant and wanton aggression of our time. For this reason, I submit that our thoughts and energy must be directed towards one aim, that of vindicating the injured conscience of humanity by condemning this aggression and foiling its schemes.

44. The Secretary-General, in his timely statement yesterday [751st meeting], has been the most eloquent interpreter of the general indignation which has reverberated in the hearts of the Members of the United Nations and among people everywhere. This indignation was clearly reflected in the faces of the people who witnessed the debate in the Security Council and listened to the callous statements of France and the United Kingdom. The interventions of the French and British representatives in the Security Council furnished the purest example of classical machiavellism.

45. Not only does the combined armed aggression include all the essential elements of a crime perpetrated against peace and humanity and of armed aggression according to Article 51 of the Charter, but there are aggravating circumstances which render it more villainous and which merit the utmost condemnation. This aggression was carefully plotted and premeditated by two permanent members of the Security Council, and it was put in the service of the Israel policy of aggression which has been condemned several times by the

Council. Rumours are already circulating about the distribution of booty among the three aggressors.

46. The British and French representatives who attempted yesterday, in the Security Council, to deceive the world by stating that the real objective of their Governments' intervention was to ensure peace in the area, not to serve any selfish aims, were well answered by no less a person than Mr. Gaitskell, leader of the Labour Party, in the House of Commons. Mr. Gaitskell, said:

"I can only say that any impartial observer must recognize that this is a clear breach of the Charter of the United Nations. Whatever doubts there may be about the degree of aggression in the Israel invasion of Egypt and the extent of the provocation it suffered, there can unfortunately be no doubt about the nature of the British and French aggression. It is clear beyond all peradventure . . .

"I cannot believe that it is in the true interests of Israel to be associated with the reoccupation of the Canal zone. If they are looked upon as simply the stooges of Britain and France—a kind of advance guard of Western imperialism—then any prospect of a peaceful settlement is gravely endangered."

47. In this connexion, I wish to remind the General Assembly of what we have always stated before its various organs, namely, that Israel was a bridgehead for Western imperialism. And Western imperialism basically is French and British. Then Mr. Gaitskell went on to say:

"In the Canal zone, we may seize territory and may defeat—and no doubt will quite easily—the Egyptian forces. But then what do we do? The Prime Minister's own comment today that before we left we should have to make sure this did not happen again leads one to suppose that he has no real intention of evacuating at all."

48. Is there any doubt after this as to what the United Kingdom and France are after? These self-appointed guardians of the peace are not after peace. They have flouted the principles of the world Organization, whose primary duty is to ensure peace. They are after pieces of territory; they aim to satisfy their colonial and imperialist hunger with other people's land.

49. They thought they could satiate this appetite with impunity, but the world conscience has reacted vehemently to their greed. It is not only the peoples of Asia and Africa which have condemned their action, but their principal allies as well. I need not now repeat the wise words of President Eisenhower, which are well known to all the representatives in this Assembly, but let the French and British listen to the words of Marshal Tito, the President of Yugoslavia, of Mr. Pearson of Canada, of the Foreign Ministers of the Scandinavian countries, and of Germany, Italy and Spain, and of many other leaders in the world, and let them take cognizance of the letters from the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Organization, which have associated themselves with the Security Council's decision to call this extraordinary session to deal with this flagrant breach of the peace.

50. Mr. Ben Gurion, author of the Israel aggression, has pushed his effrontery to the height of praising the noble stand taken by the President of the United States. This is not the first example of its kind. Israel has accustomed us to declarations of peace in the public light, accompanied by machinations of war perpetrated in enveloping shadow.

51. The urgent convening of this body in special session, in spite of obstructions on two occasions from the French and British representatives against the action of the Security Council, constitutes a brilliant victory for the United Nations over the spirit of evil and destruction which inspired this combined aggression. This victory, however, is not complete. It is but a preliminary move for swift and radical action. The hour does not call for mellifluous speeches, nor for voluble tirades. At this very moment Egyptian cities are the targets of intensive bombardment. Human lives are being sacrificed. We must act immediately and sternly.

52. The Governments of three countries which pretend to be at the apex of civilization and democracy have, by their concerted action of aggression, launched an action of contemptuous defiance against the civilized world and democratic institutions.

53. If the United Nations does not succeed by immediate and vigorous measures in arresting the combined aggression, the conflict, at this point localized in Egypt, will spread swiftly throughout the whole region and beyond. Clauses guaranteeing mutual assistance bind the Arab States to Egypt. These States will sooner or later be called upon to exercise their legitimate right of individual and collective defence, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter.

54. Even if such measures of redress are not taken to re-establish the *status quo*, Israel, France and the United Kingdom will never be secure in that which they have momentarily acquired. We will never tolerate such a state of affairs.

55. In conclusion, I must say, as I stated at the outset, that the situation in which we find ourselves calls for urgent action on our part. The Prime Minister of India, in his letter dated 31 October 1956 to the Secretary-General [S/3720] mentioned the following, among other things:

"In view of the disastrous consequences of this invasion of Egyptian territory, I earnestly trust that the United Nations will take strong steps in this matter to prevent the world plunging into war, and demand immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from Egypt. The procedure of the United Nations must be swifter than the procedures of invasion and aggression."

56. Such a procedure, in our view, must include these basic measures: first, condemnation of the United Kingdom, France and Israel for their armed aggression against Egypt; secondly, immediate cessation of air, naval and land operations initiated against Egypt by these three aggressors; thirdly, immediate withdrawal of foreign troops behind the armistice lines; fourthly, application of sanctions against Israel for its armed aggression against Egypt in flagrant violation of the General Armistice Agreement; and fifthly, in case of non-compliance by the aggressors with the resolution which the Assembly might adopt, immediate assistance prescribed by the provisions of Chapter VII must be made available to Egypt, the victim of aggression.

57. This, in the view of my delegation, is what this grave situation requires. However, due to the fact that the United States has submitted a draft resolution [A/3256] which embodies some of the measures we consider essential to deal with this problem, we are in a position to lend it our support. We take this opportunity to express to the Government of the United

States our deep appreciation for the initiative it has taken so far.

58. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): This emergency special session of the General Assembly faces a very important task: the immediate adoption of measures to end the aggression of the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt.

59. The situation in the Near East is extremely serious. On 29 October 1956, Israel, in violation of the General Armistice Agreement, of decisions of the Security Council and of the United Nations Charter, began aggressive military operations against Egypt. On that same day, when Israel's aggression against Egypt was already in full swing, the Governments of the United Kingdom and France presented Egypt with an ultimatum which, on the pretext of preventing further hostilities between Israel and Egypt, would have compelled Egypt to surrender to the United Kingdom and France key positions in Egyptian territory—Suez, Port Said and Ismailia.

60. In spite of the fact that the Government of Egypt, acting in defence of its national sovereignty and territorial integrity, rejected this unprecedented demand, the Governments of the United Kingdom and France did not renounce their aggressive designs. At the very time that the Egyptian army was forced to repel aggression by Israel's armed forces, Egypt found itself confronting the immediate danger of an invasion by British and French occupation forces.

61. According to an announcement by the Egyptian Command, British and French military aircraft, in the course of 31 October and 1 November, carried out a number of raids on Egyptian territory, bombing Cairo, Alexandria and towns in the Suez Canal zone.

62. British and French bombers have sunk a ship in the Suez Canal, thereby disrupting navigation through the Canal. British warships have blockaded the Suez Canal at both ends. Strong British and French naval forces are moving towards Egyptian ports.

63. By engaging in armed intervention in Egypt, the Governments of the United Kingdom and France have hurled a challenge at the peace-loving peoples of the whole world. They have violated the obligations assumed by them under the United Nations Charter. In so doing, these Governments have taken upon themselves the grave responsibility of seriously aggravating the international situation.

64. There is every indication that the aggression against Egypt by Israel, and the aggression by the United Kingdom and France, is the result of a co-ordinated plan worked out in advance by the United Kingdom and French Governments, and not of mere coincidence.

65. Israel aggression was planned with the purpose of creating a pretext for the seizure of the Suez Canal by British and French armed forces. The Israel Government, in undertaking aggressive action against Egypt, proved to be a tool in the hands of the imperialistic circles which are trying to re-establish their colonial domination in the East. In so doing, they have hurled a challenge at all the Arab peoples, at all the peoples of the East, which are fighting colonialism. This action by the ruling extremist circles of Israel is criminal and dangerous, primarily for Israel itself and for its future.

66. By undertaking aggressive action against Egypt, the United Kingdom and France have entered upon a



course which is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. The representatives of the United Kingdom and France have prevented the Security Council from taking the necessary measures to put an end to the aggression against Egypt. While the Security Council was considering this question, the Governments of the United Kingdom and France, in circumvention of the Council, started serving Egypt with threats and with an ultimatum, and began open hostilities against the State of Egypt.

67. The Governments of the United Kingdom and France are trying to justify their action by alleging that they are protecting the Suez Canal and freedom of navigation through the Canal. The question may legitimately be asked: who is threatening the Suez Canal and freedom of navigation through it? If the threat comes from Israel's military operations against Egypt, why is it that the United Kingdom and France took action not against Israel but against the victim of Israel aggression, Egypt? Why is it that their ultimatum demanded that Egypt should allow Israel armed forces to occupy all Egyptian territory east of the Suez Canal? How can the protection of freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal explain the blockading of the Canal by the British and French navies? In what way can concern for the Suez Canal account for British and French air raids against installations of the Canal?

68. It is perfectly clear that the statements by the United Kingdom and France concerning the protection of navigation through the Suez Canal are only a pretext to disguise their aggressive action against Egypt. In the Security Council, too, the representatives of the United Kingdom and France attempted to justify that aggressive action by alleging that their respective countries were trying to put an end to hostilities in the Near East and to restore peace and calm to that region.

69. The facts, however, indicate the contrary. The United Kingdom and France prevented the Security Council from taking measures to stop Israel aggression against Egypt. The United Kingdom and France themselves opened hostilities against Egypt, thus fanning the flames of war in that region. Such conduct on the part of the United Kingdom and France is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations and is a gross violation of the solemn obligations which Members of the United Nations assume under the Charter.

70. The aggression of the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt has stirred the profound indignation of all the freedom-loving peoples of the world, who have expressed their deep sympathy to the Egyptian people in their just struggle in defence of their national independence and sovereignty. The peoples of the world demand the cessation of aggression against Egypt and the immediate withdrawal of the troops of the interventionists from Egyptian soil.

71. The representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Pierson Dixon, speaking from this rostrum [561st meeting], openly conceded that the French and British were engaged in intervention in Egypt, and tried to show that the armed forces of the United Kingdom were invading Egypt in order to restore law and order. He even argued that the bombing of Egyptian towns was a peaceful police action by the United Kingdom Government. What would Sir Pierson Dixon say if one of the United Kingdom's neighbours tried to carry out "police measures" of this kind on British soil?

72. As to the objectives of the Soviet Union's foreign policy in the Near East, I shall not take the path down

which Sir Pierson Dixon would lead the Assembly, the path of slander and distortion of well-known facts. I shall only make the following points. British, not Soviet, aircraft are bombing Cairo, Port Said and many other towns in Egypt, killing the peaceful population. British, not Soviet, armed forces are poised on Egyptian shores, or perhaps are already landing and occupying Egyptian territory. Let me say to Sir Pierson Dixon that no barrage of slander and insinuation, no smoke-screen, can hide these facts from the eyes of the whole world.

73. The peoples of the Soviet Union join in the demand of the peoples of the whole world that the United Nations should take resolute and effective action for the immediate cessation of the aggression launched by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt.

74. The representative of the Soviet Union, in his statement of 31 October 1956 in the Security Council [751st meeting], unequivocally condemned the act of aggression perpetrated against Egypt by those three countries. The Soviet Government considers it the duty of the United Nations, for the sake of the preservation of peace and calm in the Near East, to take urgent measures for the cessation of military operations by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt, and for the immediate withdrawal of the armed forces of the interventionists from Egyptian soil and from Egyptian waters.

75. The delegation of the Soviet Union urges the General Assembly: to condemn the armed attack by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt as an act of aggression incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations; to demand of the United Kingdom, France and Israel the immediate cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of their armed forces from the territory of Egypt and from Egyptian territorial waters; to appoint a United Nations commission to supervise the carrying out of the recommendations of the emergency special session of the General Assembly. The Assembly must act swiftly and resolutely.

76. Mr. MIR KHAN (Pakistan): I speak on a point of order. As I understand it, we have perhaps about twenty more speakers, and perhaps there will be many more inscribed to speak as we go on. I also see that a draft resolution has been submitted by the United States [A/3256]. I particularly have my eye on paragraph 3, under which it is recommended that all Members refrain from introducing military goods in the area. The draft resolution also urges that the cease-fire become effective immediately.

77. I myself have a great deal to say on this matter. I have to say that we feel in great pain while our brothers in faith in Egypt are being killed. I have to say how angry we feel against the aggression committed by Israel against Egypt. I also have to say how unwarranted we feel the attack made by the United Kingdom and France against Egypt—the United Kingdom and France, with whom my country has such traditional and sacred ties. We belong to the Commonwealth. We are associated with the United Kingdom in that wonderful association of countries which work for peace. With France we have traditional and cultural friendship. However, I see that while we speak and perorate here, there is damage being done to valuable property; there are people being killed.

78. With this in mind, I make a formal proposal that we take up this draft resolution for consideration and

voting here and now, without prejudice to the right of any member to speak after this draft resolution has been voted. I move that as a formal proposal, and I request the President to consult the Assembly on this proposal.

79. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): As the Assembly has heard, the representative of Pakistan has raised a point of order under rule 73 of the rules of procedure. He proposes that the Assembly should proceed to an immediate vote on the draft resolution submitted by the United States [A/3256]. This proposal has been made without prejudice to the rights of representatives wishing to take part in the debate; it should consequently be understood that, if the Assembly decides to approve the proposal of the representative of Pakistan, all representatives will have ample opportunity to express their views.

80. I shall therefore put this proposal to the vote. A roll-call vote has been requested.

81. The representative of New Zealand has asked for the floor.

82. Sir Leslie MUNRO (*New Zealand*): As I understand the proposal just put by the representative of Pakistan, he is moving for closure on the basis that, after the vote, members will be able to explain their votes. I have also heard it suggested—and I think this would be eminently reasonable—that there should in any case be at least three speakers on either side before it is put to the vote. I should think that this would be the least that we could agree to.

83. We are discussing a great and solemn matter. We have a draft resolution before us which has been submitted by the leader of the delegation of the United States. This draft was submitted about two hours ago. I have had some time to examine it, but I have not had time to refer it to my Government. Nevertheless, I have been able to formulate certain views about it.

84. I believe that there is a difference between speaking before a draft resolution is put to the vote and explaining one's vote afterward. Even though the hour is late, surely this is not a time to act precipitately. I should be astounded if other representatives wished this matter to be considered precipitately. We are dealing with issues on which we should debate carefully and with time. We surely can postpone the vote at any rate for one hour.

85. Therefore, at the very minimum, I put to the Assembly that, before the vote is taken, we should hear three speakers for each side.

86. Mr. SARPER (*Turkey*): I shall be very brief. My delegation fully realizes the importance and extreme gravity of the situation. However, I want to submit that if the Assembly presses for a vote tonight or during the next hour or two hours, I shall find myself in considerable difficulty in regard to voting. I know that there are a number of other representatives who are in the same position. I wish to repeat that I fully realize the gravity of the situation. I appeal to the Assembly, however, not to press for a vote at least during the next two or three hours. I am quite prepared to sit here for that time, if it should be necessary.

87. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (*France*) (*translated from French*): Since I represent one of the Powers involved in this debate, I think it would be absolutely inadvisable for the Assembly to proceed to a vote on the United States draft resolution before I had had an opportunity of commenting upon it. I shall not oppose the amendment proposed by the representative of New

Zealand to allow three speakers in favour of the draft resolution and three opposed to it to present their views. In any event, I wish to be one of the three speakers opposing the draft resolution.

88. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I should like to ask the representative of Pakistan whether he is prepared to accept the amendment proposed by the representative of New Zealand, to the effect that we should hear three speakers in favour of the draft resolution and three against it before we proceed to a vote.

89. Mr. MIR KHAN (*Pakistan*): I certainly intended that the parties principally concerned in the draft resolution should have an opportunity to speak. If the representative of France wishes to speak, I am sure that not only I but the whole Assembly would be very glad to hear what he has to say. I would say the same thing as regards the representatives of the other countries affected. Should the representative of the United Kingdom and the representative of Egypt wish to speak on the draft resolution, I had no intention of suggesting that they should not.

90. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I understand that the representative of Pakistan accepts the amendment proposed by New Zealand.

91. I shall consequently give the floor to three speakers who are in favour of the United States draft resolution and to three who are against it. The list of speakers will be drawn up in such a manner as to include speakers of both opinions.

92. I now put to the vote the proposal of Pakistan as amended by the representative of New Zealand.

93. Mr. WALKER (*Australia*) (*from the floor*): Point of order.

94. Mr. KIDRON (*Israel*) (*from the floor*): Point of order.

95. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The voting has already started. I gave representatives the opportunity to speak on the proposal before.

96. Mr. KIDRON (*Israel*) (*from the floor*): Point of order.

97. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I must again point out that I asked if anyone wished to speak, and, as there was silence in the hall, I put the Pakistan proposal to the vote. I must insist that we proceed now with the vote.

98. Mr. KIDRON (*Israel*) (*from the floor*): Mr. President . . .

99. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We are now in the process of voting.

100. I shall have to repeat once again the proposal on which we are voting. The Pakistan proposal has been amended by the representative of New Zealand to provide that a vote shall be taken on the United States draft resolution after we have heard the views of three speakers who are in favour of that draft and three who are against.

101. I must therefore ask the representatives who are in favour of the proposal as I have just explained it to raise their hands.

*The proposal was adopted by 57 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.*

*The meeting was suspended at 11.10 p.m. and resumed at 11.50 p.m.*

102. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I must apologize for the delay in complying with the

Assembly's instructions. We have had difficulty in making up the list of speakers. We have been able to overcome this difficulty, we think, through the co-operation of the New Zealand representative, who told us that his proposal that the list of speakers should include three representatives supporting the United States proposal and three against did not mean that the countries concerned in the dispute which had not yet spoken, namely France and Israel, should not be given the floor.

103. On this basis I submit to the Assembly for its approval the following list of speakers: Israel, Ecuador, Australia, Yugoslavia, France, India, Saudi Arabia and New Zealand.

104. If the Assembly agrees to this list, we shall be able to carry out the decision we took just now.

*It was so decided.*

105. Mr. EBAN (Israel): On Monday, 29 October 1956, the Israel defence forces took security measures in the Sinai peninsula in the exercise of Israel's inherent right of self-defence. The object of these operations is to eliminate the bases from which armed Egyptian units under the special care and authority of Mr. Nasser invade Israel's territory for purposes of murder, sabotage and the creation of permanent insecurity to peaceful life. These are the only military activities for which the Government of Israel is responsible.

106. Stretching back far behind the events of this week lies the unique and sombre story of a small people subjected throughout all the years of its national existence to a furious, implacable, comprehensive campaign of hatred and siege for which there is no parallel or precedent in the modern history of nations. Not for one single moment throughout the entire period of its modern national existence has Israel enjoyed that minimal physical security which the United Nations Charter confers on all Member States, and which all other Member States have been able to command.

107. We meet here under the auspices of the United Nations, a family of sovereign States organized in a system of mutual rights and obligations. Its basic premise is the principle of sovereign equality of all its Members. Whatever rights are enjoyed by other Members of this Organization belong to Israel, without addition or diminution. Whatever obligation any Member State owes to another, Egypt owes to Israel and Israel to Egypt. If Egypt denies Israel the plenitude of its Charter rights, then it inflicts a deep injury upon Israel, and its competence to invoke the Charter against Israel is seriously compromised and reduced.

108. What are the obligations which Egypt owes to Israel under the Charter? Under the Charter, Egypt is bound to practise tolerance and live together in peace with Israel as a good neighbour. Under the Charter, Egypt is bound to unite its strength with Israel to maintain international peace and security. Under the Charter, Egypt is bound to regard Israel as a State endowed with sovereignty equal to its own. Under the Charter, Egypt is bound to respect the territorial integrity and the political independence of the State of Israel, and especially to refrain from the threat or use of force against that integrity and that independence. Under the Charter, Egypt is bound in advance to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council whenever such decisions are made in favour of Israel as of any other State.

109. To these broad obligations, derived from the Charter, there must be added to Egypt's account other obligations of a more specific nature, based on the General Armistice Agreement of 1949. Under that agreement, Egypt is bound to respect the demarcation line between Israel and Egypt, to prevent any illegal crossings of that line, to abstain from the threat or use of force from its own side of the line against Israel's side, to regard the agreement itself as a transitory measure leading to permanent peace, to respond at any time to Israel's request for a conference to develop the agreement into a peace settlement or to amend and review the provisions of the agreement, to abstain from any act of hostility or any act of blockade or belligerency.

110. Is there any resemblance whatever between this list of obligations and Egypt's actual conduct of its relations with Israel? Can anyone imagine that, if Egypt had been willing to carry out this system of relations with Israel, we should have been assembled here on this tragic and solemn occasion?

111. What we confront tonight is a point of explosion after seven years of illicit belligerency. Belligerency is the key to the understanding of our problem tonight. Egypt has practised belligerency against Israel by land. Egypt has practised belligerency against Israel by sea. Egypt has established belligerency as the juridical basis of its relations with Israel. Egypt has held belligerency to be the spiritual and emotional mainspring of its conduct towards Israel. Out of this four-fold belligerency maintained by Egypt for seven years—but with special vigour and intensity since the rise of the Nasser régime—is born the crisis which the Assembly of the United Nations confronts tonight. I would say a word to the Assembly on each of these aspects of Egyptian belligerency.

112. Belligerency by land took its origins in May 1948 on the very morrow of Israel's emergence to sovereignty. On that date, Egyptian forces, joined by the converging forces of other Arab armies, marched into the newly established, independent, sovereign State of Israel with the avowed aim of its destruction.

113. Alas, the processes which now move so swiftly in Egypt's protection were much slower at that time. It took us eight weeks to secure from the organs of the United Nations the establishment of an effective and stable cease-fire. During that period, every home in Israel stood under the direct shadow of death and extinction. Our men, women and children fell by the thousands while this wave of aggression threatened to convulse us.

114. At the end of that year, negotiations were held under United Nations auspices which led to the conclusion of the Rhodes Armistice Agreement. This agreement did not promise us an affirmative, trustful and co-operative pattern of relationships. It did at least, however, promise us immunity from overtly hostile acts. Under the Armistice Agreement, every citizen of Israel is entitled to till every inch of Israel's soil and to navigate every inch of Israel's waters, without let or hindrance by any violent encroachment from the Egyptian side.

115. Yet, throughout this period of the armistice, our territory has been subjected to constant encroachments. The frontier has not been for Israel a barrier against the sudden leaping forward of violence by day and by night. Our toll of over 400 dead or wounded through these incursions tells the story of an armistice frontier which has been violated with consistency and with



special frequency and intensity during the past two years, since the Nasser régime has held sway in Egypt. The toll of dead and wounded has been augmented and aggravated by countless pipelines blown up, by water supplies demolished, by trees pulled down, by an inferno of insecurity and danger which has raged along peaceful farms and homesteads in the frontier area. And last year, as I shall point out, to all of these torments was added perhaps the most penetrating and perilous of all, through the organization and mobilization of the *fedayeen* movement.

116. It may be difficult for nations assembled here, which enjoy a normal security, to understand what has been involved for Israel by this belligerency on land. While much has been said about Israel's responsibilities to the United Nations, it is a melancholy fact that, since 1948, any Arab State which has ever tried to kill Israel, to plunder Israel property, to blockade Israel's ports, to intercept Israel's navigation, has never regarded itself as operating under any effective international deterrent. Thus the United Nations has not been able to offer Israel the minimal of daily security enjoyed by all its other Members in nearly every sector of their national lives.

117. Surrounded by hostile armies on all its land frontiers, subjected to savage and relentless hostility, exposed to penetrations, raids and assaults by day and by night, suffering constant toll of life amongst its citizenry, bombarded by threats of neighbouring Governments to accomplish its extinction by armed force, overshadowed by a new menace of irresponsible rearmament, embattled, blockaded, besieged, Israel alone amongst the nations faces a battle for its security anew with every rising dawn and with every approaching nightfall. In a country of small area and intricate configuration, the proximity of enemy guns is a constant and haunting theme.

118. These are the fears and provocations which hover over us everywhere, but they fall upon us with special intensity in the frontier areas, where development projects vital to the nation's destiny could be paralysed or interrupted by our adversaries from a position of dominating geographical advantage.

119. In short, it is a small country where every activity by farmers or citizens becomes a test of physical and moral courage. These are the unique circumstances in which Israel pursues its quest for security and peace.

120. On innumerable occasions, the active defence of Israel life and territory has been compromised in deference to international opinion. We know that Israel is most popular when it does not hit back, and world opinion is profoundly important to us. So, on one occasion after another, we have buried our dead, tended our wounded, clenched our teeth in suppressed resentment and hoped that this very moderation would deter a repetition of these offences. But sometimes the right and duty of self-preservation, the need to avoid expanding encroachments, the sentiment that if the claim to peaceful existence is not defended it will be forever lost, prevails in the final and reluctant decision.

121. But this belligerency which assails us by land has its counterpart by sea. In 1948, the Government of Egypt established processes of visit, search and seizure, began to confiscate ships and cargoes bound for Israel ports, established restrictive regulations, assumed punitive measures against the shipping and flags of other countries desiring to trade peacefully with Israel and to navigate upon and between the high seas. The flags of fifteen nations, endowed with the

unconditional right of free navigation in the Suez Canal, have been abused and prejudiced by unlawful acts of interception. Ships have been confiscated and sold, cargoes have been held and sequestered, sailors have been tormented and wrongfully imprisoned, and all of this on the great international waterway consecrated nine decades ago to the universal right of all nations to free commerce and navigation.

122. Thus, classic acts of war by maritime blockade have been added to the pattern of Egypt's land belligerency in the total pattern of Israel's siege. Again, through all the development of this policy during the Nasser régime, we have witnessed a consequent sequence of aggravation. The processes of blockade and interception have been extended in the name of belligerency from the Suez Canal to another international waterway, the Gulf of Akaba, and the State of Israel has had to distort the entire pattern of its economy, to bear unwarranted burdens running into tens of millions of pounds, in order to compensate for the impact of this piratical system which Egypt has established on this great artery of the world's communications.

123. Belligerency by land and belligerency by sea are both expressed in a doctrine of juridical belligerency. This doctrine has been discredited by the Security Council of the United Nations, but it continues to be maintained. On 12 June 1951, in the Mixed Armistice Commission, the Egyptian representative said:

"We exercise our rights of war. We are legally at war with Israel. This armistice does not put an end to a state of war. It will not prohibit Egypt from exercising certain rights of war."

In the Security Council of the United Nations, the Foreign Minister of Egypt declared:

"The Egyptian-Israel General Armistice Agreement will not be interpreted by us as terminating in any legal or technical sense the state of war between Egypt and Israel."

124. This jurisprudence continues to be maintained long after it has been adjudicated and discredited. It furnishes a basis for our contention that in juridical and legal terms Egypt has cut itself off from its Charter obligations towards Israel and does not even avow a legal basis upon which this conduct towards us can legitimately be explained.

125. The fourth aspect of this belligerency should be studied in those statements of Egypt's intentions towards Israel which furnish the philosophical background to the belligerent acts which I have described.

126. Here is a typical example of the kind of utterance which bombards the ears of Israel's population by day and by night:

"Wait and see"—says the Egyptian dictator—"soon will be proven to you the strength and will of our nation. Egypt will teach you a lesson and quieten you forever. Egypt will grind you to the dust."

127. On 11 April 1956, celebrating the exploits of Egypt's commando units in Israel, the Egyptian Minister of Religious Properties declared:

"There is no reason why the faithful *fedayeen*, hating their enemies, should not penetrate into Israel and transform the lives of its citizens into a hell. Yes, we will be victorious because our motives are holy and our aims are the highest. We will be victorious because we are more diligent in death than is Israel in life."

128. On 14 October 1956, the Egyptian dictator himself said:

"I am not solely fighting against Israel. My task is to deliver the Arab world from destruction through Israel's intrigue, which has its roots abroad. Our hatred is very strong. There is no sense in talking about peace with Israel. There is not even the smallest place for negotiations."

129. The Press and all the agencies and media of information take up the chorus. A typical example was contained in the leading Egyptian newspaper:

"Israel will not be saved from the Arabs. She will be destroyed under the feet of Arab fighters and the flag of freedom will be unfurled over Palestine."

130. There is a tendency in some quarters to underestimate the importance and the impact of these pronouncements. I can assure members of the General Assembly that it is a unique and disquieting experience to live in a country surrounded by neighbours which bombard it by day and by night with predictions and menaces for its physical destruction. There is no doubt whatever that these authoritative directives furnish the psychological and emotional background against which belligerency by land and by sea is organized with growing and increasingly explosive intensity.

131. But all these aspects of belligerency together would not of themselves automatically invite a drastic response in self-defence, and I wish to explain frankly and candidly to the General Assembly the special background against which our action of 29 October took place.

132. World opinion naturally asks itself: What are these *fedayeen* units? What do their activities imply for Israel's security? It asks whether their actions in the past and their plans for the future are really full of peril for Israel, and whether the peril was really so acute that Israel might reasonably regard the elimination of this peril as a primary condition of its security and indeed of its very existence.

133. The Government of Israel represents a people endowed with a mature understanding of international facts. We are not unaware of the limits of our strength. We are perhaps amongst the half dozen smallest Members of this Organization. We fully understand how certain measures might at first sight evoke a lack of comprehension, even in friendly minds. Being a democracy, we work under the natural restraints of a public opinion which compels us to weigh drastic choices with care and without undue precipitation. It is, in short, a Government which determines its actions by its single exclusive aim of ensuring life and security for the people whom it represents, while safeguarding the honour and trust of millions linked to it by the strongest ties of fraternity.

134. In recent days, this Government of Israel has had to face a tormenting question: Do its obligations under the United Nations Charter require it to resign itself to the existence of uninterrupted activity to the south and north and east of armed units practising open warfare against it, and working from their bases in the Sinai peninsula and elsewhere for the maintenance of carefully regulated invasions of our homes, our lands, and our very lives? Or, on the other hand, are we acting legitimately within our inherent right of self-defence when, having found no other remedy for over two years, we cross the frontier against those who have no scruples in crossing the frontier against us?

135. Members of the General Assembly may be in a better position to evaluate the choice and to identify themselves with this situation if they hear something of the background of this movement and its place in the total pattern of Egyptian intransigence and aggression.

136. Let it be plain that the system of waging war against Israel by commando penetrations is the product of Mr. Nasser's mind. It is one of his contributions to the international life and morality of our times.

137. After intensive preparation during the spring and summer of 1955, this new weapon was launched in August of that year, breaking a period of relative tranquillity on the Egyptian-Israel frontier, indeed, coming at a time when Egypt and Israel were engaged in hopeful negotiations with the United Nations Chief of Staff, looking towards the integral implementation of the 1949 Armistice Agreement.

138. Between 30 August and 2 September 1955, the Egyptian Government proclaimed its official responsibility for those invasions. On 30 August, it broadcast:

"Egyptian forces have penetrated into the territory of occupied Palestine and pursued the attackers."

On 31 August 1955, an official *communiqué* informed the Egyptian people of this new military technique:

"Egypt has decided to dispatch her heroes, the disciples of Pharaoh and the sons of Islam, and they will cleanse the land of Palestine. Thus we have decided and thus is our belief. There will be no peace on Israel's border because we demand vengeance, and vengeance is Israel's death."

On 31 August, another official *communiqué* stated:

"The Egyptian *fedayeen* have begun their activities inside the territory of Israel after repeated clashes on the border during the past week. The Egyptian *fedayeen* have penetrated into Israel settlements spread out in the Negev until Beersheba and Migdal Ashqelon, at a distance of 40 kilometres from the Egyptian border, and have taught our aggressive enemies a lesson that they will not forget. The Egyptian *fedayeen* sowed fear and consternation amongst the citizens of Israel."

On 2 September, the following official statement was broadcast in Cairo:

"The forces of the Egyptian *fedayeen* moved towards Israel, approached its capital and caused heavy casualties along the border between Gaza and Tel Aviv."

139. These are some of the documents which mark the origin of the *fedayeen* movement. United Nations authorities have repeatedly condemned these activities, designated them as aggression, held the Egyptian Government responsible for them and called for their cessation. As one example, I quote a statement at that time by the United Nations Chief of Staff, General Burns. Reporting to the Security Council, he wrote:

"The episode of 22 August was soon after followed by an organized series of attacks on vehicles, installations and persons, carried out by gangs of marauders in Israel territory which, according to my information, resulted in the deaths of 11 military and civilian personnel . . .

"The number and nature of these acts of sabotage perpetrated well within Israel territory are such as to suggest that they are the work of organized and well trained groups." [S/3430, paras. 3 and 4.]

140. That was the opening shot in the *fedayeen* offensive in the summer of 1955. In the spring of this year, the activity of these groups took on a new scope and intensity. This was the period during which the arms race initiated by Mr. Nasser with external help was running most drastically to Israel's disadvantage. Members of the General Assembly will recall how close we were then to the threshold of general war, while these units came in and out of Israel every day on their missions of murder and plunder, accompanied by the official exhortations of Mr. Nasser and his officials and by exuberant shouts of triumph in all the media of Arab information.

141. In an address to the Security Council on 30 October [749th meeting], I submitted a detailed chronicle of acts of violence carried out by penetrating *fedayeen* units, day by day and night by night, in the period between April of this year and a few days ago. Throughout the whole of that period, United Nations officials concerned with security on our frontier were devoting great attention to this problem. On 8 April 1956, the United Nations Chief of Staff addressed a letter to the Foreign Minister of Israel. In that letter, General Burns includes the following passages:

"I am dispatching to the Foreign Minister of Egypt a protest against the action of the *fedayeen*, assuming it to have been authorized or tolerated by the Egyptian authorities, and requesting the immediate withdrawal of any persons under Egyptian control from the territory of Israel . . .

"I consider that if Egypt has ordered these *fedayeen* raids, it has now put itself in the position of the aggressor."

142. I will not weary the General Assembly with this sordid chronicle in all its details. Suffice it to say that, during this period of Egyptian belligerency, there had taken place against Israel 435 cases of armed incursion, nearly 2,000 cases of armed robbery and theft, 1,300 cases of armed clashes with Egyptian armed forces, 172 cases of sabotage perpetrated by Egyptian military units and *fedayeen* in Israel. As a result of these activities, 465 of our people have been killed or wounded. In 1956 alone, so far, as a result of this one aspect of Egyptian belligerency, 28 of our people have been killed and 127 have been wounded.

143. I have said that this activity is merely the spearhead of Egyptian belligerency. It is a new device for making war and for making it with safety. The doctrine is one of unilateral belligerency. The Egyptian-Israel frontier is to be a one-way street. It is to be wide open for these armed Egyptian units to penetrate deeply into Israel to accomplish their mission and to return. It is to be closed in their favour against any offensive response.

144. It was in these circumstances that the Government of Israel faced the tormenting problems of its duties and obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. We are not satisfied with a justification of our actions in pure terms of national expediency. There is perhaps no Member of this Organization more sensitive to all the currents of international opinion, more vulnerable to the disfavour and the dissent of friendly world opinion, broader in the scope and extent of its universal associations, less able to maintain its life and its existence on any principle of self-sufficiency and of autarchy.

145. It was with full knowledge of this fact that we have been forced to interpret Article 51 of the Charter

as furnishing both a legal and a moral basis for such defensive action as is literally and specifically applicable to the dangers which we face. Under Article 51 of the Charter, the right of self-defence is described as "inherent"; in the French translation it is "*naturel*". It is something which emerges from the very nature of a State and of humanity. This inherent right of self-defence is conditioned in the Charter by the existence of armed attacks against a Member State.

146. Can anyone say that this long and uninterrupted series of encroachments did not constitute in its totality the essence and the reality of an armed attack? Can it seriously be suggested that we made no attempt to exhaust peaceful remedies. Time after time at the table of the Security Council and in meetings of the Mixed Armistice Commission efforts were made to bring about tranquillity on this frontier. Yet all of this well-intentioned, enlightened, and, at certain times, hopeful effort ended without making the life or the security of a single citizen of Israel greater than it was before.

147. I have mentioned the problem of opinion. It is perhaps natural that a country should interpret its own obligations for the preservation of security more stringently than those who enjoy greater security far away. If we have sometimes found it difficult to persuade even our friends in the international community to understand the motives for our action, this is because nobody in the world community is in Israel's position.

148. How many other nations have had hundreds of their citizens killed over these years by the armed action of armies across the frontier? How many nations have had their ships seized and their cargoes confiscated in international waterways? How many nations find the pursuit of their daily tasks to be a matter of daily and perpetual hazard? In how many countries does every single citizen going about his duties feel the icy wind of his own vulnerability? It might perhaps require an unusual measure of humility and imagination for others to answer the question how they would have acted in our place. Nobody else is in our place and is therefore fully competent to equate the advantage and the disadvantage of our choice.

149. The Government of Israel is firmly convinced that it has done what any other nation would have done in our place, with the reservation that many would have done it earlier and perhaps with greater impact of resistance. It is especially moving to us to find that, despite the uniqueness and the eccentricity of our position, something of it is making its way into the generous consciousness of mankind. Since this discussion proceeds not merely from the rostrum of the General Assembly, but also against the bar of world opinion, I think it is legitimate to quote an eloquent and cogent passage from one of the great organs of opinion published in this, the host city of our Organization. Yesterday's edition of *The New York Times* stated:

" . . . it would be ridiculous to permit Colonel Nasser to pose before the United Nations or the world as the innocent victim of aggression, or to hold a protecting hand over him. On the contrary, in so far as there is any one man guilty of aggression, it is the Egyptian President, for he has waged war against Israel, Britain and France by propaganda, by gun-running, by infiltration of murderous bands, by stirring up rebellion in French North Africa, by seizing the Suez Canal by force and scrapping a treaty in the same manner in which Hitler marched into the Rhineland, by blocking the canal for Israel shipping in defiance of United Nations orders—fi-

nally by his whole loudly proclaimed programme of throwing Israel into the sea in alliance with other Arab states and creating an Arab empire under his hegemony which would expand his influence in concentric circles to all Africa and the whole Moslem world”.

150. In these circumstances, both the position and the attitude of the Israel Government are clear. This attitude is based upon our fundamental concept of reciprocity. If the frontier between Egypt and Israel is to protect Egyptian territory against Israel entry, then it must protect Israel territory against Egyptian entry. We hold that it is a self-evident truth that the lives of Israel men, women and children are not less sacrosanct or less worthy of international protection than are the lives of the hired *fedayeen* groups which are the main instruments of Nasserism in its assault upon the peace and decencies of Middle Eastern life.

151. Beyond these incidents, grave as they are, we discern issues of even greater moment. World opinion must surely choose between the two candidates for its confidence: on the one hand, the farmers and workers, the men, women and children of Israel; and, on the other hand, the fanatic warriors of the *fedayeen* groups. Behind that confrontation there stands the much broader and more significant confrontation between Israel and Mr. Nasser.

152. A small people builds its society and culture in its re nascent homeland. In the early days of its independence it is set upon by the armed might of all its neighbours, who attempt to wipe it off the face of the earth. In the following years its neighbours continue their assault; with warlike acts of their own choice they attempt its destruction by armed intervention. They send armed units into its territory to murder and plunder. They strive by every means to ensure that nowhere shall there be tranquillity for peaceful pursuits. They blare forth the most violent threats of Israel's destruction. They accumulate vast armaments for bringing this about. They announce, as they did last week from Cairo, that it is they who will choose the time and the place for the final assault and that it is for us to wait passively for the moment of their selection. They proclaim that a state of war with Israel already exists. They seize the greatest of the world's international waterways and convert it into an instrument for unilateral national pressure.

153. Across Africa and Asia, wherever Nasserism spreads its baneful influence, it works actively to subvert all peace and progress and to establish an ambitious and insatiable hegemony. Now, having considered that it has humbled and defeated the international community and the maritime Powers, Nasser's action returns to its first target, Israel, which is to be swamped from three sides with a new wave of *fedayeen* violence. The Assembly will recall that the new wave began shortly following the tripartite military alliance concerted ten days ago between the Government of Syria, Jordan and Egypt, under Egypt's control.

154. While studying with attention all proposals for strengthening security in the Middle East, we must reject with vehement indignation the charges of aggression launched against us here, launched by some States whose own current international and security activities are well in the forefront of today's international attention.

155. There is aggression, there is belligerency in the Middle East, but we for eight years have been its victims, not its authors. That is what I mean when I

say that world opinion as here represented should decide whom to trust. Shall it be the small free people establishing its homeland in peace and constructive progress, or shall it be the dictatorship which has bullied and blustered and blackmailed its way across the international life of our times, threatening peace in many continents, openly avowing belligerency, placing its fist on the jugular vein of the world's communications, bringing the Middle East and the world ever nearer to the threshold of conflict, intimidating all those who stand in its path, all except one people, at least, which will not be intimidated—one people whom no dictator has ever intimidated, the people which has risen up against all the tyrants of history, the people which knows that the appeasement of despots yields nothing but an uneasy respite, and that a Government which allowed its own citizens to be murdered daily in their homes would lose the dignity and the justification for which Governments are instituted among men?

156. In conclusion, I would ask the General Assembly to believe that Israel and the Arab States, the region in which they and we must forever live, now stand at the crossroads of their history. An aggressive dictatorship has for the first time encountered successful and glorious resistance. Some elements of its pride have been broken. Those whom it has outraged with impunity have stood up and asserted their rights, and the hope of freedom burns brighter in the Middle East today, not only for Israel but for many others in our region who have found ways of communicating to us their own deep apprehensions of what Nasser's encroachment means for their own cherished sovereignty.

157. If the power of this tyranny is not artificially revived, our region will again become a place where men of all nations, including Israel, can live and work in peace, where legitimate universal interests will be respected under the sanction of law, where contacts with other lands will be held in respect, where all those in Asia and Europe whose fortune is linked by history and geography with the Middle East will receive justice and respect for their legitimate interests. It will be a region where the great maritime nations will not have to suffer the indignities which they underwent in this building last month, when they had to hang with exaggerated deference on every wave of the hand, on every nod of condescension from the representative of the territorial Power which had converted the unconditional right of navigation into an act of grace or a privilege to be conferred or withheld at will.

158. Such a Middle East, free from domination and totalitarian influence, will enter perhaps soon upon its new birth of freedom. This is the crossroad at which we might soon stand. We could have wished that we had reached it less drastically, with smaller peril and sacrifice. But, having reached it, surely we must go forward and not back. This momentous discussion today has made it plain that one thing will not do: it will not do to go back to an outdated and crumbling armistice régime designed by its authors to last for a few months and now lingering for eight years in growing paralysis of function. Least of all can we be satisfied to return to an imperfect armistice, distorted by unilateral belligerency, to a system designed seven years ago as a transition to peace and interpreted for seven years by one of the parties as a continuing state of war.

159. Israel has no desire or intention to wield arms beyond the limits of its legitimate defensive mission. But whatever is demanded of us by way of restoring Egypt's rights and respecting Egypt's security under

international law must surely be accompanied by equally binding Egyptian undertakings to respect Israel's security and Israel's rights under the identical law. Egypt's obligation to abstain from acts of hostility, to liquidate its commando activities, to abolish its illicit discrimination against Israel shipping in the Suez Canal and in the Gulf of Aqaba, is equal and identical in law to Israel's obligation to respect the established armistice lines. Our signpost is not backward to belligerency, but forward to peace. Whatever Israel is now asked to do for Egypt must have its counterpart in Egypt's reciprocal duty to give Israel the plenitude of its rights.

160. Beyond the moment when fire will cease, the prospect must not be one of unilateral claims by one party against the other. The horizon must be of peace by agreement, peace without maritime blockades in the Gulf or in the Canal, peace without frontier raids or commando incursions, peace without constant threats to the integrity or independence of any State, peace without military alliances directed against Israel's independence.

161. Egypt and Israel are two peoples whose encounters in history have been so rich and fruitful for mankind. Surely they must make their journey from this solemn moment towards these horizons of peace.

162. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) (*translated from Spanish*): Before going into the substance of the question, I should like to refer to the motion which the Assembly has approved under which three speakers have been selected to speak for and three against the United States draft resolution [A/3256], over and above the Powers directly involved. I think that those of us who opposed the motion were very few. The object of the motion was to save time, so that the draft resolution could be approved and could have effect at once. The net result, however, was to lose more time and the resolution will have the same effect whether we approve it now, in the early hours of the morning, or many hours later.

163. The great significance of this debate is precisely that it gives all the civilized peoples of the world an opportunity to come to this rostrum and state their views on a problem which is of the deepest interest to all countries, particularly the small ones. This is the forum of world opinion, and we must defend our right to speak here and to show the world that we small nations cannot assert ourselves by force but must do so by reason, argument and propaganda. This rostrum must be open to all debates and the opinion of all peoples must be heard, especially at such a crucial moment of history as this, when the final position of a civilization is being defined. The Ecuadorian delegation accordingly objected to the debate being closed, since that would prevent those who wished from expressing their views freely and frankly. There is a difference between taking part in the debate and expressing views after the debate is closed, when the vote has been taken and it is merely a matter of explaining one's vote. Such statements are not even listened to with due attention.

164. As regards the substance of the matter, we must analyse the facts in order to appraise them. We have before us two cases of aggression, of a very clear aggression, which does not need to be defined in order to be immediately understood and judged morally: first, that of Israel against Egypt, and secondly, that of the United Kingdom and France against Egypt.

165. Are the two related? Was one the historical antecedent of the other? My delegation refuses to believe such a thing, it rejects such a theory. It does not

believe that Israel has lent itself to a manoeuvre of this kind, not even on the pretext of defending its vital interests.

166. I greatly appreciate the worth of this small State and, as I know it and have been there, though only for a few days, I am aware of the marvellous efforts that it is making, cultivating what is little more than stones and desert and sand and making it bring forth vegetation and produce gardens to feed the people and beautify the country. I know this people's worth, and all they are doing to create their homeland and to further universal culture, and I reject as inconceivable the idea that they can have lent themselves to such trickery.

167. The second act of aggression, that of the United Kingdom and France against Egypt, followed upon the invasion of Egypt by the Israel armed forces; was it deliberately linked to the Israel invasion? I believe that, with their well-known political acumen, the United Kingdom and France merely took advantage of the political, economic and social circumstances to carry out a plan which had been maturing for many months.

168. Both are acts of aggression, and all countries, particularly the small countries, which have been or may be victims of aggression, must from this rostrum condemn aggression in the strongest and most emphatic terms, whatever the motive or the pretext for that act of aggression may be. It was for this very purpose that this Organization was established; it was for this that the Charter to which we are subject was drafted at San Francisco. Either at that time, or subsequently, all the States represented here, including the present aggressors and their victims, promised to relinquish the threat of force, on any pretext, and to use it only in self-defence, in the case of an armed attack and never in any other.

169. The nations, particularly the small ones, cannot accept the argument which the representative of the United Kingdom defended with so much skill, but to the alarm of the world, adducing a multitude of apparent reasons. He maintained that the situation was such that the United Kingdom and France had no alternative but to take matters into their own hands. The Security Council—these are almost his very words—was unable to do anything, being always hamstrung by the veto, and, since it was impossible to rely upon the United Nations because it was not strong enough to enforce respect for peace and the law, it had been necessary, urgent and legitimate to take this police action whose only object was to restore and maintain peace.

170. But there had in fact been no breach of the peace. The Suez Canal had been operating perfectly. On the eve of the British and French aggression, fifty ships had gone through the Canal peacefully. It is therefore clear from a simply study of the facts that France and the United Kingdom seized the opportunity offered by the invasion of Egypt by the Israel army to do what they had been thinking of doing, what they had threatened to do but had not ventured to do because there had been no clear and adequate pretext.

171. They had already made it clear from the moment that the Egyptian Government nationalized the Suez Canal Company and refused to participate in the London Conference and later refused to accede to what was almost an order presented by the five Foreign Ministers who were sent to Cairo, that they did not exclude the possibility of using force to save the situation. But there could be no immediate resort to



force, because there was no pretext to justify it; the scandal would have rocked the world, and so they did not dare go further.

172. The opportunity, however, quickly presented itself and then, in defence of purely economic interests, they violated the Charter, as well as the fundamental rights and guarantees of peoples, and committed an act of aggression that was doubly immoral. In the first place, it violates the Charter, which all countries, large and small, are bound to respect. In the second place, the violation has been committed by two great Powers, two Powers in which we have all placed our confidence as guarantors of world peace and security and which, for that very reason, enjoy the right of veto. That right they used a few days ago in order to prevent the Security Council and the United Nations from coming to the defence of the weak and so preventing an outrage from being committed.

173. The two cases of aggression before us must therefore be judged differently. Both are unpardonable, but both cannot be equally explained; Israel's aggression is explicable, but the attack by the United Kingdom and France defies explanation. The civilization of these two great nations, to which the representative of the United Kingdom referred from this very rostrum a few hours ago, has played a great role in the East and in the Middle East, as well as in Europe and America. We owe our culture to the United Kingdom and France; we owe all our civilization to them, and it was not to be expected that they, who gave us our civilization, and who have a moral obligation to continue that great tradition, should have been the ones to violate a sacred undertaking. Why have they done so? In order to defend purely material interests. In so doing, they are setting a bad example to us smaller countries, encouraging us to think that we should or could do the same when our own interests are at stake.

174. What, then, have these two great Powers achieved by violating the Charter? They have given us the most barbarous of lessons; they have told us that the Charter is good only when it suits our purposes, and that it can be flouted when it runs counter to our interests. Today it is the great Powers which are doing this; what example are they setting the smaller Powers? Is the Charter intended only to keep the smaller nations in chains and obedient to its doctrine, and not to apply to the others?

175. I believe that this is one of the gravest and most acute crises in the history of our Organization, because of the nature of the acts committed and of the status of those responsible for committing them. I can explain, though I do not justify, Israel's aggression. From the beginning, Israel's history has been one of struggle. It is surrounded by a group of peoples hostile to it, peoples opposed to it on grounds of religion, language and culture; it has to fight, and it has fought bravely. In Israel, passions are running high; the people are besieged, panic-stricken, and could commit an act of tragic folly.

176. But what are France and the United Kingdom fighting for? Israel is fighting for its very existence, for all that the mind and muscle of its people have created, but what are these two great Powers fighting for? Simply for a matter of business, the business of the Suez Canal. They are fighting, they say, for the freedom of this vital international waterway; for freedom of passage through the Suez Canal, the canal which is essential to the existence of many European coun-

tries and on which the life of half of Europe, and of the United Kingdom and France in particular, depends.

177. All this is true, but at bottom it is a question only of great economic interests, it is simply a matter of big business; and peoples surely do not go to war to defend the fat dividends of Suez Canal shareholders. There can be no question of that. In this day and age the peoples are not blind to that extent, and the proof is that in the United Kingdom itself a large body of opinion, educated people, highly responsible members of the British Parliament, have said much harsher things than I am saying now on behalf of my small nation in this, the supreme forum of the world.

178. From the time of Israel's establishment until the armistice agreements, war raged. From the armistice agreements until the present day, Israel has had to face a constant and uninterrupted struggle; it has had to plough its fields rifle in hand; it has not known a single hour of real peace. So that although it has committed an act which we do not approve, even if we can explain it, it is fighting for its life and for an ideal, the ideal of being an independent country, however small the ideal of being a State and of giving fit expression to the intellectual gifts with which its great race has been endowed.

179. I believe that at this time we must, on behalf of all the civilized peoples of the world, condemn these acts of aggression and, in the name of world peace and security, ask that everything possible should be done to repair the evil so far committed and to solve all the problems whose solution has been sought by violence.

180. The United Nations also has a great responsibility in regard to the problem of relations between the Arab peoples and Israel. The United Nations has not done all that it could and should have done to prevent the ever-increasing problems in this field from reaching the present explosive stage. The United Nations, in execution of its lofty legal and moral purpose, must take advantage of this opportunity and, after censuring the deed which has been committed, albeit only morally it must make every effort to settle the various problems involved so that, once the present hostilities are halted these problems do not remain as seeds of discord and of war.

181. The United Kingdom representative said [*561st meeting*] that after the police action undertaken by his country and France, it would be possible to work out a settlement of these problems so that out of this great evil much good might come. Here the adage may perhaps apply that evil is sometimes the origin of much good; there is no evil of which good may not come.

182. The President of the United States, in his dispassionate and masterly statement to the American people yesterday, made it clear that he and his Government are taking the highest possible moral position; it is clear to us all that he has sacrificed important interests and risen above them in order to pass judgement impartially, applying, as he said, the same law to friends and to enemies, for it is true that there can be no peace in the world if we apply one code of international law to our friends and another to our enemies. Mr. Eisenhower, although we do not agree with all he said, has demonstrated once and for all that his great country is worthy of the trust which all the Americas have placed in it. As the true standard bearer of democracy, the principles of justice and the Charter, he has not hesitated, even at the risk of endangering the interests of his two great friends, to utter

a moral but effective condemnation of the acts which have prompted the present meeting.

183. I believe that in the midst of this crisis we have gained two fundamental advantages: first, that we have been able to come here to express the opinion of all peoples on acts committed by great Powers; and secondly, that the greatest Power in the world has at this time taken a democratic, intelligent and human stand, thereby winning universal respect and admiration.

184. We shall vote for the draft resolution introduced by the United States delegation [A/3256]; but, applying Mr. Eisenhower's observation that there should be one law for all, I would say that the first and second paragraphs of the preamble should have been drafted in the same form.

185. In the first, which notes the disregard on many occasions by the parties to the Israel-Arab armistice agreements of 1949 of the terms of such agreements, and the fact that the armed forces of Israel have penetrated deeply into Egyptian territory in violation of the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel, there is a strong condemnation of Israel. The second paragraph, however, notes only that armed forces of France and the United Kingdom are conducting military operations against Egyptian territory.

186. These military operations constitute the most flagrant and open aggression, they are a violation of the United Nations Charter and they threaten the downfall of our Organization. But they are referred to in veiled diplomatic and tactful terms, although the act in question violates the United Nations Charter, whereas the other act, which is no more than a breaking of the armistice between a group of countries, is harshly judged.

187. Are we applying the same law in our judgement of the little State of Israel and the little Arab States, as in our judgement of the great Powers which are at this moment attacking Egypt? I do not think so. I wish merely to draw attention to the fact that the carefully worked out and subtle language used to disguise this bitter pill simply means that the military operations are open and flagrant aggression against a country which had given no cause for it and, even if it had done so, should not have been so attacked. I wish to place on record the view of my delegation.

188. The third paragraph of the preamble says that traffic through the Suez Canal is now interrupted, to the serious prejudice of many nations. Yes, traffic is now interrupted; it was interrupted as soon as the United Kingdom and France began their bombing; it was interrupted as soon as the British-French aggression began. The paragraph should therefore read: "Noting that, owing to the British-French aggression, traffic through the Suez Canal is now interrupted, to the serious prejudice of many nations . . .", etc.

189. Finally, in paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution, it would appear that Egypt, too, is being ordered not to move forces within its own territory. I do not think that was the intention of the United States delegation: the text must surely be understood as referring to the forces which started the aggression.

190. After these few remarks on the view taken by my delegation in voting for the draft resolution, I will conclude by voicing my earnest hope that the United Kingdom and France, which have always been among the leaders of the civilized world, which have done much to spread civilization and have hitherto been its

official spokesmen, will pause for reflection and retrace their steps. I trust that they will see that, with the bombs they are now raining on Egyptian territory, they are throwing away their prestige, and that the great evil they are doing is not only destroying their prestige but causing all the peoples which formerly believed and had faith in their greatness to lose that faith and to consider them worthy of the sharpest censure.

191. Mr. WALKER (Australia): When the Secretary of State of the United States addressed us earlier this evening, he said that he spoke with a heavy heart. I must say that I heard his statement with heavy heart.

192. In Australia we believe that the strength of the United Nations rests principally upon two foundations: on the one hand, the participation of the wide range of Members throughout the world and, secondly, on the close friendship and close co-operation of the United States, the United Kingdom and France. It is with very heavy heart that we recognize the division of opinion, the very deep division of opinion, that has developed regarding the practical measures that should be taken at this time to deal with the tragic situation in the Middle East.

193. Moreover, our own relations with the United States are so close and so friendly that our hearts are heavy as we find ourselves in opposition to a draft resolution proposed by the United States [A/3256], particularly as we know in our hearts that the objectives sought by the United States are those that we would seek ourselves in connexion with this grave problem. I wish I could say that I were as sure that all those who speak or vote in favour of this draft resolution share profoundly the same objective of restoring the peace in the Middle East.

194. I propose to address myself strictly to the terms of the draft resolution, and to refer to it as briefly as is consistent with making the position of my delegation clear.

195. The draft resolution must be analysed in terms of its objective: the restoration of peace in the Middle East. The problem out of which the present difficulties have arisen is one that has a long history, and I do not intend to go into it, but I do wish to emphasize the fact that throughout a considerable number of years this Organization has wrestled, with only very limited success, with the enormous problems involved in maintaining the peace between Israel and its neighbours.

196. Some parts of this draft resolution do not present any difficulty. Two days ago, I voted in the Security Council [750th meeting] for a draft resolution calling upon Israel and Egypt to cease fire and to withdraw behind the frontiers, and we find a provision for something of that sort in this draft resolution. But we find other things with which we have very great difficulty.

197. Some reference has been made already to those parts of the draft resolution that refer to the need to reopen the Suez Canal when hostilities have ceased, and the draft asks us to note that traffic through the Canal is now interrupted, to the serious prejudice of many nations. It has even been suggested and stated here that the traffic through the Canal has been interrupted through the military action of the United Kingdom in sinking an Egyptian vessel. I have seen a message from the Middle East Command that has just recently been published, stating that an Egyptian blockade ship which was being moved into a sinking position athwart the Lake Timsah channel was attacked

twice today by British naval aircraft and sunk at the second attempt. It is believed that the ship is lying outside the buoys demarcating the channel. Egyptian reports that this was a deliberate British attempt to block the channel are said to be wholly unfounded.

198. We are hearing many reports of the results of developments in the region. I mention this because I take it that the reference to traffic through the Canal being now interrupted is not intended as requesting this Assembly to endorse reports being made by one side or another before this Assembly is in a position to establish the actual facts. We know that in times like this some rather strange claims are sometimes made. We know also that ships are not using the Suez Canal and that many countries are diverting their ships away from the Canal until it is safer to continue to use that international waterway.

199. The main features of this draft resolution to which I wish to direct attention are the second paragraph of the preamble and paragraph 1 of the operative part. Paragraph 1 reads as follows:

*"Urges as a matter of priority that all parties now involved in hostilities in the area agree to an immediate cease-fire and as part thereof halt the movement of military forces and arms into the area"*.

This paragraph, taking priority, as it were, over the other operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, seems to be clearly directed against the action which has been taken by France and the United Kingdom. It reflects a judgement which this Assembly is asked to make on that action.

200. We have heard a statement by the representative of the United Kingdom this evening, and we have yet to hear a statement from the representative of France. We have also heard statements in the Security Council, and they have been available in the Press of the world. The declared objectives of the United Kingdom and France in this matter are not to wage war, but to prevent some of the consequences of war, and to prevent the development of the conflict between Israel and Egypt and, in particular, to safeguard the lives and property of the nations using the Suez Canal. Their objectives have been stated to be to prevent the Canal itself from becoming a battle line between Israel and Egypt, a development which would deny the use of this international waterway to the whole world. Their objective is to interpose forces between the Egyptian and Israel forces.

201. The United Kingdom and France have declared solemnly that this is temporary emergency action, to be terminated when peaceful conditions are restored. They are not setting out to impose a solution to the problems of the Middle East by force, but to establish the conditions necessary for a peaceful solution of those problems. Their objective is not to supersede the action of the United Nations, but to reinforce the limited measures that the United Nations is able to take in present circumstances. The United Kingdom and France have declared that these emergency measures are not directed against Egypt's sovereignty or territorial integrity.

202. As I said in the Security Council yesterday [751st meeting], the record of the United Kingdom and France in this Organization is such as to warrant a fair consideration of their statements. Their record is such that I believe they have a right to have their solemn assurances accepted by Members of this Organization.

203. For these reasons, a resolution drafted in the terms that have been placed before us is not acceptable to the Australian Government and its delegation.

204. Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia): The General Assembly is meeting tonight in what has been rightly described as an unprecedented emergency session. It is meeting at a moment of crucial gravity for the peace of the world. An act of aggression whose consequences are incalculable is being committed against a Member State of the United Nations. Its territory is being invaded, its cities bombed.

205. Egypt has been attacked, it is true, by three States—by Israel, by France and by the United Kingdom—for what are alleged to be different reasons. Can there be any doubt, however, that what is now unfolding before our very eyes is a single pattern of aggression? The planning, the timing and the only too apparent ulterior motives are surely conclusive in this regard. Both the Israel attack and the attack by the United Kingdom and France have come after a series of deliberate and increasingly obvious preparatory moves. The Israel attack is the culmination of a growing series of armed retaliatory attacks against Israel's neighbours in defiance of the Armistice Agreement, of Security Council resolutions and of the United Nations Charter. The attack by the United Kingdom and France has climaxed many months of threats and ominous military moves openly directed against Egypt.

206. When the Israel attack occurred, the Security Council was called, on the initiative of the United States, to discharge its primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security. It was considering the urgent steps required—to achieve a cease-fire and a withdrawal of the invading forces. Draft resolutions to this effect were submitted. They had the support of the majority of the members of the Council. They were, however, vetoed by France and the United Kingdom on the ground that those very draft resolutions, calling for a cease-fire and for the withdrawal of the invading forces, were inconsistent with their policy, as explicitly stated by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 750th meeting of the Security Council. Even as they did so, as they themselves frustrated even the mildest form of Security Council action, they argued that the Council was clearly incapable of effective action.

207. Thereupon, they took the law into their own hands. They presented Egypt, the victim of the original attack, with an ultimatum. They enjoined the Egyptian Government to renounce its inherent right of self-defence within the meaning of Article 51 of the Charter. They also summoned Egypt to accept the occupation of a part of its territory by two foreign and obviously hostile Powers. This, surely, was going back to the methods of 1940, or even 1914. Egypt, of course, rejected this ultimatum, as any self-respecting sovereign State would have done. A few hours later, the attack by the United Kingdom and France, the second phase of aggression, began.

208. The impact which this aggression is bound to have, if it is not halted in time, upon the fabric of world peace is still difficult to surmise to the full extent of its implications. France and the United Kingdom have sought to justify their armed intervention in Egypt on the grounds of a desire to extinguish, or at least to circumscribe, the Israel-Egyptian conflict. What they have in fact done is to start a conflagration of even more alarming proportions. They have claimed that their action was necessary to ensure freedom of navigation

in the Suez Canal. What this action has in fact done is to block the navigation which had been proceeding in a perfectly normal manner. It is hard, indeed, to find a plausible excuse for aggression in a world in which the United Nations has become a reality.

209. It is encouraging on this dark occasion to note that a swelling tide of revulsion at the British-French-Israel aggression is already sweeping the world. Public opinion and responsible statesmen have not been slow to react to this deliberate assault on the peace of the world.

210. It is hardly necessary for me to stress the momentous responsibility which has now fallen on the General Assembly. Our task here is to stop the fighting and to halt what might be irreparable while there is still time to save the peace. All other considerations fade before these overriding tasks. On this much we are surely all agreed—the attack on Egypt must cease, and the attacking forces must be withdrawn. We all know full well, of course, that this will not in itself settle the basic issues which have so long tormented the Middle Eastern scene. We shall, however, have created the elementary preconditions for any settlement.

211. It is surely obvious that one cannot hope to advance towards a solution while fighting is going on and while invading armies are on the march. Indeed, should the present situation persist or worsen, the issues may well become insoluble. Therefore, as Mr. Dulles so rightly pointed out, first things must come first.

212. The draft resolution proposed by the United States delegation fully meets the immediate requirements of the situation, and it has the full and warm support of the Yugoslav delegation. I am confident that this draft resolution will meet with an overwhelmingly favourable response in this Assembly, and that it will be adopted as speedily as possible. Let us hope that the voice of the General Assembly will not remain unheard, and that peace will yet be restored.

213. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*translated from French*): A short time ago, speaking on behalf of my Government, I made specific reservations as to the legality of any resolutions this Assembly might adopt concerning the item now under discussion. I feel obliged to reaffirm those reservations, particularly since part of the draft resolution now before us exceeds the scope of the item submitted to the Assembly.

214. I think, however, that I should now state the position of my Government. I deem it necessary, first of all, to recall the events of the last two days and the reasons for the attitude adopted by France in the Security Council.

215. The French Government approved the request for an urgent meeting of the Security Council made by the United States delegation during the night of 29 October 1956. The French Government has never questioned the fact that, given the gravity of the situation, an urgent meeting of the Security Council was called for. It took the view that the fighting going on between the Israel forces and the Egyptian army should be stopped immediately. It also believed that it was necessary to take all appropriate steps to ensure that the hostilities which had just begun would in no event impede free navigation through the Suez Canal. We all know how vitally important this international waterway is to France and to many other countries.

216. The Security Council was convened on 30 October 1956 [*749th meeting*], and the United States

delegation immediately submitted a draft resolution, the text of which I shall not read to the General Assembly because that very resolution afforded the basis for convening this Assembly. We opposed the adoption of that draft resolution. We did so because we felt that it covered only one phase of the problem and that from the entirety of an extremely dangerous situation it singled out one incident, a most serious one to be sure, but merely an incident.

217. The United States delegation answered by saying that the Assembly should first deal with the incidents in the Sinai peninsula and then, if the Council deemed it appropriate, discuss the Suez question and the other items included in the agenda of the Security Council.

218. In the French Government's view, this approach did not take account of the political situation. The French Government considered, in fact, that the tension in the Middle East had progressively assumed so grave a nature that it was imperative to view the situation in its entirety and act accordingly. The French Government, in close co-operation with the Government of the United Kingdom, decided to take the necessary action. The members of the Security Council were apprised of that decision while it was in session.

219. The French Government did not lightly embark on measures which at first glance might appear to be inconsistent with its traditions. It did so because it felt, in full agreement with the United Kingdom Government, that the tragic and rapid turn of events called for vigorous and immediate decisions.

220. Who can in all honesty dispute the fact that ten years' work by the United Nations, innumerable resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and even the noteworthy efforts of our Secretary-General, have been powerless not only to eliminate the danger of war in the Middle East, but even to prevent that danger from increasing to the point where it became a threat to world peace?

221. In reality, the United Nations has proved powerless to settle the Palestine question, because the action of the Security Council has been paralysed by the veto of one of its permanent members. Two years ago, for the first time, the Soviet Union delegation exercised its right of veto to prevent the condemnation of an Arab stand in the Palestine question. Subsequently it persistently prevented any condemnation, no matter how justified, from being pronounced against any one of Israel's neighbours.

222. The impunity thus vouchsafed to certain States has intensified the intransigence of some of them. The inability of this Organization to enforce its decisions—or even sometimes to take such decisions—and to induce the parties concerned to conclude a permanent peace, has had the result of giving free rein to inordinate ambitions, based on increasingly modern armaments, the source of which should provide serious cause for concern to those who would regard the situation we are considering today as a mere border incident.

223. These are not unfounded allegations. There is abundant proof in the writings and statements of Mr. Nasser and his spokesmen, and also in a number of indisputable facts. The United Nations need hardly be reminded of statements to the effect that Israel must be wiped off the map, or appeals made to Islamic solidarity, which, under the guise of strengthening the religious ties of all Moslems—ties which in themselves

are worthy of respect—were actually designed to serve Egyptian national interests exclusively since, to quote Mr. Nasser, that solidarity was without a doubt destined to be the gigantic scaffolding of Egyptian power.

224. In so far as Egypt's African ambitions are concerned, suffice it to recall Mr. Nasser considered that "we cannot forswear the task of expanding Egyptian civilization, even into the heart of the virgin forest".

225. The August 1956 issue of an economic and political review published in Cairo contained a statement of the measures to be taken by Egypt in order to achieve its objective. In addition to systematic propaganda efforts, there were two very specific projects. In the first place, a pan-African conference was to be held at Cairo chiefly for the purpose of reaching decisions ensuring Egyptian domination over the entire African continent. Secondly, the publication recalled that the Supreme Council for African Affairs had been established at Cairo in 1955 in order to make that policy a reality.

226. These ambitions are as inordinate as those which, twenty years ago, were nourished by another dictator whose megalomania ultimately led to the death of more than 25 million human beings. This manifold aspiration is no longer at the stage of individual dreams or academic projects. It has already taken the form of a series of aggressive acts aimed, like the plan which conceived them, in various directions.

227. Against Israel, the activities of so-called death volunteers have been organized on a strictly military basis. Is there any need to recall that, on the very eve of what is now called the "Israel aggression", a number of Egyptian commandos had carried out raids deep into Israel's territory, causing numerous casualties among the civilian population?

228. The Members of the United Nations will surely not have forgotten the forcible seizure of the Suez Canal last July, which constituted not only a violation of international law and commitments undertaken, but also one of the most serious blows ever directed against international confidence.

229. Lastly, the recent seizure by the French navy of a cargo of armaments loaded at Alexandria by Egyptian soldiers and designed to supply the forces of rebellion in North Africa demonstrated without a shadow of doubt that the Egyptian Government, not only by means of propaganda and by sending sabotage experts, but also by shipments of supplies and armaments, is fanning the flames of revolt against the established order. The French Government signified the gravity of this question by requesting that it should be placed on the agenda of the Security Council. The Council members unanimously decided to do so.

230. Thus, before our very eyes, day in and day out, notwithstanding our decisions, Egypt has been openly and cynically helping to aggravate the situation and to prepare the way, within a relatively short time, for developments even more serious than those which we are witnessing today.

231. Could traditional methods prevent this march towards the point of no return? I regret to say that we were no longer able to believe it. When, on the night of 29 October 1956, Israel forces, retaliating against the provocation of the Egyptian death commandos, penetrated into the Sinai area, the French Government considered that this time it would no longer suffice to add to the collection of Security Council resolutions another page containing recommenda-

tions which would remain a dead letter. What was called for was action, and swift action. Those who now blame us for that action should recall the continued flouting of the provisions of the Security Council resolution concerning the free passage of Israel's ships through the Suez Canal [S/2322] and the Council's inability to act effectively when, hardly a month ago, the question of the seizure of the Suez Canal in violation of international agreements was placed before it. Precedents of this order left no hope that substantial and lasting results could be expected from recourse to traditional procedures. These procedures have also proved incapable of putting an end to a situation which, as Mr. Dulles remarked earlier in this meeting, has existed for eight years.

232. France and the United Kingdom then decided to intervene, not in a manner contrary to the purposes of the United Nations as defined during the past few days by the majority of the members of the Security Council, but because it seemed to them essential—as at the time of the Korean situation—that a Power or group of Powers should resolutely take the initiative of facing the real problems. It has been alleged that we have violated international law, and even that we have committed an act of aggression. But as Mr. Mollet, Prime Minister of France, stated on 30 September 1956, "the spirit of the Charter is not a spirit of capitulation; the quest for peaceful solutions cannot mean the acceptance, out of inertia, of *faits accomplis*". It was in that spirit that we felt in duty bound to intervene.

233. Those were the motives which impelled the French Government to take its decision, jointly with the United Kingdom Government. We are aware that it is in the interests of some people not to understand those motives. But we also know that the majority of the members of this Assembly are convinced that the greatest international catastrophes have been caused by the fact that those who were to be the victims were unable to take the necessary decisions in time. As I have already said, the Franco-British intervention in the Suez Canal zone is designed, in the first place, to call an immediate halt to hostilities between Egyptian and Israel armed forces by setting a screen, as it were, between the belligerent forces, and, in the second place, to protect the Suez Canal and establish lasting peace in the Middle East.

234. The French Government will not maintain its forces in the Canal area beyond the time required for the fulfilment of the objectives I have just enumerated. This operation in no way jeopardizes Egyptian sovereignty. We affirm that in taking the decisions which have been forced upon us we in no way intended to act in a manner incompatible with the principles of the Charter. The situation facing us today can be properly appraised only in the light of all its elements, historical, geographical and political. It is within this general framework that the decision taken by my Government, in the interests of the free world and of that just peace which Mr. Dulles invoked a short time ago, must be placed.

235. Mr. LALL (India): In this hour overcast with clouds of war and aggression, I rise to make these brief remarks on behalf of the Government of India because my Government remains convinced that the horror which is upon us can be arrested, and a major catastrophe averted, if immediate and effective action is taken by this emergency special session of the General Assembly, which has been called by vote of the Security Council and for which supporting requests have been



made by as many as forty-nine Members of the United Nations, that is, by well over half of its total membership.

236. Let me say immediately that I do not propose at this late hour to engage in a discussion on the remarks of the representatives of France and the United Kingdom, except to say that if they would only re-read parts of their speeches side by side with the Charter, they would be amazed at the wide gulf between the two sets of documents and would find no support or sanction whatsoever for their self-imposed role of policemen in the Middle East.

237. At this very moment, the people and the Government of Egypt are the victims of a triple invasion, and our deepest feelings go out to them in sympathy. They are being subjected to the brutal facts of war. Their sovereignty is being violently curtailed and their territory is being occupied by the armed might of a neighbour and of two powerful countries. There has been released over Egypt a manifestation of the law of the jungle instead of the law of peace and the law of nations as enshrined in our Charter. Thus on the territory of Egypt is mockery being made of the Charter of the United Nations, and there the organs of the United Nations are being affronted by aggression and invasion. It is this appalling state of affairs which confronts us and which demands, through our united efforts, an immediate remedy, a remedy which will directly replace folly and inhumanity by peace and justice.

238. There cannot, there must not, be the slightest delay in applying such a remedy, and that is why in our opinion we must waste no time in proceeding to a vote on the draft resolution before us.

239. For the United Kingdom and France, in this moment when we are in total disagreement with the actions of their Governments and completely repudiate the course on which they have embarked, we have feelings. Those feelings reflect our conviction that those two countries are capable of an entirely different and immeasurably superior quality of international action. We believe that in this moment of clouded vision they will wish us to remind them of their own capacity to seek solutions by peaceful means which they themselves have brought to bear with success in other situations which, if handled as they are handling this one, could have become equally grave and equally perilous to the peace of the world. We believe that the interests, not only the best interests but the basic interests, of France and the United Kingdom cannot be served by the course they have chosen. That course is self-defeating and destructive for them as much as for anyone else.

240. We in fact ask France and the United Kingdom to apply now those standards of objectivity and good sense which they would expect of other nations, and much more strongly does all this apply to Israel, a State that owes its very existence to the United Nations and which should most appropriately, therefore, be foremost in its adherence to the Charter.

241. Speaking of this situation, the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, has said:

"The sudden invasion of Egypt by Israel was a breach of the armistice and of the United Nations. It was clear and naked aggression. In such circumstances, when every United Nations Member should have tried to stop the invasion, Britain and France issued an ultimatum to Egypt . . .

"Remember here that Israel was the aggressor who was attacking the Suez Canal, which was then func-

tioning properly. If there was danger to the Canal, it was from Israel, which overran ninety miles inside Egypt . . .

"We are going back in this twentieth century to the predatory methods of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The difference today is that there are self-respecting independent nations in Asia who are not going to tolerate this kind of incursion."

242. There has been much talk of the protection of vital interests, but we ask ourselves: how can the protection of the vital interests of some so blatantly crush the vital interests of others, and how can this protection be achieved by a course which sows the seeds of increasing strife and war? We do not ask for the resigning of these vital interests, but we do ask that those countries which have deluded themselves into the view that their present actions will protect their interests recognize immediately how futile is the course they are following.

243. Their argument is that their invasion is meant to protect the Suez Canal and to ensure free passage, but this argument has no force, for the first result of this invasion is that traffic in the Canal has ceased. This has actually happened as a result of the military action of France and the United Kingdom, and these countries have added to their other follies their disregard of the Constantinople Convention of 1888. As was to be expected, this violent approach to the safeguarding of vital interests is thus plunging the world into chaos.

244. It is for this reason that we demand of the nations concerned that they immediately seek to pursue their vital interests only through the measures allowed to them by the Charter and sanctioned by all codes of civilized and humane behaviour.

245. It is with these feelings and with a deep sense of urgency that we ask this Assembly to act immediately and to adopt the draft resolution before it.

246. This draft resolution calls for the very minimum that is required at this stage. The aerial and sea bombardment and other operations of this character against Egypt must stop forthwith. The armed forces of Israel, France and the United Kingdom must leave Egyptian territory and waters immediately and this Assembly, which has met here to fulfil the objectives of peace, must remain in session until this purpose has been achieved. We must, one and all, be determined that there will be no repetition of 1935 or of 1939. We must remember that the engines of war today are immeasurably more destructive than they were before. We must rescue ourselves immediately from the vistas of horror which face us, lest there be no returning for mankind to the paths of peace.

247. Only determined and immediate action will now suffice us. Again, as Mr. Nehru said in his message to the Secretary-General yesterday [S/3720], the procedure of the United Nations must be swifter than the procedures of invasion and aggression.

248. Thanks to the initiative of the United States, we have before us a draft resolution which, for the most part and with the interpretation given to its first operative paragraph by the representatives of Colombia and Ecuador, fulfils the immediate requirements of the situation. It decides, furthermore, that we remain in emergency session pending compliance with the resolution. We strongly urge this Assembly, including the parties mainly concerned, to accept the draft resolution by unanimous vote as a first step towards settling the issues involved.

249. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Were I to take the time to unfold this question as the representative of the United Kingdom has done, maybe many thousands of lives would be lost. Therefore it is not my intention to deliver a long speech, because now, more than ever, time is of the essence.

250. Nonetheless it is imperative that Saudi Arabia make its position clear in this struggle between right and wrong. If this crisis, which directly affects us, is not promptly resolved by the United Nations, it will undoubtedly lead to dangerous consequences in all the Arab countries, which consequences indeed may easily extend to other areas of the world. Saudi Arabia, as well as the other Arab States, are allied to Egypt in accordance with the Charter of the Arab League and the mutual military pact that bind them together in peace and in war. Furthermore, Saudi Arabia has contracted a treaty of defence with Egypt, whereby any attack on Egypt would be considered as a direct attack on Saudi Arabia.

251. The whole United Nations is confronted by an immoral act of aggression, not only against one of its sovereign States, but, as has been said time and again during the last few days, against the principles of the United Nations Charter. An unprovoked act by any aggressor is nowadays fraught with great danger because it may well spread into a global conflagration. It is therefore heartening that the Security Council did not allow itself to be frustrated by a veto in this most serious situation. It is also heartening that the General Assembly has met in an emergency special session with the hope of putting an end to the unwarranted aggression by two Member States on another Member State of our world Organization.

252. It is not now a question of peace or war; it is war. What can the United Nations do to stop it? We have met here under resolution 377 (V) of 3 November 1950 entitled "Uniting for peace". This resolution provides for collective measures to maintain or restore international peace and security. How can we achieve this goal? The said resolution is clear about the methods to be used. It stipulates the employment of force, when necessary.

253. All the Members of this Organization enjoy a juridical equality. But it so happens that two of the strongest Powers, Member States, have resorted to the use of force in this act of aggression against Egypt. Those of us who do not possess the technology of the modern war machine which these two aggressors are deploying against Egypt would be powerless to stop their aggression and that of their stooge which they used as a pretext in this unwarranted and inhuman act in the Middle East. Hence the United Nations has no other choice but to pool its resources and, at the same time, to urge concerted action, even to the extent of using force, to resist aggression, not only to defend the sovereign rights of one of its Member States, but to save the United Nations as the only effective instrument for maintaining world peace.

254. I am sure that the members of the General Assembly would agree that the United Kingdom and France have chosen a path that should have been avoided by all means. They have utilized a State of their own creation as a vehicle for their attack on Egypt, justifying their intervention in the name of security of traffic in the Suez Canal. Whom do they think they are fooling? It is the height of folly to consider it reasonable to request Egypt to withdraw to a distance of ten miles from the Suez Canal for the alleged pur-

pose of avoiding a clash with the Zionist State. Obviously this will provide the United Kingdom and France with a free hand to occupy Egypt and to assert their own rule and suzerainty over that country.

255. One would have expected the United Kingdom and France to refrain from allying themselves with Israel against the Arab countries, all the more so because of the repeated treacherous attacks committed by that State, which has been repeatedly condemned by the United Nations. Unfortunately, however, they decided to conspire with Israel against Egypt and the Arab countries in order to pursue their own egotistical interests.

256. If we are to dismiss this conspiracy and conclude that the United Kingdom and France were seriously concerned about the Suez Canal as a result of Israel's aggression, is it not reasonable to inquire why they did not confine their ultimatum to Israel, by blocking its advance towards the Canal, and order their troops to stop the Zionist aggression? Is that not logic? We are also impelled to ask the United Kingdom and France why they did not direct their naval and aerial attacks against the ports and air-fields of the Zionist State instead of sending them against Egypt. And they have repeatedly accused Israel from this rostrum of having infringed the armistice agreements and violated the Charter. Why do they do that?

257. In the whole history of the United Nations, I am not aware of a similar unprovoked aggression as has been perpetrated by two great Powers, permanent members of the Security Council, whose primary duty is to set an example in respecting the provisions of the United Nations Charter and to be against the aggressor. Instead, what did they do? They sided with the aggressor. They became aggressors themselves.

258. The United Kingdom and France issued a twelve-hour ultimatum to the Egyptian army to withdraw all its forces ten miles west of the Canal. Do you realize the significance of this? It is really ridiculous. It means that a million Egyptian civilians would be left in the area without any security, without any food and without any communications. At the same time, such a situation would place those refugees at the mercy of the enemy.

259. Who can guarantee that genocide will not be on the march again on a larger scale than that which was committed at Deir Yassin? Would the two aggressor States abet such a plan? Can they guarantee that no pretext would be invented to slaughter refugees? Who knows? They may say that there are *fedayeen* there. Inventions. Even in the Gaza strip.

260. Second, the twelve-hour ultimatum would signify that all communications would be severed—relations between the bulk of the army and those 250,000—and I hear that there are about 300,000—refugees between the Suez Canal and the Gaza strip. That would leave them at the mercy of the Zionist aggressors without the support of Egypt—and they are Egypt's responsibility.

261. Third, the twelve-hour ultimatum would signify that Egypt would be compelled to hand over bases, aerodromes, depots and warehouses of food to the enemy, thus paralyzing the Egyptian army and making it unable to resist Zionist aggression and the aggression of the colonial Powers. No one in the world would accept such an ultimatum. Such ultimatums could emanate only from tyrants and dictators in order to get the law into their hands so as to enable them to pounce upon their prey. While paying lip-service to democracy,

France and the United Kingdom are unabashedly playing the role of such tyrants and dictators in Egypt today. Egypt's sovereignty has been attacked. Cities have been ravaged and bombarded from the air. What has befallen Egypt is a stab in the hearts of all the Arab peoples and, I am sure, of many Asian and African peoples.

262. When this ultimatum was being handed to the Egyptian Ambassador in London with diplomatic decorum, ships were passing through the Canal in a regular manner, notwithstanding the various acts of sabotage designed to render the operation of the Canal a failure.

263. That the attack on Egypt was conspired in and concocted by the British and French can clearly be demonstrated by citing many dispatches. But I will cite one that appeared in *The New York Times* of 1 November 1956. It was a dispatch from Paris and stated:

"Highly responsible and well-informed circles here cited evidence today to indicate that a British-French occupation of the Suez Canal zone had been planned for weeks and awaited only a suitable occasion."

264. We know what the suitable occasion was—some difficulties in Hungary and the elections in the United States. The motives can be summed up as being the result of a frustrated France in North Africa, stuck in a colonial war and trying to divert attention from its abject failure by fighting another war in Egypt where, with the United Kingdom, they enlisted Israel as their ally.

265. It is evident that both the United Kingdom and France were quite perturbed to see the renaissance of the Arab world, and they were dismayed to discover that Egypt was able to ensure passage through the Canal without external assistance. They failed to understand these developments, and therefore they succumbed to their selfish desires and hypocrisy in using force, completely disregarding the dangerous consequences to the whole Middle East.

266. The United Kingdom and France, in their perfidious attack against Egypt, have committed a grave breach of the Charter of the United Nations, both in its letter and in its spirit—the Charter which urges all countries to resolve their disputes by pacific means.

267. The United Kingdom and France have also renounced the agreement previously made to co-operate with the United States to come to the assistance of victims of aggression. Unfortunately, those two countries conspired with the Zionist State to commit this crime and refused to heed the pleas of President Eisenhower calling upon them to refrain from the use of force.

268. The world today is witnessing the real motives of those two imperialistic Powers in their attempt to reassert their domination over Egypt, the Arab world and other areas of Asia and Africa. However, nothing that the United Kingdom and France may commit against the Arab lands in the form of destruction and intimidation will diminish Arab resolve to resist such attacks, and we have the support of our Asian and African friends in this struggle to free ourselves from the last vestiges of abject colonialism.

269. It is obvious that the consequences of their blunder—it has been called an error; we call it a blunder; some call it a crime—will have great repercussions for many years to come, the more so because the world has denounced those attacks. Notwithstand-

ing that, many innocent Arabs will be sacrificed. The United Kingdom and France will undoubtedly suffer great losses in blood and treasure which to many of them—their Governments—is more important than blood because they have been sacrificing in North Africa a lot of their blood and the blood of others—and treasure too.

270. By this act of folly they will lose all their friends—if they still have any—among the Arab countries. It is shocking indeed to note that until the last minute the United Kingdom has been distorting the truth through Press releases in which it says that Egypt was negative in responding to the Secretary-General's communication with regard to the Suez Canal problem. At 8.15 p.m. on 1 November the British circulated a Press release which is full of untruths, which they think will influence the world, to the effect that President Nasser and the Government of Egypt have not responded to any attempts to solve the Suez question.

271. A message from the Secretary-General belies such a Press release. I have a copy of it here and, if I may, I shall read it out to this Assembly:

"A message from the Secretary-General to the Foreign Minister of Egypt was sent in the afternoon of 24 October. A preliminary reply was received 29 October indicating that the message was to be studied. In view of later events, no further reaction was to be expected in the few days which have elapsed."

272. And still the United Kingdom, which has highly developed media of information, disseminates untruths about Egypt and the Government of Egypt at this last moment.

273. Furthermore, we have the testimony of none other than the Secretary of State of the United States, who only a few hours ago delivered to us a most momentous statement, in which he said "it seemed that a just and peaceful solution, acceptable to all, was near at hand". Every word uttered by the Secretary of State is carefully weighed, and he would not have said "was near at hand" and "it was hoped that those negotiations would continue", if he had not so intended.

274. Mr. Dulles went on to say—and although we all listened to what he said, it is worth repeating in order to show the flagrant distortions that are being carried out by the United Kingdom and France—France naturally trailing along:

"... at the close of that series of Security Council meetings, I made a statement, which was acquiesced in by all present, to the effect that the Security Council remained seized of the problem and that it was hoped that the exchange of views by the three countries most directly concerned—Egypt, France and the United Kingdom—with the assistance of the Secretary-General, would continue. They did not continue, although I am not aware of any insuperable obstacle to their continuance". [561st meeting, para. 147.]

275. Having said this, I shall now address myself very briefly to the United States draft resolution [A/3256]. As much as we regret that in its preamble some Arab States are placed on the same level as the aggressor, and as much as we regret that paragraph 3 recommends that all Member States refrain from introducing military goods without naming the aggressors, who are known to all, we have no choice at this very late hour but to agree to this draft resolution and to vote for it.

276. There is hope for us in that, if the aggressors do not heed the warning of the United Nations, para-

graph 5 of the draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to observe and promptly report on the compliance with the resolution to the Security Council and to the General Assembly for such further action as they may deem appropriate in accordance with the Charter. It is only because of this paragraph 5 that we feel that we can vote for the draft resolution despite the discrepancies which I have just mentioned.

277. Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand): The gravity of the situation which faces this special session of the General Assembly leads me to speak with a deep sense of responsibility. I speak as the representative of a country which has always given devoted support to the objectives of the United Nations Charter, which is a fellow-member with the United Kingdom in the Commonwealth, with all that that implies, and which is closely and enduringly associated with the United States, not only by formal treaty arrangements in the Pacific and South East Asian areas but also by ties of respect and friendship.

278. My Prime Minister yesterday issued a statement in which he expresses full confidence in the intentions of the United Kingdom in moving forces into the Suez Canal zone. He notes that the United Kingdom Government has given an undertaking that its operations are designed solely to protect the Suez Canal and to halt the fighting between Israel and Egyptian forces, and are intended to be of limited duration. It is my Prime Minister's hope that there will in due course be wider understanding of the motives of the present action as explained by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

279. My Government is confident that the measures taken by France and the United Kingdom constitute an emergency action of a limited nature designed to deal with a situation of great political danger, a situation likely to deteriorate still further unless checked by drastic action.

280. May I add one word in particular about the position of the United Kingdom, with which our ties are never closer than in times of stress and danger. My Government does not accept any charge or imputation of insincerity in the motives of the Government of the United Kingdom. Still less does it accept the charge of British complicity in the Israel attack upon Egypt, a charge which was, in our opinion, convincingly answered by the representative of the United Kingdom in the Security Council [750th meeting] and again in this Assembly [561st meeting].

281. With these considerations in the forefront of our minds, my delegation has carefully examined the United States draft resolution [A/3256]. Let me say at once that we do not feel able to support proposals which, as so many speeches reveal only too clearly, gravely reflect upon those on whom now rests a principal responsibility for the restoration of peace and order in the Middle East.

282. The United States draft resolution is at present the only draft before us. It raises issues which are at least as important as, and perhaps more difficult than, any on which my Government has been required to take a decision since the foundation of the United Nations. As I read the draft resolution, it appears to raise more questions than it answers. Who, for example, is to take steps to reopen the Suez Canal and restore secure freedom of navigation? The most serious defect in the draft resolution, it seems to my delegation, lies in the absence of any proposal for dealing effectively with the situation in the Middle East as a whole, a

situation which has been so seriously aggravated by the action of the Egyptian Government in seizing the Suez Canal.

283. The Prime Minister of my country has been at pains to emphasize that the New Zealand Government cannot but regard with the utmost concern what appears to have been complete disregard by Israel of the existing General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Egypt. There is no doubt about our concern on that point. There is equally no doubt about our concern over the various past events which are part of the whole unhappy story contributing to the incursion of Israel forces into Egypt.

284. I should have liked, moreover, to have heard some response to the constructive suggestions of the United Kingdom in regard to the desirability of a conference to negotiate a lasting settlement of the problems which have thrown the Middle East into turmoil. There is obviously not time tonight for my delegation, or for many others, to obtain instructions based on the present text of the United States draft resolution. Despite the undoubted urgency of the situation, it would, I believe, be proper and justifiable for the Assembly to adjourn before a vote is taken. If, however, we are obliged to cast a vote tonight, my delegation will regretfully be constrained, for the reasons I have given, to oppose the draft resolution.

285. May I say, finally, that New Zealand's interest in this issue is a vital but not a selfish one. Our sole aim here and elsewhere will be to do what we can to contribute to a solution of Middle Eastern problems which will be swift, which will be effective and which will be lasting. Whatever our vote here tonight, let us not regard our work in this place as finished. I make a suggestion for serious consideration, that the whole problem of Arab-Israel relations should be fully and effectively considered at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly. I go further: we shall get nowhere if the parties to the Arab-Israel dispute are not prepared to meet and to negotiate. They owe it to themselves and to the whole world to do no less.

286. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): With the statement just made by the representative of New Zealand, we have exhausted the list of speakers who were entitled to take the floor before the vote. We shall therefore proceed to vote on the draft resolution submitted by the United States [A/3256]. A roll-call vote has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Panama, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan.

*Against:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, France, Israel, New Zealand.

*Abstaining:* Portugal, Union of South Africa, Belgium, Canada, Laos, Netherlands.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 64 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.*

287. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In accordance with the Assembly's earlier decision, I shall now give the floor to any other representatives who wish to speak in the debate.

288. Mr. VITETTI (Italy): I have asked to speak on a point of order.

289. Document A/3251, which has just been circulated, has brought to our attention a letter addressed to the Secretary-General by the Hungarian People's Republic. This letter contains a protest against the entry of further Soviet troops into Hungary and an urgent appeal to the United Nations.

290. The events in Hungary, which have already been discussed by the Security Council, are of the utmost gravity, arousing deep emotion all over the world. It is my belief that we should immediately demonstrate to the Hungarian people our real concern in their destiny. Let us not forget that, at this very moment, in Hungary a desperate struggle for freedom—that very freedom which the United Nations Charter guarantees to all the peoples of the world—is in progress. Hungary asks for the help of the United Nations. We cannot be deaf to its appeal.

291. I hope that the United Nations—and, if necessary, this special emergency session—will immediately take whatever action is possible with regard to the request of the Hungarian people.

292. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Chair takes note of the statement made by the representative of Italy.

293. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (*from the floor*) (*translated from Spanish*): I ask for the floor.

294. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Chair has a list of speakers and we must adhere to it.

295. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (*from the floor*) (*translated from Spanish*): A point of order has been raised and I wish to support it. That is all I have to say.

296. Mr. PEARSON (Canada): I rise not to take part in this debate, because the debate is over; the vote has been taken. But I do wish to explain the abstention of my delegation on that vote.

297. It is never easy to explain an abstention, and in this case it is particularly difficult, because we are in favour of some parts of this resolution, and also because this resolution deals with such a complicated question.

298. Because we are in favour of some parts of the resolution, we could not vote against it, especially as, in our opinion, it is a moderate proposal couched in reasonable and objective terms, without unfair or unbalanced condemnation; and also, by referring to violations by both sides to the armistice agreements, it puts, I think, recent action by the United Kingdom and France—and rightly—against the background of those repeated violations and provocations.

299. We support the effort being made to bring the fighting to an end. We support it, among other reasons, because we regret that force was used in the circumstances that face us at this time. As my delegation sees it, however, this resolution which the General Assembly has thus adopted in its present form—and there was very little chance to alter that form—is inadequate to achieve the purposes which we have in

mind at this session. Those purposes are defined in the resolution of the General Assembly under which we are meeting—resolution 377 (V), entitled "Uniting for peace"—and peace is far more than ceasing to fire, although it certainly must include that essential factor.

300. This is the first time that action has been taken under the "Uniting for peace" resolution, and I confess to a feeling of sadness, indeed even distress, at not being able to support the position taken by two countries whose ties with my country are and will remain close and intimate; two countries which have contributed so much to man's progress and freedom under law; and two countries which are Canada's mother countries.

301. I regret the use of military force in the circumstances which we have been discussing, but I regret also that there was not more time, before a vote was taken, for consideration of the best way to bring about that kind of cease-fire which would have enduring and beneficial results. I think that we were entitled to that time, for this is not only a tragic moment for the countries and peoples immediately affected, but it is an equally difficult time for the United Nations itself. I know, of course, that the situation is of special and, indeed, poignant urgency, a human urgency, and that action could not be postponed by dragging out a discussion, as has been done so often in this Assembly. I do feel, however, that had that time, which has always, to my knowledge, in the past been permitted for adequate examination of even the most critical and urgent resolution, been available on this occasion, the result might have been a better resolution. Such a short delay would not, I think, have done harm but, in the long run, would have helped those in the area who need help most at this time.

302. Why do I say this? In the first place, our resolution, though it has been adopted, is only a recommendation, and its moral effects would have been greater if it could have received a more unanimous vote in this Assembly—which might have been possible if there had been somewhat more delay.

303. Secondly, this recommendation which we have adopted cannot be effective without the compliance of those to whom it is addressed and who have to carry it out. I had ventured to hope that, by a short delay and in informal talks, we might have made some headway, or at least have tried to make some headway, in securing a favourable response, before the vote was taken, from those Governments and delegations which will be responsible for carrying it out.

304. I consider that there is one great omission from this resolution, which has already been pointed out by previous speakers—more particularly by the representative of New Zealand, who has preceded me. This resolution does provide for a cease-fire, and I admit that that is of first importance and urgency. But, alongside a cease-fire and a withdrawal of troops, it does not provide for any steps to be taken by the United Nations for a peace settlement, without which a cease-fire will be only of temporary value at best. Surely we should have used this opportunity to link a cease-fire to the absolute necessity of a political settlement in Palestine and for the Suez, and perhaps we might also have been able to recommend a procedure by which this absolutely essential process might begin.

305. Today we are facing a feeling of almost despairing crisis for the United Nations and for peace. Surely that feeling might have been harnessed to action, or at least to a formal resolve to act at long last and to do



something effective about the underlying causes of this crisis which has brought us to the very edge of a tragedy even greater than that which has already taken place. We should then, I think, have recognized the necessity for political settlement in this resolution and done something about it. And I do not think that, if we had done that, it would have postponed action very long on the other clauses of the resolution. Without such a settlement, which we might have pushed forward under the incentive of fear, our resolution, as I see it, may not make for an enduring and real peace. We need action, then, not only to end the fighting but to make the peace.

306. I believe that there is another omission from this resolution, to which attention has also already been directed. The armed forces of Israel and of Egypt are to withdraw or, if you like, to return to the armistice lines, where presumably, if this is done, they will once again face each other in fear and hatred. What then? 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 a tolerable position, but would be a return to terror, bloodshed, strife, incidents, charges and counter-charges, and ultimately another explosion which the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization would be powerless to prevent and possibly even to investigate.

307. I therefore would have liked to see a provision in this resolution—and this has been mentioned by previous speakers—authorizing the Secretary-General to begin to make arrangements with Member States for a United Nations force large enough to keep these borders at peace while a political settlement is being worked out. I regret exceedingly that time has not been given to follow up this idea, which was mentioned also by the representative of the United Kingdom in his first speech, and I hope that even now, when action on the resolution has been completed, it may not be too late to give consideration to this matter. My own Government would be glad to recommend Canadian participation in such a United Nations force, a truly international peace and police force.

308. We have a duty here. We also have—or, should I say, we had—an opportunity. Our resolution may deal with one aspect of our duty—an urgent, a terribly urgent, aspect. But, as I see it, it does nothing to seize that opportunity which, if it had been seized, might have brought some real peace and a decent existence, or hope for such, to the people of that part of the world. There was no time on this occasion for us to seize this opportunity in this resolution. My delegation therefore felt, because of the inadequacy of the resolution in this respect, that we had no alternative in the circumstances but to abstain in the voting.

309. I hope that our inability to deal with these essential matters at this time will very soon be removed, and that we can come to grips with the basic score of this problem.

310. Mr. SOLE (Union of South Africa): All speakers have emphasized the gravity of the situation that we have been discussing. It was no less true that all delegations faced a grave decision in determining how they should vote on the draft resolution which was before us. It was a decision to be taken not by delegations but by Governments. South Africa has the closest of ties with the United Kingdom and France. It also has cordial relations with both Egypt and Israel. The draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation became available only a few hours ago. My

Government obviously had no time whatsoever to consider it in all its far-reaching implications, many of which have been referred to in the statement made by the previous speaker, the representative of Canada. In these circumstances, it would have been neither right nor proper for me to record South Africa's vote either for or against the United States draft resolution. My delegation therefore abstained.

311. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): Since the draft resolution was circulated at what in Europe was already a very late hour, and was put to the vote this morning, I have had no opportunity to consult my Government on it. I therefore felt obliged to vote against it, since it seems not consistent with the policy of my Government.

312. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation has observed with deep concern the grave events which have stirred the world in the past few days.

313. It could hardly be otherwise, for Mexico has at all times unwaveringly upheld the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and has steadfastly advocated that Member States should refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. Mexico has constantly maintained that all the nations of the world should endeavour to bring about by peaceful means, and in accordance with the principles of justice and international law, the settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

314. Mexico condemns the use of force as an instrument of the international policy of States. But the reports received from official sources and from the Press and, in particular, the statements made in the Security Council by the representatives of two permanent members with whose countries and peoples we are bound by ancient ties of friendship, unfortunately leave no room for doubt that Israel, the United Kingdom and France are conducting military operations in Egyptian territory which constitute a flagrant violation of the Charter, whose provisions all Members have undertaken to fulfil in good faith.

315. In view of those facts, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary of State of the United States, because we believe that it is designed to bring about a cessation of hostilities against Egypt and the withdrawal from Egyptian territory of all the foreign troops that have invaded it, so that at a later stage a pacific settlement may be sought within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with the obligations assumed by its Members.

316. I should like to place on record the fact that we could have wished that some paragraphs of the draft resolution had been couched in stronger terms; we accepted it without amendment because of our earnest desire that the General Assembly should lose no time in assuming its responsibilities under the "Uniting for peace" resolution [377 (V)].

317. The blood of thousands of human beings is at this very moment being shed on Egyptian soil. It is the inescapable duty of the United Nations to give effect to the first of the purposes set forth in the Charter, to maintain international peace and security.

318. Mr. PALAMAS (Greece) (*translated from French*): The Greek delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution presented by the United States dele-

gation. At so grave a juncture, this resolution represents the least that the General Assembly could do to try to stop the conflagration and facilitate the restoration of peace in the Middle East. As I did not have an opportunity to take part in the debate preceding the vote, I should like briefly to explain my Government's position on this important matter.

319. Israel, the United Kingdom and France have invaded Egyptian territory. They have resorted to force, to war, for reasons which there is no point in discussing now. Under the Charter, there is no valid justification for the unilateral use of force. We know of only one case where the Charter authorizes the use of force: that provided for in Article 51, which sanctions the exercise of the right of self-defence. In the present instance, Egypt alone is exercising that right, for it is defending itself against invaders. In any other case, according to the Charter, the use of force is admissible only as a collective measure. It can be used only to ensure respect for obligations arising out of the Charter, in pursuance of decisions taken by the competent organs of the United Nations.

320. Aggression in itself is an international crime. Nothing can justify a breach of the peace, as defined by the Charter. Even the best reasons lose their validity if such a breach is committed. The Charter was designed to abolish the law of the jungle. Some have not understood that, and they are jeopardizing the United Nations, world peace and their own fate.

321. We all have our friendships, our ties, our alliances. We have not come here to judge the present case in the light of those friendships, ties and alliances, important though they are to us; we have acted as Members of the United Nations. The only cause with which we are concerned now is that of peace and our community of free and independent nations.

322. In this spirit, the United States has set the world a shining example. It has taken the initiative and placed itself at the service of peace, setting aside all extraneous considerations of expediency and political interest. In this dilemma, with the future of the United Nations at stake, the only encouraging sign is that this truly great Power in the world today is supporting the United Nations and its principles of law.

323. In this hour, when Egypt is defending itself against aggression, the Greek delegation extends to the people and Government of Egypt its deepest sympathy, born of a close and age-old friendship. The Egyptians are now living in the shadow of fear, and our thoughts and hearts go out to them. Greece knows full well the price of independence. It has always opposed aggression and has always rallied to the cause of international law and order. The reckless adventure of this ill-considered action against Egypt is the result of illusion and a wistful harking-back to a colonialism which refuses to face reality.

324. Some purblind political leaders persist in ignoring the changes which have occurred since the last war and the new conditions created by the entry into force of the United Nations Charter. It is the same colonialism which still continues to dominate the people of Cyprus by force, and from Cyprus is now attempting to extend its dominion over other civilized peoples. Colonialism has proceeded from its static phase to an expansionist phase. Half a century ago, the appearance of a squadron was enough to stifle any shred of inclination on the part of a nation or people for independence. However, times have changed. We

fervently hope that the resolution which has just been adopted will exercise its salutary effect.

325. Mr. VAN LANGENHOVE (Belgium) (*translated from French*): The Belgian delegation abstained from voting for the following reasons.

326. The Belgian Government fully appreciates the reasons which prompted the resolution just adopted by the Assembly. The Charter condemns resort to force in the settlement of international disputes. Consequently, the Belgian Government regrets that Franco-British military intervention occurred before any decision was taken by the United Nations. However, the Belgian Government considers that this intervention cannot properly be the subject of a recommendation which fails to take account of the entire body of facts and responsibilities which led up to it. In the opinion of the Belgian Government, the recommendation cannot attain its stated objective unless it is coupled with the satisfactory settlement, under United Nations auspices, of the international dispute concerning the Suez Canal, which has seriously affected security and order in the endangered area.

327. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland): The Polish Government whole-heartedly supported the decision of the Security Council to convene an emergency special session of the General Assembly. We gather here at a moment when Egypt, a Member of our Organization, has become the victim of a concerted armed attack by three other Members of this Organization. I take this opportunity to express on behalf of my Government and the people of Poland our deep sympathy for the people of Egypt which is now subjected to the horrors of modern warfare.

328. It is a tragic thought that, at the very moment when the Security Council was prevented by two vetoes from acting in the conflict, bombs started falling on Egyptian territory, and they are falling now. We here are deliberating, and over there casualties keep mounting. The principles of our Charter have been brutally violated. The basic principle of international relationship has received a serious blow indeed. A breach of the peace has been committed.

329. What makes the situation even more tragic and dangerous is that all this is happening in the midst of what seemed to be a general improvement in the international situation. It seemed that we were entering a new era of improved and more normal relations between nations.

330. We knew that in the Middle East the situation was a tense one. The United Nations had been continually seized of the problem, and only two weeks ago six Foreign Ministers gathered in this very building in order to find a satisfactory solution.

331. Nothing extraordinary has happened on the Israel-Egyptian border since to justify such sudden and violent steps as those undertaken by Israel. We must, therefore, consider the invasion of Egypt by the Israel forces as absolutely unwarranted. It constituted an act of plain aggression.

332. But this is only a fragment of the whole problem. Further developments bring us to the conclusion that the Israel invasion is only part of a concerted action backed and inspired by third Powers.

333. The course of events has proved that the whole military action was planned and prepared for quite a while. Even before the representatives of the United Kingdom and France had a chance to veto the draft resolution, and while the Council was in session, the

Governments of those two permanent members of the Security Council presented an ultimatum to Egypt and Israel giving them a twelve-hour limit in which to comply. In connexion with this I should like to stress two points.

334. First, we were witnessing an attempt on the part of the United Kingdom and France to take the situation out of the hands of the Security Council and into their own—in other words, to present our Organization with a *fait accompli*. Who, may I ask, has authorized the United Kingdom and France to take such arbitrary action? Neither country can claim to have such authority or legal power.

335. Second, what was the essence of the ultimatums? That addressed to the aggressor virtually invited the Israelis to advance towards the Suez Canal and to stop at a distance of only ten miles therefrom. The second ultimatum, addressed this time to the victim of aggression, demanded not only the surrender of its inherent right of self-defence, but also the withdrawal of Egyptian forces from their own territory, the surrender of key positions along the Suez Canal and the acceptance of the return of British forces to the Canal zone.

336. All this is presented to the world under the smoke-screen of concern for the freedom and security of navigation in the Canal. But if there existed any threat to that navigation, it was the drive of Israel forces towards the Suez Canal. Therefore the only way to protect free navigation was to stop hostilities and make Israel troops withdraw from the Sinai peninsula. It was just such a solution which the two Powers vetoed at the Security Council meeting on 30 October 1956 [750th meeting]. Thus they demonstrated clearly that they were opposed to all measures for restoring peace in the area, and showed the world that, furthermore, they were interested only in the continuance of the conflict and in the occupation of the Canal.

337. It appears that these three Powers are determined to achieve their aims at any price—not only at the price of the sovereign rights of one particular State, but even at the price of flagrant violation of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, even at the price of international peace and security.

338. Egypt had no choice but to reject the ultimatum, as every Government in the world would have done. What followed was the launching of a well-prepared and well-planned attack by British and French forces upon Egypt, the victim of Israel aggression. Now both the French and United Kingdom Governments assure us that their intervention is only temporary. Consequently, a new definition has been introduced in international law—the notion of temporary aggression.

339. I cannot believe that this aggression has the whole-hearted support of the British people—a great people which merits our respect and sympathy. This belief of ours has been confirmed by the words pronounced yesterday in the House of Commons by the leader of the Opposition, who said that this attack was an “attack on the principles and the letter of the Charter” and an attempted breach of the Charter.

340. Those were the words of the leader of the Opposition, but now let me quote the words of the Prime Minister himself. Less than a year ago, on 9 November 1955, speaking about the situation in the Middle East, Sir Anthony Eden said:

“Her Majesty’s Government and I personally are available to render any service in this cause. If there

is anything that we can do to help, we would gladly do it for the sake of peace.”

And now we are asked to accept a flagrant aggression as an action for the sake of peace.

341. But the General Assembly has today refused to do that. The Polish delegation deeply regrets that the Security Council proved unable to act effectively in this case. We believe, however, that the holding of the present special session of the General Assembly will result in the prompt restoration of peace in the Middle East, in the cessation of the armed attack, in an immediate cease-fire, and—what is more—in an immediate evacuation of Egyptian territory by foreign troops.

342. For that reason, the Polish delegation voted in favour of the United States draft resolution, which, despite certain omissions, provides for the most immediate objective of restoring peace in Egypt.

343. Mr. SUDJARWO (Indonesia): When the President opened this emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly this evening, we all realized that the session had been called to meet an emergency situation.

344. War is going on in Egypt. Egypt is the victim of an armed aggression committed by three Powers, Israel, France and the United Kingdom. People are being killed by bombs, by air attacks. Many of these people are defenceless against the brutal forces of aggression. Hence, this special session of the Assembly is really called upon to take immediate steps to bring the aggression to an end, to restore peace and the integrity of Egypt—even if this is only the first step to a further solution of this grave problem.

345. When, however, I listened to some of the speeches made during the first part of this evening’s meeting—and specially the speech of the United Kingdom representative—it seemed almost as if there were no war at all, as if the killing of people by the British and other invading forces should be allowed to continue, in violation of the United Nations Charter. Moreover, the United Kingdom representative’s defence of the aggressive action of his Government was really an insult to the intelligence of man. This is truly tragic.

346. My delegation appreciates the fact that the draft resolution introduced by the United States delegation was put to the vote as soon as possible, so that at least some definite measures to stop the aggression could be taken this evening. Had the draft resolution not been put to the vote quickly, my delegation would have had much to say about the aggressive action committed by France, the United Kingdom and Israel. The actions of those three Governments have provoked the indignation, and indeed the condemnation, of all the freedom- and peace-loving peoples of the world, including even those in the three countries themselves.

347. My Government and people were, needless to say, shocked by the recent developments, not only because they have the closest and most friendly relations with Egypt, but also and no less because they clearly recognize the crucial issue at stake in this crisis. They cannot but view with profound consternation this malicious conspiracy, not only against Egypt, but indeed against the very aims and purposes of the United Nations.

348. The draft resolution introduced by the United States delegation was, in my delegation’s view, not entirely satisfactory, since it did not express the real feelings of the overwhelming majority of the members of this Assembly. We should have liked to see some

provisions of the draft resolution altered or amended in order to make it more effective and unmistakably clear concerning the serious aspect of the issue created by the actions of the United Kingdom and France. I agree with the remarks made on this point by the representative of Ecuador. However, my delegation, wishing to co-operate fully in this Assembly's efforts to decide upon a course of action as quickly as possible, voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to make it possible for the necessary first steps to be enacted immediately—that is, this very night. We are thankful to the United States delegation for the initiative it has taken in submitting the draft resolution which has now, happily, been adopted.

349. The condemnation of the aggressive action against Egypt which has been expressed both in the Security Council and, tonight, in the General Assembly will, I hope, give added moral strength to the resolution.

350. In this moment of trial for the Egyptian people, we have the deepest sympathy for the courageous stand of the Egyptian Government and people in defence of their sovereign rights, their independence, their freedom, the very life of their nation; and, indeed, at the same time, in defence of the very principles and purposes of this Organization. The Asian-African group at the United Nations has already expressed in unmistakable terms the sentiments of our countries and peoples, in conformity with the principles and purposes of the Bandung Conference. I believe that this will give the Egyptian people moral strength in their fight to ensure the very principles enunciated at Bandung.

351. I should not like to conclude this brief statement without making the following observations.

352. The issues at stake in this grave situation indeed go beyond the fact of military aggression. Nor is it simply a question of the flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter. It is much more than that. What is happening now should, I believe, be regarded as a turning point in history. We of Asia and Africa have experienced the cruelty and senselessness of colonial imposition and *diktat*. The aggressive actions of the three Governments—and in particular of the Western colonial Powers—confirms once again for our people the righteousness of our struggle and our continuing fight for freedom everywhere. The action of the aggressors has, in fact, again taught us a lesson. It is painful to note that Powers such as the United Kingdom and France, which are reputed to represent Western civilization, have acted here in this incredible manner, carrying out the very policies against which all Asia and Africa have fought in recent times. The recent history of my own country is a vivid memory of the expression of this kind of policy and behaviour. This action does a disservice to the cause of Western civilization, indeed, to civilization as a whole.

353. I feel, however, that this action opens the eyes of those who, up to now, have believed in and supported the actual policies and behaviour of these aggressors. Moreover—and this is very important—it may also mean a turning point, a move in the direction of a new political orientation in the world, the benefits of which these Powers have apparently not yet quite recognized.

354. The Egyptian people's fight against these aggressors has, therefore, this deeper meaning, namely, that it is a fight not only for the freedom and life of the Egyptian nation and people, but also for a new and

better foundation for the political relationship among nations. It is heartening that this fight has the full support of the United Nations.

355. We have never doubted the eventual outcome of this struggle. At this crucial time, we feel the deepest sympathy for the great sufferings being endured by the gallant Egyptian people. This futile action of the aggressors will only hasten the arrival of the victory in the human struggle for freedom and equality. This is our belief: that from the sufferings of Egypt today, from the present dangerous and crucial situation, and from this momentous decision of the Assembly tonight, there may arise the new hope of mankind—a real United Nations world practising freedom and equality and bringing about a better order and a new evaluation among nations.

356. Mr. DULLES (United States of America): I want first to express the gratification felt by my delegation that it was possible for it to formulate a resolution which gave expression to what seems to have been the overwhelming wishes of this Assembly, a resolution which I think will have historic significance. I know that the resolution was far from perfect and far from satisfactory to all of us, including, perhaps, myself. I felt that it was a situation where the importance of acting promptly was very great.

357. In my opening remarks, I spoke of the importance of a constructive and positive development of this situation, and not merely attempting to turn the clock back. Mr. Pearson, the representative of Canada, also spoke rather fully upon that point, and I want to emphasize my complete agreement with what he said, and not only my personal agreement, but the feeling of President Eisenhower, with whom I talked a few hours ago about this aspect of the matter. It is a phase of the situation which we deem of the utmost importance, and the United States delegation would be very happy indeed if the Canadian delegation would formulate and introduce as part of these proceedings a concrete suggestion along the lines that Mr. Pearson outlined.

358. Before leaving this rostrum, I want to express my endorsement of the intervention made by the representative of Italy with reference to the Hungarian situation. I think we must not allow our preoccupation with what is going on in the Middle East to keep us from also observing with equal intensity what goes on in that part of the world. We have had encouraging reports of the withdrawal of foreign forces from Hungary, but there have also come in tonight disturbing reports about the reintroduction of foreign forces into Hungary, in face of the fact that we have before us the declaration of the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister of Hungary that they have declared their neutrality and no longer invite the presence of foreign forces.

359. I hope that this matter, which is on the agenda of the Security Council, will be kept urgently before it and that we shall not be preoccupied with the Middle East to the exclusion of assisting the State of Hungary to regain its independence.

360. Mr. ALABIDIYAH (Libya): On 17 October 1956, at the request of the Security Council, I submitted the Libyan Government's view on the Suez Canal dispute for the consideration of the members of the Council [S/3684]. I should like now to read out some paragraphs from that statement of my Government's view:

"The Government of Libya . . . watched with deep regret the economic measures taken by France and the United Kingdom against Egypt, and the movements of certain navy, army and air force units of the French and British armed forces to the Eastern Mediterranean sea, as well as the possibilities of military action taken by France and the United Kingdom against Egypt, which are opposed to the Charter of the United Nations . . . and which may endanger to a great extent the peace in the Middle East and in the whole world.

"There is no doubt that colonialism, which is responsible to a large measure for poverty in the Middle East and for the bloodshed and daily loss of life in Algeria, as well as Zionism which created the problem of Palestine, put the Arab States in a very difficult situation which requires justice and wisdom to be overcome. Any measures which may be taken and which neglect this fact, and fail to respect the dignity and sovereignty of Egypt or any of the Arab States, may be the cause of many unseen troubles . . .

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Libya supports the resolution adopted unanimously by the Security Council at its 743rd meeting stating the six basic principles on which Egypt, the United Kingdom and France, through their Foreign Ministers, agreed.

"It is the view of the Libyan Government that, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, the Suez Canal dispute must be settled by peaceful means through negotiations which will respect the sovereignty of Egypt and the interests of the users of the Canal."

Let us now see what has taken place since.

361. Five days ago, the Israel army invaded Egypt and penetrated deep into Egyptian territory, aiming at occupying the Suez Canal. The Israel Government falsely alleged that it was doing this as a defence measure against the Egyptian commandos. At the same time, both the British and French Governments took this opportunity to send their strange ultimatum to Egypt, asking permission for the Israel, British and French troops to invade Egypt. As a matter of fact, two days ago those troops began invading Egypt by air and by sea, thus challenging United Nations resolutions and the Charter.

362. All this happened in delicate international circumstances, with which we are all familiar. The United Kingdom, France and Israel took advantage of this delicate international situation and agreed among themselves on the unwarranted invasion of Egyptian territory. This action shows clearly the aggressive attitude which Zionist Israel and colonialist Britain and France have towards that area. It is now clear that the real reason which made Israel insist on buying arms was to fulfil its imperialist ambitions at the expense of the neighbouring Arab countries. That was why the Arab States continuously warned the world of Israel's imperialist ambitions for the expansion of its State at the expense of Arab territory. Moreover, it is now obvious why the United Kingdom and France raised such an outcry at the nationalization of the Suez Canal. This was their opportunity for a last attempt to restore their colonial policy in the Arab world, oblivious to the changing times and the determination of the world to wipe out colonialism.

363. The Security Council convened several times recently in an attempt to reach a fair decision with

respect to the withdrawal of Israel troops from Egypt and to ensure the non-recurrence of such invasions. But the use of the veto by the United Kingdom and France made such a decision impossible, and the matter was put before the General Assembly for appropriate measures.

364. Similar acts of aggression occurred during the time of the League of Nations, when the fascist troops invaded Ethiopia in 1936 and when Nazi troops invaded Eastern Europe in 1938. This, as we all know, led in turn to the Second World War, for the simple reason that the League of Nations was too weak to stop the aggressors. The Prime Ministers of Israel, the United Kingdom and France are now repeating the same tragedy, threatening world peace and paving the way for a third world war, which may destroy the whole world.

365. The world at large now looks to this Organization, which represents world opinion, and asks what it will do to defend the victims of this aggression and what measures it will take to stop the aggressors.

366. The Libyan Government affirms its complete support of Egypt in its defence against the aggressors by all means that are in accordance with the United Nations Charter, and holds the United Kingdom, France and Israel entirely responsible for the bloodshed, loss of life, damage and destruction committed as a result of their aggression.

367. With respect to the resolution adopted some minutes ago, which was supported by my delegation and the delegations of the other Arab States, I should like to make the following reservations on behalf of my Government.

368. It was neither fair nor just to treat equally the aggressors and the victim. Israel, which has been condemned again and again by the United Nations for breaking the armistice agreements of 1949, now plays with the Charter of the United Nations, commits the biggest aggression and slays thousands of peace-loving people. The allies, France and the United Kingdom, which, in 1950, declared with the United States that they would guarantee the borders between the Arab States and Israel, and pledged their honour to combat the aggressor, whoever it might be, are now invading Egypt, a Member State of this world Organization, and bombing the peaceful cities of Cairo, Alexandria and the three big cities of the Suez Canal, killing thousands of innocent people just for the victory and the enjoyment of Mr. Ben Gurion, Sir Anthony Eden and Mr. Mollet.

369. This equality of treatment between the aggressors and the victim was noticeable in the spirit of the resolution, as well as in its provisions. My country believes that the aggressors—Israel, France and the United Kingdom—are entirely responsible for the murders, damage and destruction they have already committed against Egypt, and for the bad seeds of hostility which they have sowed against the Arab States in particular and the whole world in general by this new and dangerous way of dealing with international matters.

370. Mr. ESKELUND (Denmark): I wish to raise a point of order. I just want to have a point clarified. We have decided to remain in emergency session. In the President's opinion, does that mean that we will have to stay here without any interruption or adjournment for two, three or four days?

371. Mr. IOIA (Romania) (*translated from French*): It was with profound emotion and apprehension that



the Romanian people learned of the invasion of Egyptian territory by Israel, French and British troops.

372. Using as a pretext the unjustified attack launched by Israel armed forces, the United Kingdom and French Governments served upon the victim of Israel aggression an ultimatum imposing upon Egypt conditions which no independent State could accept without losing the essential attributes of its sovereignty and national honour.

373. As might have been expected, Egypt refused to bow to the unacceptable demands of the Franco-British ultimatum, and at 6 p.m. on 30 October 1956 heavy bombers of the United Kingdom and French forces dropped bombs upon Egyptian cities. As we deliberate here, in this chamber, the planes of the aggressors are sowing death and destruction in the towns and villages of Egypt, that cradle of civilization. A French journalist at Nicosia reports the following statement by a British flyer returning from his mission of destruction:

"We were over Egyptian territory by exactly 5 minutes and 5 seconds past 6 p.m. It was already dark. We dropped all our bombs. It was all over in thirty seconds."

These words, tragic in their military simplicity, reveal the suffering inflicted on the Egyptian population.

374. It is obvious that the aggression against Egypt is only another phase of the Suez Canal affair, a bloody military sequel to the economic and political pressure phase. Because Egypt insists that its sovereignty and national independence must be respected in the question of the Suez Canal, the United Kingdom and French Governments decided to use force to break the heroic will of the Egyptian people.

375. The events leading to the unwarranted aggression against Egypt are too well known to require mention here. It is also common knowledge that, in order to achieve their designs, the two Western Governments found a docile and willing cat's-paw in the Israel Government, which furnished a pretext for their joint intervention. No one has any doubts about the true motives and aims of the British-French action, or the nature and purpose of the aggression by Israel.

376. The aggression against Egypt is a threat to world peace. Since peace is indivisible and there can be no international security when war is ravaging part of the globe, and since, too, the Middle East is of tremendous economic, military and political importance, the hostilities in Egypt are of concern to all States and are clearly a threat to all.

377. Since the tripartite aggression may well shake the very foundations of our Organization and, what is more serious, the very principles of the United Nations, as the Secretary-General pointed out, it is only natural that this question should greatly disturb the conscience of the world. This resort to force has abruptly ended the possibility of a solution under the auspices of the United Nations, which provided for continued negotiations on the Suez problem.

378. My country is a firm supporter of the cause of peace, and, owing to its position on the Black Sea, is situated close to the Mediterranean. It is therefore natural that it should be profoundly concerned at the situation in the Middle East, and declare solemnly here and now that the tripartite action constitutes unjustified aggression which it is the duty of the United Nations to stop by all the means at its disposal.

379. The preamble of the Charter proclaims equality of nations, large and small. It stipulates that armed

force shall not be used save in the common interest. I am sure that the representatives here are far more familiar with this text than I am, and if I venture to mention it it is because at this grave hour of historic responsibilities it is imperative that these provisions should be borne in mind. We are bound under the Charter to settle disputes in conformity with the principles of justice and international law. In condemning the tripartite aggression against Egypt we shall, at the same time, be paying tribute to the principles of justice and international law; for what Egypt wants is respect for its rights, honour, independence and liberty.

380. The General Assembly of the United Nations, convened in emergency special session after the significant and eloquent vote of the Security Council, is in duty bound to proclaim the principles of the Charter, to bring effective assistance to the Egyptian people, and to declare unequivocally that, in invading the ancient land of Egypt, the tripartite forces have committed unjustified and unprovoked aggression.

381. We do not identify the noble French and British nations with those who launched the aggression against Egypt. Many voices in the United Kingdom and France have been raised against these acts of aggression and have demanded that the attack against Egypt be stopped.

382. The General Assembly of the United Nations has therefore clearly and firmly condemned the acts of aggression and has taken the necessary measures to put an end to the bloodshed in the Middle East. The era of colonialism has ended, but some Governments have not yet realized this. They must be told that we are living in the era of the Charter of the United Nations.

383. Since the draft resolution presented by Mr. Dulles noted that the armed forces of France and the United Kingdom were engaged in military operations against Egypt, and called for an immediate cessation of hostilities followed by immediate measures to put an end to the bloodshed in Egypt, I voted in favour of it.

384. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia): This is a sad and grave moment in the history of the United Nations. Two great nations which hold permanent seats in the Security Council, and Israel, have launched armed attacks against the territorial integrity of Egypt. The armed forces of Israel have penetrated deeply into the territory of the victim. Egyptian cities are subject to bombardment by the air forces of the United Kingdom and France.

385. Such are the deplorable circumstances in which the resolution we have just adopted was presented to this Assembly by the delegation of the United States. These are facts and, in our view, they are very deplorable facts.

386. We listened to the statements by the delegations of the three Powers which are engaged in hostile acts against Egypt. The whole world knows that all these three countries have grievances against Egypt. It may also be that there are many other nations that have grievances against one or more States. Does such resentment against a State justify the use of force by the parties which claim to be injured? The answer to the question is set out clearly in the United Nations Charter, which prohibits the use of force as a means of settling international differences, or grievances for that matter.

387. We have been told that the military action undertaken by Israel against Egypt is in self-defence. Ac-

ording to the Charter of the United Nations, self-defence is permissible only when it is exercised in accordance with the principles laid down in the Charter. Such is not the case in the present instance.

388. We are told also that the British and French actions were undertaken against the people of Egypt in order to separate the two hostile parties, that is, Israel and Egypt. My delegation, among others, finds it difficult to see why it was necessary to bombard Egyptian cities in order to separate the two parties. We can hardly acquiesce in this type of argument. The plain fact is that a clear case of a breach of the peace has taken place, and this Assembly is duty bound to act with speed and determination.

389. This Assembly cannot accept the claim of France and the United Kingdom that they are acting as international police. We do not think that in all honesty they themselves believe in this theory.

390. My country has a long tradition of opposition to aggression and to the use of force in international relations. In 1935, Ethiopia sacrificed millions of its sons and daughters and lost its independence defying aggression and upholding the rule of law. Today, in this dark hour for the United Nations and for the people of Egypt, my delegation can do no less than to add its voice to others in support of the rule of law and in opposition to the use of force.

391. We believe that the present resolution does accomplish the required job, and that is why my delegation voted for it. We hope that the three countries involved in hostile acts against Egypt will find it possible to comply with the provisions of the resolution. To do so, I believe, will increase their prestige and will be in accordance with their long-standing tradition of compliance with the rule of law. Not to comply with the resolution, in my opinion, could certainly injure not only the prestige of those countries, but also their long-term interests.

392. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia): The present development of events in the Middle East, which has culminated in an armed attack against a Member country of the United Nations, Egypt, has created a most serious situation which may entail far-reaching consequences for all mankind and the United Nations.

393. In this situation, this emergency special session of the General Assembly has been convened, for the first time since its existence, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Security Council. International peace and the system of security created by the United Nations are still facing an imminent crisis caused by forces and interests hostile to peace, which have inspired and launched an unprovoked armed attack against Egypt, thus committing a flagrant breach of the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter. Such a breach of the peace is bound to receive a proper answer from the United Nations by the efficient measures provided under the Charter.

394. The aggression against Egypt has been denounced with indignation by all peace-loving nations as an attack against peace and security. It is well known today to the international public that what has occurred is an action deliberately prepared behind the backs of United Nations Members and directed against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of a Member State.

395. Such an action on the part of Israel, the United Kingdom and France, which places their interests and selfish goals above the basic principles of the Charter, calls for a resolute denunciation by all other Member countries. What is particularly alarming is the fact that

a serious situation in the Near East has been caused, apart from Israel's initial invasion of Egyptian territory, by the joint actions of two great Powers.

396. The Charter lays down clearly that all Members of the United Nations shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means and that all Members of the United Nations shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force. The aggressive actions against Egypt constitute a gross violation of the particular obligations assumed by both the United Kingdom and France, two great Powers which, under the Charter, are permanent members of the Security Council, bearing special responsibility for the maintenance of peace and international security.

397. The Czechoslovak people emphatically condemn these acts of aggression directed against Egypt and express their sympathy with the just and sacred struggle of the Egyptian people for their freedom and independence. The Czechoslovak Government issued a declaration yesterday in which it condemned the aggression committed against Egypt by the Governments of the United Kingdom and France, which have made the Government of Israel their tool. In its declaration, the Czechoslovak Government states that the aggressors bear full responsibility before the whole world for this breach of peace and for all possible consequences.

398. On behalf of its Government, the Czechoslovak delegation associates itself with those who have demanded the condemnation and immediate cessation of the aggression unleashed against Egypt and the peaceful solution of the Suez question, a solution that will respect the sovereignty and national interests of Egypt. We are convinced that measures taken by the General Assembly to that effect will receive the whole-hearted support of peace-loving nations.

399. With this main consideration in mind, we voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation.

400. Mr. VITETTI (Italy): I have a few brief remarks to make. The delegation of Italy voted in favour of the draft resolution presented by the delegation of the United States. We share the views and ideas which are behind this resolution.

401. It is not necessary for me to state how much the Italian Government and the Italian people have been worried about the situation which has developed in the Middle East. We have watched with the greatest concern the chain of events which has led to this alarming situation.

402. I shall not go into an examination of all the facts. The problems that we are facing are not new in their origin. They have been accumulating over a period of time, and during the past two months have moved at such speed and with such intensity that we are now facing conditions which are fraught with the gravest dangers. It is not my intention to reconstruct the chain of those events. The important thing now is not to have discussions to establish the origin and cause of these events; we must see how to break this chain of events, and how to put an end to the fighting.

403. I was very much interested in what was said by the representative of Canada. There are problems which have to be considered and settlements and solutions which have to be found. Those views are, I think, shared by my Government. The Cabinet, which met in Rome yesterday, has addressed an earnest appeal to the countries of the Near East and to the allied and friendly countries in order that an effort be made to reach an

agreement rapidly which might put an end to military action. We consider that negotiations must be started as soon as possible to obtain a peaceful solution, not only to the present controversy, but also to all the questions which have for too long a time been disturbing peace in that area. Naturally, first of all, we affirm that our first duty, the duty of every country, is the observance of international treaties and obligations deriving from membership in the United Nations, which obligations must be respected in order that they may represent a warranty of international lawfulness.

404. I am not saying these words to minimize the situation in any sense. What I wish to emphasize is that we are convinced that we have to act in a direction which will lead us to affirm the fundamental rules of international conduct, the obligation of every State under the United Nations Charter, and which will at the same time also lead—and this is by far more important—to putting an end to the conflict which is taking place and bring hostilities to a close.

405. U WIN (Burma): As there was an overwhelming desire on the part of the great majority of members here to proceed with the voting on the United States draft resolution in view of the extreme urgency of the situation, my delegation refrained from taking part in the debate. However, we feel it necessary to state the very strong views of my Government in this Assembly and explain why my delegation voted for the resolution.

406. At the conclusion of the Second World War, which brought the Nazi and fascist dictatorships to an end and helped to liberate the 600 million people in what has here been called the arc of free Asia, the major allies, France, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States, pooled their energies to help create the United Nations.

407. A war-weary world gave thanks once again. It was hoped that international peace and order would be maintained by the international Organization. The purpose of the United Nations, carefully written into the Charter, was to abjure force as an instrument of national policy. It is true that the United Nations has not yet been able to agree on a definition of aggression, but it is also true that the Charter, in Article 2, explicitly denies to its Members any sanction for "the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State".

408. Today we are once again meeting because international peace and order have been gravely disturbed by the actions of some Members of the United Nations. My Government firmly believes, on the face of the immediate evidence—which all the world knows—that the United Kingdom, France and Israel have not discharged their obligations under the terms of the Charter which they solemnly and democratically approved. Such dubious international morality cannot be condoned, nor is it to be expected from its perpetrators. The perils and evils of war—the big war, the little war, the hot war or the cold war—which have afflicted the peoples of the world for so many years of this half century, once again loom ominously on the Middle East horizon. Therefore, my delegation strongly supported the resolution of this Assembly which brings its moral suasion to bear on the participants. Let us once and for all time put an end to "gunboat diplomacy".

409. To support this resolution, however, is not enough, for, as I have just indicated, we are today dealing only with the immediate situation. We must be aware of causes and provocations on all sides antecedent to the events of this week. We feel that incon-

clusive armistice arrangements lasting eight years do not make for peace. We feel that armistice and inspection commissions which are not allowed to function freely, or even to function, do not make for peace.

410. When associated nations are continuing raids and reprisals across boundaries, that does not make for peace. When nations associated with one or another of the so-called East and West blocs aid and abet an armament race in which small countries spend precious currency, better used for upgrading their levels of living, that does not make for peace. Freely uttered threats by one nation to annihilate another, in a crusade, do not make for peace either. Nor does a truculent response which leads to so-called "preventive war" or self-appointed police action make for peace. Nationalization of vital property is obviously within the competence of any sovereign nation. But, with equal obviousness, when the use of such property vitally affects the economic health of many nations, prompt and effective negotiations on its use, for all users, seems to be indicated.

411. In short, the passage of this resolution is not enough. It may stop the shooting—and that will be a great boon—but unless the United Nations is able to use its abilities to eliminate or adjudicate or compromise or otherwise remove the antecedent causes for the shooting, unless, in other words, it helps to bring solutions of peace to the turmoil of the Middle East, it will not have done its most important work.

412. When Burma was admitted as the fifty-eighth Member of the United Nations, a few months after it had reattained its independence, Burma decided then, and has never deviated from it, to subscribe unconditionally to the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter.

413. To this end Burma has always voted to support non-partisan resolutions and actions which would advance the cause of peace through all legitimate means. From time to time my Government and our people have expressed their disappointment at the results. But, in the words of our former Prime Minister, U Nu, on the occasion of his United Nations visit in July 1955:

"The United Nations has survived the first ten years of its existence. I venture to suggest that these formative years are the most precarious and that we may expect from now onward that this youngster will rapidly gather in stature and strength and begin to assume for itself the kind of role which was intended for it in the first place."

414. I suggest that the issue of peace in the Middle East—genuine peace, not just the absence of a shooting, undeclared war; not just the presence of an uncertain cease-fire and armistice—is a critical test of the survival potentiality of the United Nations. To ensure that the United Nations will "gather stature and strength and begin to assume for itself the kind of role which was intended for it in the first place", my Government will gladly and hopefully join the Member States in seeking a solution for our present problem and its antecedent causes, in seeking that genuine peace capable of preserving the sovereignty of all nations and the dignity of all peoples.

415. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay). (*translated from Spanish*): Naturally, in view of the late hour, I shall not detain the Assembly, but I should like very rapidly to explain why my delegation voted, whole-heartedly and without reservations, in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the United States.

416. We all thought that after the signing of the Charter at San Francisco the use of force in the old arbitrary way had become a thing of the past. We believed that, in accordance with the Charter, force could be used only in the common interest.

417. We voted for the United States draft resolution because, in the first place, it refers to the armed attacks which have been made against Egyptian territory and Egyptian sovereignty.

418. However, as the representative of Ecuador pointed out, we believe that, in considering aggression in the situation with which we are concerned, a distinction must be made between two completely different factors: the attack and penetration of Egyptian territory by the armed forces of Israel, and the action taken against Egypt by the United Kingdom and France after an ultimatum which gave Egypt a period of hours to comply with the demands it contained or suffer the acts of force that have led to the convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

419. We believe that the problem of Israel and the Arab States must be viewed in its own context. Those of us who have taken part in the discussion of this distressing problem in United Nations bodies since 1947 have sought only the unity and progress of the Arab States and of Israel. We have sought not to destroy them but to ensure their peace and progress.

We have sought not strife between them but an identity of aims for the sake of future generations.

420. Therefore, if any fruit is borne of this first emergency special session of the General Assembly, which has decided to maintain unimpaired the principles of law embodied in the Charter, let it be a reaffirmation of our desire, not for an armistice, but for peace between the Arab States and the State of Israel.

421. As regards the other problem, it is not enough for any Member State to say that it can act as a policeman and resort to force in a police action of its own choosing. We do not believe that it is possible to take such action outside the framework of the United Nations and contrary to the provisions of the Charter. The democratic principles laid down in the Charter are the fruit of the immense sacrifice of the flower of mankind in the last world war, and, as we have supported the use of force in the common interest, in self-defence through the United Nations, we could not, tonight, do otherwise than vote in favour of the United States draft resolution, as the great majority of the Assembly has done.

422. May our vote tonight affirm, on behalf of those who believe in democracy, the principles of the Charter, which has become, and must for all time be, the new law of the world.

*The meeting rose on Friday, 2 November, at 4.20 a.m.*