The objective of the security measures which the Israel defense forces have felt bound to take in the Sinai Peninsula is the exercise of our country’s inherent right of self-defense. The object of these operations is to eliminate the Egyptian Fedayeen bases from which armed Egyptian units, under the special care and authority of Colonel Nasser, invade Israel’s territory for the purposes of murder, sabotage and the creation of permanent insecurity to peaceful life. World opinion is naturally asking itself what these Fedayeen units are; what their activities imply for Israel’s security, whether their actions in the past and their plans for the future are really full of peril for Israel; and whether this peril is so acute that Israel may reasonably regard its elimination a primary condition of its security and indeed of its existence.

The Government of Israel is the representative of a people endowed with a mature understanding of international facts. We are not unaware of the limitations of our strength. 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 might compel us to weigh drastic choices with care and without undue precipitation. It is therefore a Government which governs its actions by a single exclusive aim to insure life and security and opportunities for self-development for the people whom it represents while also safeguarding the honor and trust of millions linked to it by the strongest ties of fraternity. In recent days and months the Government of Israel has had to face a tormenting question: Do its obligations under the United Nations Charter require us to resign ourselves to the existence of uninterrupted activity to the South and North and East of our country, of armed units practising open warfare against us and working from their bases in the Sinai Peninsula and elsewhere for the maintenance of carefully regulated invasions of our home, our lands and our very lives? On the other hand, are we acting with an inherent right of self-defense when, having found no other remedy for over two years, we cross the frontier against those who
have no scruple or hesitation in crossing the frontier against us? Members of the Security Council may be in a better position to evaluate this choice and to identify themselves with this situation if they hear something about the Fedayeen movement, of its place in the total pattern of Egyptian belligerency, of its extension under Egyptian direction, to other Arab countries falling under Nasser's sway, and of what would happen if we made no attempt at this time to resist that movement in its drive towards total conflict.

The system of waging war against Israel by Fedayeen is the product of Colonel Nasser's mind. It is one of his contributions to the international life and morality of our times. After intensive preparations 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 front, and indeed coming at a time when Egypt and Israel were engaged in hopeful negotiations with the United Nations Chief of Staff, looking towards integral implementation of the 1949 Armistice Agreement. The Government of Egypt made no secret of these activities or of its responsibility for them. It might be convenient, to summarize some of the effects of these actions, if I were to tell the Security Council the entire toll of violence and murder inflicted upon Israel by this phase of Egyptian belligerency. During the six years during which this belligerency has operated in violation of the Armistice Agreement, there have occurred 1,843 cases of armed robbery and theft, 1,339 cases of armed clashes with Egyptian armed forces, 435 cases of incursions from Egyptian-controlled territory, 172 cases of sabotage perpetrated by Egyptian military units and Fedayeen in Israel. As a result of these actions of Egyptian hostility within Israel 364 Israelis were wounded and 101 killed. In 1956 alone, as a result of this aspect of Egyptian aggression, 28 Israelis were killed and 127 were wounded.

It cannot be seriously suggested that these activities are not the direct responsibility of the Government of Egypt. In recent months it has become apparent to us that the Arab Governments, and especially Egypt, have come to regard the Fedayeen weapon as an instrument not for mere harassment, but for Israel's destruction. The Commander-in-Chief himself, Colonel Nasser, defined their mission on May 28 when he said:

"The Fedayeen, the Palestine army, which started as a small force of 1,000 men last year, is today greater in number and in training and equipment. I believe in the strength, the ability, the loyalty and the courage of this army. Its soldiers will be responsible for taking revenge for their homeland and people."

On June 19, Colonel Nasser declared, in the context of this Fedayeen movement:

"We are obliged to be strong in order to liberate the entire Arab land from Morocco to Baghdad and in order to retrieve the rights of Palestine’s people."

Having concerted his military plans with Syria and Saudi Arabia, the Commander-in-Chief of the Egyptian army, General Abdel Hakim Amer, spoke as follows:

"Now that the hour is approaching, I, and the members of the Revolutionary Council will be in the front line of battle. In this battle our enemies will be
convincing of their weakness, and the victories will be yours and that of all the Arab states.

A little later, the same Commander-in-Chief said:

The Israeli danger no longer exists. Egypt has enough strength to wipe Israel off the map.

The Security Council will observe that this was merely the spearhead of Egyptian belligerency. It was a new device for making war, and for making it with safety. The doctrine was that of unilateral belligerency. The Egyptian-Israeli frontier is to be a one-way street; it is to be wide open for these armed Egyptian units to penetrate as deeply as possible into Israel as they like, to accomplish their mission and then return. It is to be closed in their favor against any defensive response.

I have spoken of these penetrations into Israel by armed units under the responsibility and control of Colonel Nasser. No one ever called a session of the Security Council to condemn these penetrations or to call for their withdrawal, or to threaten Egypt with the consequences of non-compliance. Can Israel be required to reconcile itself with a situation in which any Arab country which chooses to send units into Israel to murder its population, to plunder and destroy, should be able to rely upon a large measure of international apathy?

It is one thing to present resolutions for protecting the Fedayeen against the risks that they might not be safe in their abode. It is a fact that there have never been any resolutions adopted by the Security Council designed specifically to protect the Israel civilian population against the encroachments and the depredations of the Fedayeen units. The people of Israel are not able to understand the meaning of this distinction. They do not know why the shelter of the Charter should not be spread over innocent workers tilling their fields, over women in their homes, over children in the sacred hour of religious observance who were mowed down and killed by Fedayeen encroachments, and why this protection should only apply to those who, across the frontier, organize these penetrations for death and destruction. Would it not be a paradox if these Fedayeen units, the greatest plague to security in the Middle East, were to become inadvertently, the beneficiaries of international protection?

In discussing the Suez Canal case on a previous occasion, I referred to this paradox of unilateral belligerency. I ask leave to recall what I said in that context:

At the root of these tensions lie a theory and practice of belligerency. Egypt considers and proclaims that there is a state of war. In the name of that state of war Egypt asserts a right to perform hostile acts of its own choice against Israel. On the other hand, Egypt claims from the United Nations immunity from any response emanating from Israel. This is the doctrine of unilateral belligerency, and it has no parallel or precedent in the jurisprudence of nations.

The Government of Israel has had ample reason to fear that this activity was to be renewed on a scale unprecedented even during the first wave of Fedayeen invasions in August 1955, or during its recrudescence in the Spring of 1956. Following the meeting of the Chiefs of Staff of Egypt, Syria and Jordan in Amman, we had
stronger reason than ever before to believe that this recrudescence would take place. We duly gave this information to many Governments concerned with the maintenance of peace and security in the Middle East. The very day after we gave notice of this apprehension, the Fedayeen units began to arrive. Three of these units entered our territory on Sunday (October 21), two of them being captured, the other retreating to one of their bases in the Sinai Peninsula.

From a study of official Arab sources it is quite clear that again there was to be a refreshing candor about the renewal of this assault. Here is one official Arab broadcast on October 16, 1956, at 1630 hours.

The Fedayeen Headquarters in Gaza has issued a communique stating that a group of Fedayeen succeeded on October 13 to cross the southern border of Palestine in order to discover the concentration points and the factories which the Zionists have started to transfer to the coastal region so as to get them out of the firing-range of Egyptian guns which threaten to destroy them. The communique of Fedayeen Headquarters in Gaza states also that all the Fedayeen returned safely to their bases, except two who are believed to have been killed in an encounter which took place between them and the guards of Prime Minister Ben Gurion's home at Sde Boker. Further, it is believed that two other Fedayeen have been wounded and taken to a hospital in Rehovoth. The fifth of the Fedayeen has not yet returned from his mission in occupied Palestine.

This was a broadcast heard in Damascus, giving the text of the communique issued from Fedayeen Headquarters in Gaza.

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

Behind these incidents, grave as they are, we discern issues of even greater moment. World opinion must choose between two candidates for its confidence: on the one hand, farmers and workers, the men, women and children of Israel; on the other hand, these fanatic warriors of the Fedayeen groups. Behind this confrontation, there stands the broader alignment between Israel and Nasser. A small people builds its society and culture in its renascent homeland. In the early days of its independence it is set on by the armed might of all its neighbors, who attempt to wipe it off the face of the earth.

My memory tells me that it took something like eight weeks for the Security Council to secure the withdrawal of Egyptian and other Arab armies from the sovereign soil of Israel. The effort to secure that withdrawal was, perhaps, not marked by a sufficient urgency or zeal. In the following years of the conflict, Israel's neighbors have continued to assault her with warlike acts of their own choice, to attempt her destruction by armed intervention, by blockade and boycott. They send armed units into her territory to murder and plunder. They strive by
every means to ensure that nowhere in Israel shall there be tranquillity for peace-
ful pursuit. They blare forth the most violent threats for Israel's destruction. They
accumulate vast armaments for bringing that result 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 that 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, while maintaining a constant violation of international maritime
law.

Across Africa and Asia, wherever Nasserism spreads its baneful influence, it
works actively to subvert all peace and progress to establish an ambitious and
insatiable hegemony. Now, having considered that it has humbled the international
community and maritime Powers, Nasser's action returns to his first target—
Israel—which is to be swamped from three sides with a new wave of Fedayeen
violence. Accordingly, while studying with attention all proposals for strengthening
security in the Middle East, we reject with vehement indignation the charge of
aggression launched against us. There is aggression, there is belligerency in the
Middle East; but we are its victims and not its authors. That is what I mean when
I say that world opinion must decide whom to trust. Shall it be a 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 avow-
ing belligerency, placing its fist on the jugular vein of the world's communications.
bringing the Middle East and the world ever nearer to the precipice of conflict;
intimidating all those who stand in its path—all except one people, at least, which
will not be intimidated, one people which no dictator in history has even intimi-
dated, a people which has risen up against all the tyrants of history, a people which
knows that the appeasement of despots yields nothing but an uneasy respite and
that a Government which allowed its citizens to be murdered daily in their homes
would lose the essential justification for which Governments are instituted among
men.

This is the background and these are the issues which have guided my Govern-
ment's choice. We have faced them alone, and we made a decision to invoke for this
purpose, and no other, our sovereign right of self-defense. Israel is not out to con-
quер any new territory, but is determined to wipe out the bases in the Sinai wilder-
ness from which murder and death and destruction are launched against it.

We believe, as we have always believed, in our destiny of peace, and for that
we are ready now, but it must be a real peace—peace by agreement, peace without
boycott or blockade, peace without murdering Fedayeen gangs—peace, in short,
within a framework of a reciprocal regard for the ideals and principles of the
The Government of the United States has received information to the effect that in violation of the Armistice Agreement between Israel and Egypt, the armed forces of Israel have penetrated deeply into Egyptian territory. This military action commenced Oct. 29 and is continuing in the Sinai area. This situation makes imperative an immediate meeting of the Security Council, charged as it is with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security as well as responsibility for the observance of the Armistice Agreement.

I have the honor, therefore, in behalf of my Government to request to convene a meeting of the Security Council as soon as possible to consider “The Palestine Question Steps for the immediate cessation of the military action of Israel in Egypt.”

The United Nations has requested this urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider steps to be taken to bring about the immediate cessation of military action by Israel against Egypt. The Security Council has been meeting on the Palestine question within the last few days and repeatedly in recent months to consider actions which the Council unanimously believed constituted a grave danger, and I am therefore sure that there can be no question about the adoption of the agenda.

I therefore request the president to put to the vote the question of the adoption of the agenda, which I am certain each member of the Council will consider appropriate in these grave circumstances, and I am sure that the Council will act with the same unanimity now with which it has acted on the Palestine question in numerous recent meetings. After the adoption of the agenda, I would appreciate the opportunity to speak immediately on the substance of the question.

[The agenda was then adopted]

We have asked for this urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the critical developments which have occurred and which are unfortunately still continuing in the Sinai Peninsula as the result of Israel’s invasion of that area yesterday.

It comes as a shock to the United States Government that this action should have occurred less than twenty-four hours after President Eisenhower had sent a second earnest personal appeal to the Prime Minister [David Ben-Gurion] of Israel urging Israel not to undertake any action against its Arab neighbors, and
pointing out that we had no reason to believe that those neighbors had taken any
steps justifying Israel's action of mobilization.

Certain things are clear. The first is that, by their own admission, Israeli armed
forces moved into Sinai in force "to eliminate the Egyptian Fedayeen bases in the
Sinai Peninsula." They have admitted the capture of Quseima and Ras el Naqb.
Second, reliable reports have placed Israeli armed forces near the Suez Canal.
Third, Israel has announced that both the Egyptian and Israeli armed forces were
in action in the desert battle.

An official announcement in Tel Aviv stated that Egyptian fighter planes strafed
Israeli troops. We have a report that President [Gamal Abdel] Nasser has called
for full mobilization in Egypt today and that the Egyptian Army claims that it has
halted the advance of major Israeli forces driving across the Sinai Peninsula. The
Secretary General [Dag Hammarskjold] may receive more information from
General [E. L. M. Burns] and the Truce Supervision Organization, and I am sure
that we shall continue to be fully informed as we proceed with our deliberations
here.

These events make the necessity for the urgent consideration of this item all too
plain. Failure by the Council to react at this time would be a clear avoidance of its
responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The United
Nations has a clear and unchallengeable responsibility for the maintenance of the
Armistice Agreements.

The Government of the United States feels that it is imperative that the Council
act in the promptest manner to determine that a breach of the peace has occurred,
to order that the military actions undertaken by Israel cease immediately, and to
make clear its view that the Israeli armed forces should be immediately withdrawn
behind the established armistice lines. Nothing else will suffice.

It is also to be noted that the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Super-
vision Organization [General Burns] has already issued a cease-fire order on his
own authority which Israel has so far ignored. Information has reached us also that
military observers of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization have
been prevented by Israeli authorities from performing their duties.

We, as members of the Council, accordingly should call upon all members of the
United Nations to render prompt assistance in achieving a withdrawal of Israeli
forces. All members, specifically, should refrain from giving any assistance which
might continue or prolong the hostilities. No one, certainly, should take advantage
of this situation for any selfish interest. Each of us here, and every member of the
United Nations, has a clear-cut responsibility to see that the peace and stability
of the Palestine area is restored forthwith. Anything less is an invitation to disaster
in this part of the world.

This is an immediate responsibility which derives from the Council's obligations
under its cease-fire orders and the Armistice Agreements between the Israelis and
the Arab states endorsed by this Security Council. It derives, also, of course, from
the larger responsibility under the United Nations Charter.

On behalf of the United States Government, I give notice that I intend at the
afternoon meeting to introduce a draft resolution whereby the Council will call
upon Israel to withdraw and will indicate such steps as will assure that it does.
I should like at the outset to associate myself with the expression of regard for the Secretary General which have been voiced by various members of the Council. We have the highest regard for the integrity and impartiality of Mr. Hammarskjold.

As members of the Council will be aware, since our meeting yesterday evening it has been announced that the Egyptian Government regretfully has rejected the communication from Her Majesty's Government and from the French Government dated 30 October, and as a consequence Her Majesty's Government and the French Government have intervened in accordance with that communication.

I should like to say at once that I have informed myself on the true nature of the press and agency reports which have been quoted around this table in regard to military operations. I am authorized to say that the action which is being taken is strictly limited to military targets, primarily air-fields, and I would draw attention to the fact that the civilian population was warned to keep clear of such targets before the operations started.

This intervention, as I hope to show in the course of my remarks, has as its overriding purposes the safeguarding of the Suez Canal and the restoration of peaceful conditions in the Middle East.

It is one facet of a highly complex and dangerous situation and it cannot therefore be considered, as the Egyptian representative in his letter contained in Document S/3712 invites us to do, as a separate and isolated development.

I do not, of course, for one moment accept the implications and insinuations in that letter. But in so far as this matter relates to an aspect, and a troubling aspect, of the general situation, naturally I am ready to discuss it.

The Soviet representative told us yesterday, and he has repeated it again today, that this intervention was part of a long-prepared plot hatched by the British, French and Israeli Governments, designed to stir up trouble in the Middle East in order to restore old colonial empires, or words to that effect.

I think nobody will take this very seriously. I think we can all understand why the representative of the Soviet Union would wish to invent such stories in view of his own country's troubles in East Europe.

I need only make this simple point. It is common knowledge that over the past few months our relations with Israel have been very difficult and even strained. And why? Because of the strenuous efforts made by Her Majesty's Government to reduce the tensions around its borders.

Indeed, my colleagues will recollect that it was only a few days ago that the representative of Israel had some sharp words to say about the sympathy I had expressed for Jordan.

We have also heard the argument that, since the Government of Israel has agreed
to keep its troops ten miles away from the Suez Canal, no threat to the canal now exists and the Anglo-French intervention is no longer justified.

But I must point out that the Israel Government accepted the terms of the communications of the United Kingdom and French Governments on the assumption that the Egyptian response would be positive. But, as we know, the Egyptian response was unfortunately negative.

From all the information at our disposal, and we can claim, I think, to be reasonably well informed about affairs in the Middle East, we judged that the danger of a major clash between Israel and its Arab neighbors had become more imminent than at any time since the signing of the armistice agreements.

I am not, of course, in a position to reveal the full evidence, and I must ask my colleagues to accept that this judgment was well founded. It was in the light of this weighty judgment that Her Majesty's Government and the French Government took the grave decision that their immediate intervention was required to safeguard the Suez Canal and prevent a disastrous conflagration which might spread.

Whether or not our intervention will extinguish the conflict as it is intended to do, is not dependent on us alone. It depends very much on the understanding support of those members of the international community who are also concerned to see peace and order restored in the Middle East.

As there has regrettably been a considerable misunderstanding of the policies of Her Majesty's Government and the French Government in this matter, may I once again formulate what are the objectives behind our intervention. They are, in the first place, to stop all warlike action on land, sea and air as soon as possible; secondly, to enforce a separation of the belligerents; and thirdly, to protect the Suez Canal for the free passage of ships of all nations.

Any prolonged fighting along the banks of the [Suez] Canal would seriously endanger the lives and shipping of many nations of the world. Great Britain and France are the main users of this canal, and our vital interests would be endangered if free passage were interrupted. I need not go far back into the past, but I should like to recall that the circumstances in which the canal was seized were circumstances in which violence and resort to illegal methods were employed.

We have a right to defend these vital interests, and we believe, moreover, that in so doing we are also defending the interests of all nations, and there are many, whose economies depend on this great international right-of-way.

But although we have acted to protect our vital interests and those of other nations in this international waterway, our other purpose, as I have made abundantly clear, has been, and remains, to prevent an armed clash between Israel and Egypt leading to a general conflagration.

Our intervention is a temporary measure which we were obliged to take in the absence of any effective collective machinery for restoring peace and order in a matter of such extreme emergency.

Moreover, it is our firm intention to insure that the Israel forces now in the neighborhood of the canal should be withdrawn as soon as possible from Egyptian territory.

Let me state also with emphasis that we do not and could not condone any Israel action aimed at the occupation of positions in Egyptian territory. Let there be no misunderstanding about this. It is our view that Israel should withdraw its forces from their present positions as soon as this can be satisfactorily arranged. As I
stated yesterday, we have no hesitation in regarding Israel's incursion across the Egyptian border as a violation of the armistice agreement.

In the misleading version of events contained in the letter from the delegation of Egypt now before us, and in the statement made this afternoon by the representative of Egypt, my Government and the French Government are accused of committing an act of aggression. This is a very serious charge to make in the Security Council, bearing in mind the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. We strongly deny such charges and do not think it will be profitable for the Council to discuss them. What constitutes and what does not constitute an act of aggression is, as we all know, a matter of debate.

But the matter which the Council should consider today and on which we ask for the Council's understanding support is a temporary intervention by the two Governments that are in a position to restore peace and order effectively and speedily in an area of the world where a major conflagration threatens us. Our intervention is not aimed at the sovereignty of Egypt, still less at the territorial integrity of Egypt.

Address to the Security Council
Louis de Guiringaud

October 31, 1956

I shall now speak as representative of France. It is with regret that the French delegation found itself compelled last night to oppose the adoption of the draft resolutions submitted to the Council. If we did this, it was because we thought that in the present case the Council could not only confine itself merely to the consideration of only one aspect of the problem, and that in our view it was necessary for us to take account of all the elements involved in the situation.

The French Government considered that the tension in the Middle East had become gradually so serious that it was no longer possible not to view the situation as a whole and in every aspect and to act accordingly.

We were confronted with an attack carried out by Israel forces in the Suez Canal Zone and in the direction of the Canal. We had every reason to believe that the military developments might go so far as to hinder free transit through the canal. The latest news received from Egypt, which referred to the positions of the Israeli troops, show how well founded our apprehensions were.

Experience has also taught us that, whatever the moral weight of the Council's decisions, unfortunately, in that part of the world, they had little practical effect, as the United Kingdom representative pointed out yesterday, for lack of force to implement them.

The French and British Governments considered, therefore, that a serious threat existed against the Suez Canal and that if rapid, effective and decisive action were not undertaken immediately, we were running the risk of seriously jeopardizing
traffic through the Canal for an indefinite period of time. Now, free navigation through the Suez Canal is of vital importance to most countries of the world.

The French and British Governments considered it their duty to take all necessary measures, even if these measures would be misunderstood at first by some of their friends, in order to guarantee and prevent any impairment of freedom of navigation through the Canal. The French Government considered that the attack carried out by the Israeli forces was only an episode in the permanent state of hostilities which exists between Egypt and the state of Israel. It seemed to us that the time had come to take measures likely to prevent any repetition of these incidents.

These are the reasons underlying the action taken by the French Government in the Suez Canal area. In our view, this action is designed to assure an immediate settlement of the current incidents and to make it possible to find a solution very quickly which would be likely to eliminate the threats to the Canal.

The French Government would stress the temporary nature of the presence of its troops in the Canal Zone and would stress also the fact that it in no way intends to infringe upon Egyptian sovereignty.

Like the United Kingdom Government, the French Government cannot accept the accusations that it has acted counter to the principles of the Charter. The decision was taken only with the desire to insure as effectively as possible the restoration of order in the Canal Zone before it was too late.

In these circumstances the French Government is convinced that the purposes which it pursues are the same as those of the majority of members of the Council which we wish to reach, and we ask them to understand the motives which inspired it and to assist it in carrying out the action which, in agreement with the Government of the United Kingdom, the French Government has undertaken in the interests of the international community.

Address to the Security Council: Arkady A. Sobolev

October 31, 1956

May I begin by stating that the Soviet delegation trusts the Secretary General of the United Nations and supports him.

The situation in the Near East has grown sharply worse since yesterday's meeting of the Security Council. According to information just received, an invasion has begun—an invasion of joint United Kingdom—French troops in Egypt. Thus the Governments of the United Kingdom and France, from the threat of armed intervention in the Near East, have proceeded to the implementation of their proclaimed plan of occupation of the Suez Canal Zone.

The Soviet delegation expresses its deep sympathy with the people and Government of Egypt confronted with a severe ordeal. We have no doubt that the people
of Egypt, which has gone through many trials, in this difficult hour as well will be able to defend its independence and freedom against any attacks from without.

The acts of the United Kingdom and France, which have committed aggression against Egypt, constitute a crude violation of their obligations assumed under the United Nations Charter. The Charter requires members of the United Nations to refrain from the threat of the use of force or the use of force in their relations with other states. France and the United Kingdom, in their acts against Egypt, not only threatened to use force but, at the present time, are carrying out aerial bombardments of Egyptian towns and landing their armed forces on the territory of Egypt, a member of the United Nations. That is to say, in violation of the United Nations Charter they are using force.

The responsibility of the Governments of the United Kingdom and France for the extremely dangerous situation created by their acts in the Near East is aggravated by the fact that they did not allow the Security Council to carry out its functions in connection with the maintenance of international peace as defined by the Charter.

The Governments of the United Kingdom and France have assumed the heavy responsibility for a serious aggravation of the international situation, committing armed intervention against Egypt at a time when Egypt was repelling Israel aggression. Attention has already been called to the fact that Israel aggression and the aggression of the United Kingdom and France against Egypt is being carried out according to a single plan prepared in advance. The Israel aggression was calculated to create conditions facilitating the seizure by United Kingdom and French forces of the Suez Canal.

The Governments of the United Kingdom and France are attempting to justify their acts by the statement that they are taking the Suez Canal under their protection and insuring freedom of transit through the canal. However, it is quite clear that this artificial justification is designed only to cover up the aggressive acts of the United Kingdom and France against Egypt.

Indeed, on the one hand, Israel aggression is instigated against Egypt and, on the other hand, the United Kingdom and France are striking a blow against the victim of that aggression, which is Egypt.

If the United Kingdom and France really wanted a just settlement of the Suez question, they have at their disposal other, peaceful ways and means. As is known, the Security Council in the past considered the question of the Suez Canal and prepared a plan for the settlement of the Suez question by peaceful means.

Under that plan, it would have been possible to secure a settlement of the Suez question which would have corresponded both to the national interests of the sovereign Egyptian state and to the interests of the users of the canal.

However, such a method was not to the liking of the United Kingdom and France. They preferred a forcible solution of this question, and precisely for that purpose they utilized Israel aggression against the Egyptian state.

The representatives of the United Kingdom and France here attempted to justify the aggressive acts by stating that the United Kingdom and France were attempting to put an end to combat and restore peace and quiet in the area. However, the behavior of the United Kingdom and France testifies to the contrary.

At the moment when the Security Council was considering the question of Israel aggression against Egypt and was attempting to find ways and means to reach a
peaceful settlement of the conflict, the United Kingdom and France—bypassing the Security Council and violating the standards of international law and the principles of the United Nations—issued a crude ultimatum.

This ultimatum, incompatible with the dignity of a sovereign state, had the purpose of serving as a pretext for the seizure of the Suez Canal by United Kingdom and French troops. In that ultimatum the United Kingdom and France demanded that Egypt withdraw Egyptian troops ten miles from the Suez Canal.

In issuing such an ultimatum, the United Kingdom and France are, on the one hand, attempting to force Egypt to hand over to the Israel troops territory to the east of the Suez Canal and, on the other hand, demanding—in violation of all agreements—that Egypt give up its protection of the Suez Canal.

Thus the United Kingdom and France are acting like colonialists used to dictating their will to the peoples of the past. But the time of the domination of this area by colonialists has long since passed. This action can only cause regret on the part of all peace-loving peoples in the world.

The action of the United Kingdom and French Governments constitute a crude violation of the United Nations Charter and of the dignity and sovereign rights of the Egyptian state. It constitutes a denial of the inalienable right of peoples to independence and freedom.

The Security Council cannot remain idle in the face of such a complicated situation. It must adopt immediate measures to put an end to the aggression against the Egyptian state and to restore peace and calm to that area of the world.

Concerned by the situation in the Near East, the Soviet Union delegation considers it necessary for the Security Council to condemn the aggressive acts of the United Kingdom and France, acts which have taken the form of bombing populated Egyptian territory and landing United Kingdom and French forces in Egypt.

We think that the Security Council should request the Governments of the United Kingdom and France immediately to withdraw their armed forces from Egyptian territory. If necessary, the Soviet Union delegation is prepared to submit an appropriate draft resolution to the Security Council.

The Security Council, which bears the main responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, cannot remain aloof; it must fulfill its direct and immediate responsibility. The peoples all over the world are waiting for the Security Council’s decision.

Address to the Security Council: Nasrollah Entezam

November 1, 1956

The only excuse they [Britain and France] had found for their act was a reference to the threats existing at present in the Middle East, and in particular in the Suez Canal area.

But where did those threats come from? If it was Egypt that had created a
menacing situation, then, sir, may I ask, why did not your countries come before the Security Council and explain their case and seek a solution? Then it would have been for Egypt to find an excuse to explain why she had sent troops and state the views it held in respect of the situation and justify the action it had undertaken. However, I believe that an excuse of that kind, coming from those who had themselves sent troops, is completely unjustified.

The second excuse that might have been invoked was that a threatening situation existed in the canal zone because of the aggressive action undertaken by one state. In that case, what did your countries do to stop that aggression? Your countries, sir, opposed the draft resolution that was submitted yesterday. Today, instead of punishing aggression, you have attacked the victim of that aggression. How could it be possible for your countries to find some excuse before world opinion?

My delegation stands for a peaceful settlement of these issues in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, avoiding all armed intervention and respecting the sovereignty of states. None of that has been done. No heed has been paid to those principles. The council must not simply listen to speeches, but must find practical means to bring an end to this unwarranted attack.

Address to the General Assembly:
Omar Loutfi

November 1, 1956

Mr. President:

I sincerely thank the members of the Security Council who yesterday voted in favor of the draft resolution presented by the distinguished representative of Yugoslavia and likewise the member states which were kind enough to advise the Secretary General that they supported that resolution and who today voted in favor of the inclusion of this matter in the agenda.

They have given me the opportunity to address the General Assembly—this world forum—in the cruel ordeal through which my country is now passing.

You are fully alive to the question, I am sure, gentlemen. I shall be brief. As I told the Security Council, this is not the time for oration. My country has been subjected to bloody aggression. The shedding of blood which is the consequence of aggression is proceeding apace.

During the night of Oct 30 Israel committed the most heinous unprovoked armed aggression since the conclusion of the armistice agreement. This was no mere reprisal raid. It was a premeditated, carefully prepared, armed attack whose purpose it is to occupy part of Egyptian territory so as to provoke war in this part of the world.

During the day of Oct. 30, 1956, a note from the United Kingdom Government was handed to the Egyptian Ambassador in London. An ultimatum was served
upon the Egyptian Government, asking it to cease all hostilities on land, at sea and in the air, to withdraw all Egyptian armed forces ten miles from the Suez Canal, to accept the occupation of part of Egyptian territory by French and British armed forces, especially the towns of Ismailia, Port Said and Suez.

The ultimatum required an answer before 6:30 Cairo time, October 31, in the absence of which the Governments of the United Kingdom and France would intervene to the extent which they would judge necessary in order to obtain satisfaction of their demands.

Since that time, Anglo-French aviation based on Cyprus against the will of the inhabitants of that island have bombarded Egypt A number of raids took place yesterday, especially against the city of Cairo. According to information at my disposal the three raids carried out yesterday by British and French jet bombers at 7 o'clock, 8:25 and 10:25 covered the mosque, the Almaza hospital, a number of Cairo airfields and a number of points near Shubra. Nine human lives were lost.

Throughout last night British and French bombers carried out continuous raids over all Egyptian airfields. French aviation joined with Israeli aircraft in air attacks against Egyptian positions in the Sinai Peninsula. Today twenty-one air raids took place over Egypt, of which nine were in Cairo and the remainder in Ismailia, Port Said and Suez. Installations at Alexandria were destroyed and the number of victims there is not yet known.

Moreover, the Commander-in-Chief of the French-British forces attacking Egypt declared today in Nicosia, Cyprus—and I apologize for quoting him in English—"the bombing will continue until Egypt sees reason. The length of the operation depends on how quickly Egypt accepts our terms. The sooner Egypt sees reason the less damage will accrue. We have considerable strength to deal blows".

This cynical communique calls for no further comment.

Mr. President, Egypt has been subject to combined aggression—premeditated aggression—by Israel, the United Kingdom and France. It is now abundantly clear that the aggressors agreed in advance to perpetrate this act of war to justify the armed aggression which they have committed. The Governments of the United Kingdom and France have presented motives which I find it difficult fairly to describe.

Sir Pierson Dixon said yesterday that he regretted that Egypt had regretted the Anglo-French ultimatum. I am astonished to hear the representative of the United Kingdom say that he expected for one moment that Egypt would accept an ultimatum which asked for the landing against Egypt of Anglo-British forces under conditions where Egypt had been subjected to aggression.

The representative of the United Kingdom said this was designed first of all to safeguard the Suez Canal and restore peaceful conditions in the Middle East.

Now, no danger threatened the Suez Canal prior to the Franco-British intervention. According to our information the aggressors' aircraft sank an Egyptian warship in the canal. This act of war committed by Israel, France and the United Kingdom in the region of the canal is a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and on the other hand it violates the Constantinople Convention of 1888 and the principle of free passage even in time of war, which is guaranteed to all states under the provisions of Article 4 of the Constantinople Convention.

Moreover, who gave the United Kingdom and France the right to intervene in
order to safeguard the canal? The 1888 Convention confers upon Egypt alone the right to take measures for the defense of the canal.

Was there a decision of the United Nations, a decision of the Security Council, which conferred upon the United Kingdom and France the right to resort to force in order, as they allege, to safeguard the canal and insure the freedom of passage and traffic through the canal?

Many other states use the canal. No one for a moment thought of using force or joining the Franco-British forces in order to occupy the canal area.

What renders the situation even more bizarre, as stressed by the distinguished representative of Yugoslavia, at the meeting of the Security Council held in the afternoon of Oct. 30 of this year—and I quote—"is that this threat of force is directed in the first instance against the country which is the victim of aggression. Egypt is enjoined to forswear its right of legitimate defense under Article 51 of the charter and Egypt is asked to acquiesce to the occupation of a part of its territory by two foreign powers and a time limit is set in the worst tradition of the policy of ultimatum which we hoped was an obsolete one."

Moreover, Mr. President, the representative of the United Kingdom claimed that one of the objectives of the Franco-British intervention is to put an end as early as possible to any warlike acts on land, at sea and in the air. If this were the genuine objective of Franco-British intervention, why is it that the representatives of these two countries exerted the veto right against two resolutions which specifically called for a cessation of hostilities for a cease-fire?

Another point which struck my delegation was an argument by France and the United Kingdom representatives that this was a mere temporary measure. Occupation was a mere temporary measure. But history has taught us that the phrase "temporary measure" used by their delegates—used by the representatives of the United Kingdom—is far removed from the ordinary sense of these words.

The occupation of Egypt in 1882 was, according to British leaders at the time, a mere temporary measure. It happens to have lasted seventy-four years.

But the ill-faith of the aggressors needs hardly be proved further. It is obvious that the aggressive acts of France and the United Kingdom, which are trying to settle by their own means and in a unilateral manner a question which was before the United Nations, constitutes a most flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter which was utterly unjustified.

We thought that the United Nations Charter had put an end to the reign of force and that the epoch of ultimatums and dictates, which brings to mind sad memories, had come to an end when the United Nations Charter was signed in San Francisco. A resort to force now can only take place in accordance with the principles and provisions of the charter.

France and the United Kingdom, which violated the charter, have assumed a heavy onus of responsibility before the world. This act is fraught with incalculable repercussions of which France and the United Kingdom will bear the consequences.

Egypt is being invaded. Its sovereignty is being jeopardized. But one thing comforts us. This is the response to this act of aggression on the part of world public opinion. Two prominent members of the Security Council—the United States of America and the Soviet Union—condemn this resort to force by France and the United Kingdom.

President Eisenhower and the Soviet leaders clearly declared that they were
opposed to the use of force for the settlement of this dispute. Numerous other leaders have made similar statements. Amongst them the head of the Yugoslav state, Marshal Tito, as well as the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru.

I would wish to quote their statements and many others, but I leave this for the distinguished representatives of the states themselves.

Even in the United Kingdom, members of the opposition party, the Labor party, strongly and vigorously condemn the policy of the British Government. Mr. Gaitskell, the leader of the opposition, stated in a speech yesterday in the House of Commons, and I shall quote him: "All I can say is that in taking this decision, in the view of the Opposition, the Government have committed an act of disastrous folly, whose tragic consequences we shall regret for years."

He went on to say, "I can only say that any impartial observer must recognize that this is a clear breach of the Charter of the United Nations." And he went on to say that "there are millions and millions of British people—as we believe, a majority of the nation—who are deeply shocked by the aggressive policy of the Government and who still believe that it is both wise and right that we should stand by the United Nations, the Commonwealth and the United States alliance."

The implications which are drawn from this are these—that even in the United Kingdom public opinion is far from being at one in approving the policy of the present government.

Mr. President, as I had the honor to tell the Security Council, the Egyptian Government, pending necessary measures by the Security Council and the General Assembly, has no choice but to defend itself and to preserve its rights against this armed unprovoked aggression. And we persevere in that attitude.

This act of war, committed by two members of the Security Council, constitutes a heavy blow to the United Nations Organization, to world peace and to all of mankind. France and the United Kingdom, in exerting their veto rights against resolutions moved in the Security Council, stultified the council's action.

Under the circumstances, the following the adoption of the Yugoslav resolution by the Security Council and in accordance with the provisions of the resolution uniting for peace, it is up to you gentlemen to take the necessary measures in order to prevent and remove threats to peace and to put an end to acts of aggression and breaches of the peace.

It is incumbent on you gentlemen to take grave decisions fraught with heavy consequences for the destiny of our organization and for the principles which govern the world in which we live.

Egypt is defending herself and will continue to do so. The question is in your hands. Condemn the aggressors, gentlemen, put an end to aggression.
Following an invitation of His Majesty, King Hussein, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, a meeting was held in Beirut on the 10th and 11th day of Rabi' al-Thann, 1376, of the Hegira [November 13 and 14, 1956], by His Majesty, King Saud Ibn Abdel Aziz, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; His Excellency, Abdel Fattah Mohammed el-Mughrabi, President of the Sovereignty Council in the Sudan; His Excellency, Shukri al-Kuwatly, President of the Republic of Syria, His Majesty, King Faisal, King of the Kingdom of Iraq, His Excellency, Camille Chamoun, President of the Republic of the Lebanon, His Excellency, Mustafa ben Halim, Premier of Libya on behalf of the King; His Excellency, Abdel Hamid Ghalib, Egyptian Ambassador in Beirut, on behalf of the President of the Republic of Egypt; His Highness, Emir Saif ul-Islam Mohammed al-Badr, Crown Prince of the Kingdom of Yemen, on behalf of the King.

The meeting was held to discuss the position arising from an aggression that had been carried out by Britain, France and Israel against Egypt and the Gaza Strip and also to reach an accord on what should be done to support Egypt in her glorious defense of the safety of her territories and sovereignty.

The consideration of the fact that this aggression against Egypt is held to be an aggression directed against all Arab states necessitates the unity of sovereignty and efforts to safeguard joint Arab interests.

The participants have expressed their satisfaction with the measures taken by the General Assembly of the United Nations by virtue of resolutions adopted by an overwhelming majority, Nov. 2, 3 and 7, 1956.

They have appreciated the effort made by the peace-loving states that contributed to the adoption of the resolution calling for the cessation of hostilities and an immediate withdrawal of the aggressive forces from the Egyptian territories and their return to behind the armistice lines.

The following has been unanimously agreed:

1. The need for the implementation of the previously mentioned resolution of the United Nations should Britain and France refuse to comply with the United Nations resolutions and fail to withdraw immediately and unconditionally from the Egyptian territories.

Moreover, should Israel oppose the United Nations resolutions, and fail to withdraw unconditionally her forces to behind the armistice line, and should the attitude of either Britain, France or Israel cause a conspiracy likely to lead to the resumption of hostilities, Britain, France and Israel should be regarded as collectively responsible for collaborating to continue the aggression.
Address to the Lok Sabha: Jawaharlal Nehru

November 16, 1956

On the 13th September 1956, the last day of the last session of the Lok Sabha, I made a statement in the House about the developments relating to the Suez Canal issue. Previous to that, on the 8th August, I had given to the House an account of the developments which followed the action of the Egyptian Government in nationalizing the Suez Canal Company.

Over two months have passed since my last statement on this subject in the Lok Sabha, and much has happened which has been reported in the public press and must be within the knowledge of Hon. Members. The matter was taken up by the Security Council, and there was broad approval of certain basic principles which should govern any agreement in regard to the Suez Canal. It was proposed that the chief parties to the dispute, namely, Egypt, the United Kingdom and France, should meet soon after to discuss this subject further on the basis of those principles.

That meeting did not take place. Instead, on the 29th October, Israel launched...
a sudden and premeditated attack on Egypt and large concentrations of Israeli troops made deep penetrations into Egyptian territory. The next day, the Governments of the United Kingdom and France sent an ultimatum to Egypt and Israel to the effect that if they did not stop fighting and withdraw their forces to ten miles on either side of the Suez Canal, British and French forces would intervene to stop the fighting. The ultimatum expired on the morning of the 31st October and, soon after, British and French forces commenced aerial bombardment of airfields and military objectives in Cairo and elsewhere in Egypt. This was followed a few days later by landings of airborne troops near Port Said and heavy fighting there.

As the House knows, India had viewed with grave apprehension the policy of the UK and French Governments after the nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company. In particular, the massing of troops and aircraft for the purpose of military operations in Egypt appeared to us to be a reversion to past colonial methods and an attempt to coerce Egypt by show of armed might. Indeed, it was stated by responsible statesmen in the United Kingdom and France that the regime in Egypt must be changed and, in particular, the Head of the State and of the Government of Egypt should be removed. We had hoped, however, that after the Security Council resolution, more peaceful methods would be adopted to solve this dispute. The starting of military operations against Egypt by the United Kingdom and France and, more particularly, the bombing of parts of Cairo city and other parts of Egypt came, therefore, as a profound shock not only to people in India but also to large numbers of people in other countries including the United Kingdom. This appeared to be a flagrant case of aggression by two strong powers against a weaker country with the purpose of enforcing their will, even to the extent of changing the Government of that country. This led to widespread world reactions against the Anglo-French action, and as the Security Council proved ineffective because of the exercise of the veto by the United Kingdom and France, the UN General Assembly, at an emergency session, expressed its disapproval of this action and demanded the stoppage of military operations in Egypt and the withdrawal of the armed forces of Israel, France and the United Kingdom from Egyptian territory. An uneasy armistice followed, and it was declared on the part of the United Kingdom, France and Israel that they would withdraw their armed forces, though this was made subject to certain conditions.

These developments gave some hope that peaceful methods would henceforth be employed and I ventured to say a few days ago that the situation had slightly improved. Today I am by no means sure that this improvement has taken place. There are numerous tendencies which may well lead, unless checked, to a rapid deterioration of the situation and a reversion to warfare. If unfortunately military operations begin again, it is possible that they might extend over a much wider area and might even develop into a major war.

Two days ago, the Prime Ministers of Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon and India issued a joint statement which has already been placed on the table of the House. That statement gives expression to the views of these Prime Ministers to the recent happenings in Egypt and in Hungary and points out the danger of war inherent in the present grave international situation.

In spite of the United Nations General Assembly, sporadic fighting continued and there has been no attempt at withdrawal of forces from Egyptian territory.
It would appear indeed that these forces have established themselves firmly on Egyptian territory and have no present intention of leaving it. If these foreign forces continue to remain on Egyptian territory, the situation is likely to deteriorate rapidly and bring the danger of fresh military operations nearer.

The Governments of the United Kingdom and France, though apparently accepting the U.N. resolution, have laid down certain conditions which are not consistent with that resolution. The Prime Minister of Israel has continued to insist that he will not evacuate Gaza. If the foreign forces are not wholly removed from Egyptian territory, this will amount to a clear violation of the U.N. resolution.

Meanwhile, India has agreed to send a contingent of her armed forces for the United Nations International Force and this contingent is expected to leave India by air today. This United Nations force will not be concerned with the Suez Canal issue as such, which can only be considered separately after peace has been fully established and all foreign forces removed. The main task of the international force is said to be to ensure that Israel remains within the demarcation lines set by the old Armistice Agreement.

The accounts that have appeared in the newspapers have not indicated that the fighting in and around Part Said was severe. We have received some accounts of this fighting and these show that the casualties, chiefly among Egyptian civilians were very heavy, running into many thousands. Conditions in Port Said have been distressing in the extreme. We are taking immediate steps to send a large stock of medicines by special aircraft to Egypt for purposes of relief.

The story of the past three and a half months, ever since the nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company, is full of tragic drama and events have happened which I would have thought could not possibly occur in this modern age. I find it a little difficult to deal with this record of unabashed aggression and deception. The explanations that have been given from time to time, contradict one another and exhibit an approach which is dangerous to the freedom of Asian and African countries and to world peace itself. It has brought misery and disaster, hatred and illwill, with no gain whatever. And, in addition, we live now under the threat of possible world war.

During all the controversies since the nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company, Egypt has conducted herself with a large measure of propriety and forbearance. Without the least justification, Egypt was attacked not only by Israel but also by the United Kingdom and France. Whether there was any previous consultation between the aggressor countries, I do not know. But it is obvious that their plans fitted in, and the Anglo-French attack helped Israel's aggression and was itself helped by it. Egypt, the victim of Israeli aggression, was attacked immediately after by the armed forces of the United Kingdom and France. It was only the widespread indignation of peoples not only in Asia and Africa but also in Europe and America and the action taken by the United Nations that put some check on this aggression. But it appears to me that the cease-fire having taken place, there is a tendency to complacency and to allow matters to drift. Indeed, there has even been some attempt made to minimise and justify this utterly unprovoked and brutal attack on Egypt. Attention has been diverted to some extent to the grave and distressing occurrences in Hungary.

Even as we were distressed by events in Egypt, we viewed with grave concern
and distress events in Hungary. It is possible that what happened in one of these countries produced its reactions in the other and both created a very serious international situation. But it is well to remember that though both deserve serious attention, the nature of each differed from the other. Neither can be held to justify the other.

We are concerned with an attack on freedom anywhere in the world. We are concerned also with strong nations dominating, by armed force, weaker countries...

I am convinced that it is not by war and violence that these problems will be settled or freedom established. I am convinced that colonialism, whatever new look it may put on, can revert to its old brutal self and the only remedy is for it to give place to freedom.

The world stands facing great danger, and it may be that the little wars we have had, are only a first round and bigger conflicts lie ahead. In particular, the ambitions of strong nations imperil weaker countries. The only hope lies in the United Nations, representing the world community, succeeding in putting an end to the law of force and substituting for it a more civilised method of dealing with problems. Today, the choice lies between the hydrogen bomb and the Panchsheel.

29 Resolutions on the Suez Crisis:
United Nations General Assembly

November, 1956

RESOLUTION 997 (ES-1)

The General Assembly,

Noting the disregard on many occasions by parties to the Israel-Arab armistice agreements of 1949 of the terms of such agreements, and that the armed forces of Israel have penetrated deeply into Egyptian territory in violation of the General Armistice agreement between Egypt and Israel of 24 February 1949,

Noting that armed forces of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are conducting military operations against Egyptian territory,

Noting that traffic through the Suez Canal is now interrupted to the serious prejudice of many nations,

Expressing its grave concern over these developments,

1. 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;

2. Urges the parties to the armistice agreements promptly to withdraw all forces behind the armistice lines, to desist from raids across the armistice lines into neighboring territory, and to observe scrupulously the provisions of the armistice agreements;

3. Recommends that all Member States refrain from introducing military goods.
in the area of hostilities and in general refrain from any acts which would delay or prevent the implementation of the present resolution;

4 Urges that, upon the cease-fire being effective, steps be taken to reopen the Suez Canal and restore secure freedom of navigation,

5 Requests the Secretary-General to observe and report promptly on the compliance with the present resolution to the Security Council and to the General Assembly, for such further action as they may deem appropriate in accordance with the Charter,

6. Decides to remain in emergency session pending compliance with the present resolution.

562nd plenary meeting, 2 November 1956

RESOLUTION 998 (ES-I)

The General Assembly,

Bearing in mind the urgent necessity of facilitating compliance with its resolution 997 (ES-I) of 2 November 1956,

Requests, as a matter of priority, the Secretary-General to submit to it within forty-eight hours a plan for the setting up, with the consent of the nations concerned, of an emergency international United Nations Force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in accordance with all the terms of the aforementioned resolution.

563rd plenary meeting, 4 November 1956.

RESOLUTION 999 (ES-I)

The General Assembly,

Noting with regret that not all the parties concerned have yet agreed to comply with the provisions of its resolution 997 (ES-I) of 2 November 1956.

Noting the special priority given in that resolution to an immediate cease-fire and, as part thereof, to the halting of the movement of military forces and arms into the area.

Noting further that the resolution urged the parties to the armistice agreements promptly to withdraw all forces behind the armistice lines, to desist from raids across the armistice lines into neighboring territory, and to observe scrupulously the provisions of the armistice agreements.

1 Reaffirms its resolution 997 (ES-I), and once again calls upon the parties immediately to comply with the provisions of the said resolution

2. Authorizes the Secretary-General immediately to arrange with the parties concerned for the implementation of the cease-fire and the halting of the movement of military forces and arms into the area, and requests him to report compliance forthwith and, in any case, not later than twelve hours from the time of adoption of the present resolution;

3. Requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of the Chief of Staff and the members of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, to obtain compliance of the withdrawal of all forces behind the armistice lines;
4. Decides to meet again immediately on receipt of the Secretary-General’s report referred to in paragraph 2 of the present resolution.

563rd plenary meeting, 4 November 1956.

RESOLUTION 1000 (ES-I)

The General Assembly,

Having requested the Secretary-General, in its resolution 998 (ES-I) of 4 November 1956, to submit to it a plan for an emergency international United Nations Force, for the purposes stated,

Noting with satisfaction the first report of the Secretary-General on the plan, and having in mind particularly paragraph 4 of that report,

1. Establishes a United Nations Command for an emergency international Force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in accordance with all the terms of General Assembly resolution 997 (ES-I) of 2 November 1956;

2. Appoints, on an emergency basis, the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, Major-General E L M Burns, as Chief of the Command;

3. Authorizes the Chief of the Command immediately to recruit, from the observer corps of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, a limited number of officers who shall be nationals of countries other than those having permanent membership in the Security Council, and further authorizes him, in consultation with the Secretary-General, to undertake the recruitment directly, from various Member States other than the permanent members of the Security Council, of the additional number of officers needed;

4 Invites the Secretary-General to take such administrative measures as may be necessary for the prompt execution of the actions envisaged in the present resolution.

565th plenary meeting, 5 November 1956.

RESOLUTION 1001 (ES-I)

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 997 (ES-I) of 2 November 1956 concerning the cease-fire, withdrawal of troops and other matters related to the military operations in Egyptian territory, as well as its resolution 998 (ES-I) of 4 November 1956 concerning the request to the Secretary-General to submit a plan for an emergency international United Nations Force,

Having established by its resolution 1000 (ES-I) of 5 November 1956 a United Nations Command for an emergency international Force, having appointed the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization as Chief of the Command with authorization to him to begin the recruitment of officers for the Command, and having invited the Secretary-General to take the administrative measures necessary for the prompt execution of that resolution,

Noting with appreciation the second and final report of the Secretary-General on the plan for an emergency international United Nations Force as requested in General Assembly resolution 998 (ES-I), and having examined that plan,
1. Expresses its approval of the guiding principles for the organization and functioning of the emergency international United Nations Force as expounded in paragraphs 6 to 9 of the Secretary-General’s report;

2. Concurs in the definition of the functions of the Force as stated in paragraph 12 of the Secretary-General’s report;

3. Invites the Secretary-General to continue discussions with Governments of Member States concerning offers of participation in the Force, toward the objective of its balanced composition;

4. Requests the Chief of the Command, in consultation with the Secretary-General as regards size and composition, to proceed forthwith with the full organization of the Force;

5. Approves provisionally the basic rule concerning the financing of the Force laid down in paragraph 15 of the Secretary-General’s report;

6. Establishes an Advisory Committee composed of one representative from each of the following countries: Brazil, Canada, Ceylon, Colombia, India, Norway and Pakistan, and requests this Committee, whose Chairman shall be the Secretary-General, to undertake the development of those aspects of the planning for the Force and its operation not already dealt with by the General Assembly and which do not fall within the area of the direct responsibility of the Chief of the Command;

7. Authorizes the Secretary-General to issue all regulations and instructions which may be essential to the effective functioning of the Force, following consultation with the Committee aforementioned, and to take all other necessary administrative and executive action;

8. Determines that, following the fulfilment of the immediate responsibilities defined for it in operative paragraphs 6 and 7 above, the Advisory Committee shall continue to assist the Secretary-General in the responsibilities falling to him under the present and other relevant resolutions;

9. Decides that the Advisory Committee, in the performance of its duties, shall be empowered to request, through the usual procedures, the convening of the General Assembly and to report to the Assembly whenever matters arise which, in its opinion, are of such urgency and importance as to require consideration by the General Assembly itself;

10. Requests all Member States to afford assistance as necessary to the United Nations Command in the performance of its functions, including arrangements for passage to and from the area involved.

567th plenary meeting,
7 November 1956.

RESOLUTION 1002 (ES-I)

The General Assembly,
Recalling its resolutions 997 (ES-I) of 2 November 1956, 998 (ES-I) and 999 (ES-I) of 4 November 1956, and 1000 (ES-I) of 5 November 1956, adopted by overwhelming majorities,
Noting in particular that the General Assembly, by its resolution 1000 (ES-I), established a United Nations Command for an emergency international Force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in accordance with all the terms of its resolution 997 (ES-I),
1. Reaffirms the above-mentioned resolutions;
2 Calls once again upon Israel immediately to withdraw all its forces behind the armistice lines established by the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel of 24 February 1949;

3 Calls once again upon the United Kingdom and France immediately to withdraw all their forces from Egyptian territory, consistently with the above-mentioned resolutions;

4 Urges the Secretary-General to communicate the present resolution to the parties concerned, and requests him promptly to report to the General Assembly on the compliance with this resolution

567th plenary meeting, 7 November 1956.

RESOLUTION 1003 (ES-I)

The General Assembly,

1. Decides to place on the provisional agenda of its eleventh regular session, as a matter of priority, the question on the agenda of its first emergency special session;

2. Refers to its eleventh regular session, for consideration, the records of the meetings and the documents of its first emergency special session;

3. Decides that, notwithstanding paragraph 1 above, the first emergency special session may continue to consider the question, if necessary, prior to the eleventh regular session of the Assembly

572nd plenary meeting, 10 November 1956