

Soviet People
AGAINST
AGGRESSION
In Egypt

★





CONTENTS

**Soviet People
AGAINST
AGGRESSION
In Egypt**



PRESS OFFICE OF THE U.S.S.R. EMBASSY
354 Stewart Street
O t t a w a — C a n a d a

Soviet People
AGAINST
AGGRESSION
in Europe

Published by the
Soviet People
in Europe

CONTENTS

Statement By Soviet Government On Armed Aggression Against Egypt	9
From K. E. Voroshilov's Speech At A Reception In Honour Of Syrian President, Shukri Kouwatly	10
From The Joint Soviet-Syrian Communique	11
Note of Government of USSR To Governments of Britain and France	12
Message of N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of USSR Council of Ministers, to President D. Eisenhower of United States ...	14
Message of N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of USSR Council of Ministers, to Sir Anthony Eden, Prime Minister of Great Britain	16
Message of N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of USSR Council of Ministers, to Guy Mollet, President of Council of Ministers of France	18
Message of N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of USSR Council of Ministers, To Ben Gurion, Prime Minister of Israel	20
Message of D. T. Shepilov, Soviet Foreign Minister, to Jelal Abdoh, President of U.N. Security Council	22
From The Report of M. A. Suslov at Celebration Meeting of Moscow City Soviet of Working People's Deputies On November 6, 1956	24
TASS Statement	26
Message of N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of USSR Council of Ministers, to British Prime Minister, Sir Anthony Eden ..	28
Message of N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of USSR Council of Ministers, to Guy Mollet, President of Council of Ministers of France	31
Message of N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of USSR Council of Ministers, to Prime Minister Ben Gurion of Israel	34
Soviet Government's Statement on Disarmament and Easing of International Tension	37
From the Speech by N. S. Khrushchev at Reception In Kremlin In Honour of Delegation of Central Committee of Polish People's Republic	44
From the Speech by N. S. Khrushchev at a Reception In The Polish Embassy In Moscow On November 18	45
From the Joint Statement In Connection With Talks Between Delegation of Central Committee of CPSU and Government of Soviet Union and Delegation of Central Committee of PUWP and Government of Polish People's Republic	46
It Is United Nations' Duty To Bar Way To Forces of Aggression and Reaction	47
To Put An End To The Aggression Against Egypt and To Liquidate The Aftermath of The Aggression	53

CONTENTS

1	Statement of the Secretary of the Board of Health	1
2	Report of the Board of Health	2
3	Report of the Board of Health	3
4	Report of the Board of Health	4
5	Report of the Board of Health	5
6	Report of the Board of Health	6
7	Report of the Board of Health	7
8	Report of the Board of Health	8
9	Report of the Board of Health	9
10	Report of the Board of Health	10
11	Report of the Board of Health	11
12	Report of the Board of Health	12
13	Report of the Board of Health	13
14	Report of the Board of Health	14
15	Report of the Board of Health	15
16	Report of the Board of Health	16
17	Report of the Board of Health	17
18	Report of the Board of Health	18
19	Report of the Board of Health	19
20	Report of the Board of Health	20
21	Report of the Board of Health	21
22	Report of the Board of Health	22
23	Report of the Board of Health	23
24	Report of the Board of Health	24
25	Report of the Board of Health	25
26	Report of the Board of Health	26
27	Report of the Board of Health	27
28	Report of the Board of Health	28
29	Report of the Board of Health	29
30	Report of the Board of Health	30
31	Report of the Board of Health	31
32	Report of the Board of Health	32
33	Report of the Board of Health	33
34	Report of the Board of Health	34
35	Report of the Board of Health	35
36	Report of the Board of Health	36
37	Report of the Board of Health	37
38	Report of the Board of Health	38
39	Report of the Board of Health	39
40	Report of the Board of Health	40
41	Report of the Board of Health	41
42	Report of the Board of Health	42
43	Report of the Board of Health	43
44	Report of the Board of Health	44
45	Report of the Board of Health	45
46	Report of the Board of Health	46
47	Report of the Board of Health	47
48	Report of the Board of Health	48
49	Report of the Board of Health	49
50	Report of the Board of Health	50

PREFACE

During recent weeks the attention of the people of the world has been focussed on the tragic events in the Near East. All humanity was shocked by the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt. The United Nations Organization, this world forum, expressing the opinion of the majority of mankind, decisively condemned the aggressive actions against Egypt and demanded the immediate withdrawal of all Anglo-French-Israeli forces from Egyptian territory.

The Soviet people, permanent champions of peace, also decisively condemned the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt, and demanded that sanctions be applied against the aggressors.

In this pamphlet we have brought together the main documents expressing the opinion of the Soviet people on the question of the armed aggression in Egypt — Statements of the Government of the USSR and of Soviet leaders, speeches by the head of the Soviet delegation to the United Nations, and some other documents.

In putting this material at the disposal of Canadian readers, the Press Office of the Soviet Embassy in Canada hopes that they will provide a better understanding of the Soviet point of view on the developments in the Near East.

STATEMENT BY SOVIET GOVERNMENT ON ARMED AGGRESSION AGAINST EGYPT

Egypt has fallen victim to aggression. Her territory has been invaded by the Israeli forces and there is an imminent danger of a landing by the British and French forces.

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

The action of the Israeli Government constitutes an armed aggression and an open breach of the U.N. Charter. The facts indicate that the invasion by the Israeli forces has been manifestly calculated to be used as an excuse for the Western powers, primarily Britain and France, to bring their troops into the territory of the Arab states, notably, into the Suez Canal zone. To cover up their aggressive actions the Western powers are referring to the U.S.-British-French colonialist declaration of 1950 which has been unanimously rejected by all the Arab states. The Government of Israel, acting as a tool of imperialistic quarters bent on restoring colonial rule in the East, has challenged all the Arab peoples, all the peoples of the East fighting against colonialism. The course of action which the ruling extremist circles of Israel have taken is a criminal one and dangerous, above all, to the state of Israel itself and to its future.

Following the armed attack by Israel, the Governments of the United Kingdom and France presented an ultimatum to Egypt on October 30, demanding key positions for their forces on Egyptian territory — in Suez, Port Said, and Ismailia — allegedly to prevent hostilities between Israel and Egypt. In spite of the fact that the Government of Egypt, acting in defence of the country's sovereignty and territorial integrity, has declined this demand, Britain and France have dispatched their troops for a landing on Egyptian territory. The Governments of the United Kingdom and France have thus taken the course of armed intervention against Egypt, riding roughshod over the legal rights of the sovereign Egyptian nation.

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

The Government of the Soviet Union emphatically condemns the act of aggression against Egypt by the Governments of Britain, France and Israel. The freedom-loving peoples of the world fervently sympathize with the Egyptian people who are waging a righteous struggle in defence of their national independence.

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

The Soviet Government holds that all responsibility for dangerous consequences of the aggressive actions against Egypt will lie squarely on the Governments which have taken the line of disturbing peace and security, the line of aggression.

October 31, 1956.

**FROM K. E. VOROSHILOV'S SPEECH
AT A RECEPTION IN HONOUR OF
SYRIAN PRESIDENT. SHUKRI KOUWATLY**

"In its statement of October 31 the Soviet Government resolutely condemned the aggressive actions of Britain, France, and Israel with respect to Egypt and qualified them as actions incompatible with the aims and principles of the United Nations. By now it has already become absolutely clear to everyone that Israel is totally in the hands of the imperialist circles which are striving for the restoration of their colonial domination in the East.

"The armed aggression of Britain, France, and Israel against Egypt was committed at the moment when all the pre-requisites for a peaceful settlement of the Suez issue had been created. This factor attaches an especially ominous nature to this aggression — it endangers the entire Arab East, the honour, the freedom and the independence of these countries.

"Noteworthy is the fact that the aggression against Egypt was committed by one of the sponsors of the Baghdad bloc.

"This is a new indication of the fact that the Baghdad bloc pursues far-reaching aggressive and colonial aims. It is not without reason that the Arab countries see in it a direct threat to their national independence and are resolutely rejecting this bloc. We are of the opinion that the sooner this creation of the colonialists is buried the stronger will become the friendship and peace between the Eastern peoples."

"Pravda", November 4, 1956.

— ★ —

FROM THE JOINT SOVIET-SYRIAN COMMUNIQUE

The leaders of the Soviet Union and the Syrian Republic, expressing their indignation at the armed intervention of foreign states against Egypt, note that Egypt is the victim of naked and unprovoked aggression on the part of Israel, France, and Britain, and the armed intervention of British and French forces against Egypt is a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the Bandung Conference decisions, an open breach of the peace and security of the nations. The bombing of Egypt by the Anglo-French air force is a criminal act which is condemned by the whole world and exposes the coalition and complot of Britain, France, and Israel against peace in the Near and Middle East and against the security of its peoples.

Both sides state that non-implementation of the resolution of the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on a cease-fire and withdrawal of armed forces from Egyptian territory would be an action directly designed to undermine the importance and prestige of the United Nations which was specially founded to maintain peace and the security of the peoples. In view of this the sides consider it necessary that all nations, guided by the peaceful principles and purposes of the United Nations, should exert efforts to end aggression, to protect the sovereignty of Egypt, and to achieve the implementation of the resolution carried by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

"Pravda", November 5, 1956

— ★ —

NOTE OF GOVERNMENT OF USSR TO GOVERNMENTS OF BRITAIN AND FRANCE

On November 4, the Soviet Foreign Ministry sent the United Kingdom Embassy the following note:

"The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR on the instructions of the Soviet Government requests the United Kingdom Embassy to bring the following to the notice of Her Majesty's Government.

"The Soviet Government has already expressed its attitude towards the aggression of the United Kingdom, France, and Israel against Egypt, which found its expression in the Soviet Government's Statement of October 31 and in the speeches by the Soviet representative in the United Nations, the majority of whose members demanded an end to the unprovoked aggression against Egypt. The continuing bombing of Egyptian towns and installations by the British and French air forces are justly condemned by the peaceable peoples of all countries who resolutely demand an end to the aggression against the Egyptian people.

"The Government of the Soviet Union has now been informed that the command of the British and French naval forces has declared certain zones of the Eastern Mediterranean and the Northern Red Sea closed to merchant shipping.

"These actions by Britain and France run counter to the generally accepted principle of freedom of navigation on the open seas which include the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, and in fact mean the establishment by the governments of the United Kingdom and France of a naval blockade of the shores of Egypt and a number of other Mediterranean states.

"The establishment of zones closed to shipping in the Mediterranean and the Red Sea makes the use of the Suez Canal impossible and thus means an obvious violation by the United Kingdom and France of the Constantinople Convention of 1888 on the Suez Canal. It will be recalled that under Article 1 of the Convention the parties, including the United Kingdom and France, undertook that the canal should always be free and open to every vessel in time of war as well as in time of peace. The convention points out that the canal will never be blockaded.

"The Soviet Government regards the afore-said actions by the United Kingdom and France as an act of aggression, affecting the interests not only of Egypt but of other states as well. The Soviet Government cannot disregard these unlawful actions by the United Kingdom and France, especially bearing in mind that they had been taken after the overwhelming majority of the United Nations' General Assembly in the discussion of the military operations conducted by the United Kingdom, France, and Israel against Egypt went on record in favour of an immediate cease-fire, discontinuation of military operations, and resumption of shipping through the Suez Canal.

"In setting up closed zones that impede the freedom of navigation in the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, the governments of the United Kingdom and France are disregarding the decision of the United Nations and are further aggravating the situation in the Near East.

"The Government of the Soviet Union resolutely protests against these unlawful actions taken by the United Kingdom and France and declares that responsibility for all possible consequences of such actions rests with the British and French Governments."

An identical note has been forwarded to the French Embassy.

— ★ —

**MESSAGE OF N. A. BULGANIN,
CHAIRMAN OF USSR COUNCIL OF MINISTERS,
TO PRESIDENT D. EISENHOWER OF UNITED STATES**

The Kremlin, Moscow, November 5, 1956.

Esteemed Mr. President,

At this anxious and crucial moment for the cause of universal peace I appeal to you on behalf of the Soviet Government.

A week has already passed since the armed forces of Britain, France, and Israel (which is obedient to the will of outside forces) have attacked Egypt without any cause, bringing death and destruction with them. British and French aircraft are inhumanly bombing Egyptian airdromes, ports, structures, cities, and inhabited centres. Anglo-French troops have landed on Egyptian territory. Tremendous values created by the efforts of the Egyptian people are perishing from the fire of the occupationists; the human losses are increasing day by day. Before the eyes of the entire world, a war of aggression is developing against Egypt, against the Arab peoples, whose entire guilt consists in the fact that they are defending their freedom and independence.

The situation in Egypt calls for immediate and most decisive actions on the part of the United Nations. If such actions are not taken the United Nations will lose its prestige in the eyes of all mankind and will collapse.

The Soviet Union and the United States of America are both permanent members of the Security Council and are two great powers possessing all modern types of weapons, including atomic and hydrogen weapons. We bear special responsibility for stopping the war and restoring peace and tranquillity in the area of the Near and Middle East.

We are convinced that if the Governments of the USSR and the United States firmly declare their will to ensure peace, and come out against aggression then aggression will be ended and there will be no war.

Mr. President, in these ominous hours when the loftiest moral principles, the foundation and aims of the United Nations, are put to the test, the Soviet Government addresses a proposal to the Government of the United States of America to establish close co-operation in order to curb aggression and stop further bloodshed.

The United States possesses a strong navy in the Mediterranean zone. The Soviet Union also possesses a strong navy and powerful aviation. The joint and immediate use of these means by the United States of America and the Soviet Union, on the decision of the United Nations, would be a reliable guarantee to terminate aggression against the Egyptian people, against the countries of the Arab East.

The Soviet Government appeals to the Government of the United States of America to pool their efforts in the United Nations for the adoption of resolute measures to curb the aggression.

The Soviet Government has already submitted corresponding proposals to the Security Council and the Extraordinary Special Session of the General Assembly.

Such joint steps by the United States and the Soviet Union do not threaten the interests of Britain and France. The popular masses of Britain and France do not want war, they, like our peoples, want to preserve peace. Many other countries besides Britain and France are also interested in immediate pacification and in the restoration of the normal functioning of the Suez Canal which has been interrupted by the hostilities. The aggression against Egypt was by no means committed for the sake of freedom of navigation on the Suez Canal, which had been ensured. This predatory war was unleashed to restore the colonial regime in the East that had been overthrown by the peoples. If this war is not curbed, it is fraught with danger and can develop into a third world war.

If the Soviet Union and the United States of America support the victim of aggression, the other countries, members of the United Nations, will join us in our endeavours. This will greatly enhance the United Nations' prestige and peace will be restored and strengthened.

The Soviet Government is ready to enter into immediate negotiations with the Government of the United States concerning the practical implementation of the afore-stated proposals so that effective actions for peace could be made within the next few hours.

At this grave moment of history when the destinies of the whole of the Arab East and, at the same time, the destinies of peace are being decided, I await for your positive reply.

Respectfully yours

N. BULGANIN

His Excellency Dwight D. Eisenhower,
President of the United States of America
Washington.

— ★ —

**MESSAGE OF N. A. BULGANIN, CHAIRMAN OF USSR
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS, TO SIR ANTHONY EDEN,
PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN**

The Kremlin, Moscow, November 5, 1956.

Esteemed Mr. Prime Minister,

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

The Special Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly adopted a decision on the immediate discontinuation of military operations and the withdrawal of foreign troops from Egyptian territory. Disregarding this, Britain, France, and Israel are intensifying military operations, are continuing the savage bombing of Egyptian towns and villages, have landed paratroops on Egyptian territory, are turning into ruins her inhabited localities, and are killing civilians.

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

The motives cited by the British Government in justifying the attack on Egypt are absolutely groundless. At first the British Government stated that it interfered in the conflict between Israel and Egypt in order to prevent the Suez Canal from becoming a zone of military operations. After the Anglo-French intervention, the Suez Canal area has become a zone of military operations and navigation through the canal has been dislocated, which impairs the interests of nations using this canal.

Attempts to justify the aggression by reference to the interest of Britain and France in the freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal are also groundless. We understand your special interest in the canal. This, however, does not entitle you to conduct military operations against the Egyptian people. At the same time, the Governments of the United Kingdom and France cannot assume the role of judges in the question of the means of securing freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal inasmuch as many other states that denounce the aggressive actions of the United Kingdom and France, and demand the maintenance of peace and tranquillity in the Near and Middle East have no less interest in it. Besides, it is well known that freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal was fully ensured by Egypt.

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

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

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

Deeply disturbed by the developments in the Near and Middle East, and guided by the interests of the maintenance of universal peace, we think that the Government of Britain should listen to the voice of reason and stop the war in Egypt. We call upon you, upon the parliament, upon the Labour Party, the trade unions, upon the whole of the British people: put an end to the armed aggression, stop the bloodshed. The war in Egypt can extend to other countries and turn into a third world war.

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

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

With sincere respect

N. BULGANIN

His Excellency,
Sir Anthony Eden,
Prime Minister of the United Kingdom
London.

— ★ —

**MESSAGE OF N. A. BULGANIN, CHAIRMAN OF USSR
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS, TO GUY MOLLET,
PRESIDENT OF COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF FRANCE**

The Kremlin, Moscow, November 5, 1956

Esteemed Mr. President,

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

I must tell you with all frankness that the war launched by France and the United Kingdom with the use of Israel against the Egyptian state is fraught with very dangerous consequences for universal peace.

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

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

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

During our meeting in Moscow last May you said that socialist ideals inspired you in all your work. But what has socialism in common with the predatory armed attack on Egypt, which is an open colonial war? How can one square the ideas of socialism with the treacherous attack by France on a country which but recently achieved independence and which has not enough arms for its defence?

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

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

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

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

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

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

With sincere respect,

N. BULGANIN

His Excellency

Guy Mollet,

President of the Council of Ministers of France,

Paris.

— ★ —

**MESSAGE OF N. A. BULGANIN,
CHAIRMAN OF USSR COUNCIL OF MINISTERS,
TO BEN GURION, PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL**

The Kremlin, Moscow, November 5, 1956

Mr. Prime Minister,

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

At the Extraordinary Special Session of the General Assembly the overwhelming majority of the countries of the world also denounced the act of aggression perpetrated against the Egyptian state and called upon the governments of Israel, Britain, and France to immediately stop military operations and to withdraw the invading forces from Egyptian territory.

All peace-loving mankind is branding with indignation the criminal actions of the aggressors that encroached upon the territorial integrity, sovereignty, and independence of the Egyptian state.

Disregarding this, the Government of Israel, acting as an instrument of external imperialist forces, continues the reckless adventure, challenging all the peoples of the East — who are fighting against colonialism, for their freedom and independence — all the peace-loving peoples of the world.

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

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

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

We expect that the Government of Israel will change its mind, before it is too late, and will discontinue its military operations against Egypt. We call upon you, upon Parliament, upon the working people of the State of Israel, upon the entire people of Israel: put an end to the aggression, stop the bloodshed, withdraw your troops from Egyptian territory.

Taking into account the situation which has arisen, the Soviet Government has decided to instruct its Ambassador in Tel-Aviv to depart from Israel and to leave for Moscow immediately.

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

N. BULGANIN

His Excellency
Mr. Ben Gurion,
Prime Minister of the State of Israel,
Tel-Aviv.

— ★ —

**MESSAGE OF D. T. SHEPILOV, SOVIET FOREIGN
MINISTER TO JELAL ABDOH, PRESIDENT OF
U. N. SECURITY COUNCIL**

Mr. Jelal Abdoh,
President of the Security Council,
New York.

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

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

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

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

The Security Council

Bearing in mind that the resolution adopted by the Emergency Session of the General Assembly on November 2, 1956, and recommending that the Governments of the United Kingdom, France and Israel immediately put an end to the military operations against Egypt and withdraw their forces from Egyptian territory, has not been implemented by the afore-said states and that the military operations against Egypt continue.

Proceeding from the need of taking immediate measures to curb and Israel,

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

The Security Council in conformity with Article 42 of the United Nations Charter considers it necessary that all the United Nations member-states, and primarily the U.S.A. and the USSR, as permanent members of the Security Council, which have powerful air and naval forces, render armed and other assistance to the victim of aggression, the Egyptian Republic, by dispatching naval and air forces, military units, volunteers, instructors, materiel and other aid if the United Kingdom, France, and Israel do not comply with this resolution in the stated time.

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

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

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

D. SHEPILOV,

Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR

November 5, 1956.

— ★ —

**FROM THE REPORT OF M. A. SUSLOV AT
CELEBRATION MEETING OF MOSCOW CITY SOVIET
OF WORKING PEOPLE'S DEPUTIES ON NOVEMBER 6, 1956**

While the peace-loving countries and peoples are exerting every effort to resolve disputed international issues peacefully, through negotiation, the bellicose-minded circles of some capitalist countries are deliberately aggravating the situation in some parts of the world, are stubbornly refusing to solve the disarmament problem, and are building up an aggressive army in Western Germany at an accelerated pace.

Very recently an armed aggression against Egypt has been unleashed by the intrigues of these circles. We cannot fail to see that the armed attack of Israel on Egypt was inspired by definite imperialist circles, of Britain and France in the first place, who immediately made use of this attack as a pretext for introducing their forces into the territory of Egypt.

Thus, at the time when the peoples of the world rightly expected a further detente in the international situation the ruling circles of Britain and France organized an armed intervention against Egypt and hurled a challenge to the cause of peace. The air and naval forces of these powers are bombing peaceful Egyptian cities. The blood of a peaceful population is again being spilled. Mankind is once more confronted with the fact of aggression organized by the imperialists.

The meaning of the present developments is perfectly clear to the broad public, irrespective of how the aggressors twist and turn. The war against Egypt was organized by the colonial circles of Britain and France. They can in no way reconcile themselves to the fact that the peoples of the colonies are ceasing to be obedient tools in their hands and "dare" to set up independent states. The war against Egypt is a desperate attempt of the old imperialists to stop, with the help of guns and bombs, the steady disintegration of the colonial system, to intimidate the peoples of the East who are winning their freedom and to impose on them the yoke of colonialism once again.

But the breaking up of the colonial system of imperialism is the irreversible objective process of the middle of the Twentieth Century. Over 1,200-million people in Asian and African countries have already cast off the yoke of foreign oppression for ever. The sovereign states of Asia represent an active force in the struggle for the preservation of general peace, for the independence and progress of all the peoples. All the attempts of the imperialist circles to turn back the clock of history are hopeless undertakings which are doomed to failure. Aggression against the freedom-loving people of Egypt will prove to be a boomerang for its organizers; a mighty wave of indignation at the attack of the British and French imperialists on Egypt is sweeping the world, first and foremost in all the Asian and African countries, and, more directly, in the Near and Middle Eastern countries.

Energetic actions of all peace-loving states and peoples are needed to defend the freedom and life of Egypt's population, to prevent the war from spreading to other areas. Taking into account the fact that the overwhelming majority of member-states of the United Nations and the entire world public condemn the act of aggression committed by Britain and France, the United Nations can and must compel the aggressors to cease hostilities against Egypt at once, to withdraw their forces from her territory, and to commence negotiations for the peaceful settlement of the Suez issue.

As for the Soviet Union, our Government, expressing the will of all Soviet people, not only vigorously denounced the aggressive actions of Britain, France, and Israel against Egypt but also demanded the immediate application of sanctions against the aggressors. (Stormy applause.) The Soviet government has proposed to the United Nations and to the President of the United States to use together with other members of the United Nations, naval and air forces to end the war in Egypt, to curb aggression. (Prolonged applause.)

The Soviet people profoundly sympathize with the courageous Egyptian people and wish them success in their struggle for their freedom and independence! (Stormy, prolonged applause.)



TASS STATEMENT

TASS is authorized to state the following :

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

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

Noting as a positive fact the cessation of hostilities against Egypt, apprehension is expressed in the leading circles of the Soviet Union lest these moves of the circles which unleashed the aggressive war against Egypt should be a mere manoeuvre designed to gain time, to obtain a respite for an even greater accumulation of forces with the view of resuming the aggressive war against Egypt and other countries of the Near East on an even greater scale.

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

All this obligates the peoples to be on the alert and to vigilantly follow the machinations of the aggressors.

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

The position of the Soviet Government has been expressed in the letters of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, N. A. Bulganin, to President D. Eisenhower of the United States, to Prime Minister Sir A. Eden of Britain, to the President of the Council of Ministers of France, Guy Mollet and to Prime Minister Ben Gurion of Israel, dated November 5, and also in the appeal of the Soviet Government to the Security Council; and the Soviet Union is fully determined to carry into life the statements contained therein unless the aggression against Egypt is ended in compliance with the decisions of the Special Emergency Session of the United Nations General Assembly.

The Soviet people are deeply concerned over the destinies of peace and are fully aware of the consequences to which the expansion of the armed conflict could lead if the aggressors in Egypt are not rebuffed. The Soviet people resolutely denounce all attempts to reimpose the yoke of colonial oppression on the Egyptian people by force of arms.

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

The Soviet Union has always been, and remains, a consistent champion of friendship, co-operation and peaceful coexistence of states irrespective of their social system. This policy stems from the very nature of the Soviet state, from the behests of its founder, great Lenin. But the Soviet people have never been, nor will they be, passive onlookers in the case of international outrages when some or other colonial powers try to re-enslave, by force of arms, the states of the East which have become independent.

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

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

“Pravda,” November 11, 1956

— ★ —

**MESSAGE OF N. A. BULGANIN, CHAIRMAN OF USSR
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS, TO
BRITISH PRIME MINISTER SIR ANTHONY EDEN**

On November 6, N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received through the United Kingdom Embassy in the USSR a message from Sir Anthony Eden, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

On November 15, A. A. Gromyko, First Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR, handed Sir William Hayter, United Kingdom Ambassador in Moscow, a message of reply from N. A. Bulganin to Sir Anthony Eden.

Below is the pertinent section of the message of reply from N. A. Bulganin to Sir Anthony Eden:

The Kremlin, Moscow, November 15, 1956.

Esteemed Mr. Prime Minister,

I have received your reply to my letter of November 5, in which we expressed our attitude towards the situation in the Near East in connection with the military operations of Britain, France, and Israel against Egypt.

The Soviet Government would like to express its satisfaction at the fact that the military operations in Egypt have now been discontinued. We are gratified that the Government of the United Kingdom took the decision to cease fire against Egypt thus meeting the desire of the peoples, including wide sections of the people of Britain itself, and the demand of the special session of the United Nations' General Assembly on a cease-fire and withdrawal of the British, French, and Israeli forces from Egyptian territory.

I believe that it is our common aim at the present time not to fan the conflict but to search for ways to eliminate the dangerous situation for peace in the Near and Middle East, to settle unsolved problems peacefully. In this connection we feel some anxiety over the fact that, notwithstanding the cease-fire in Egypt, the withdrawal of the British, French, and Israeli forces from Egyptian territory is being delayed and that, according to certain information, armed forces are even being built up in that area. I think that such a situation is dangerous. This may lead not to a settlement but to a further aggravation of the situation. We hope that you will not take steps which could be regarded as preparation for further military operations against Egypt. You will certainly not deny that the situation that has developed in that area is very tense and that one should not sow a storm, for in the given situation a single spark may rekindle the fire there.

You remember, of course, that during our meetings in London and in our personal correspondence we turned your attention in the most friendly way to the dangerous consequences for the United Kingdom in case aggressive military actions were opened against Egypt. We regret that you did not pay any attention to this at the time. But what was the result of the intervention against Egypt? Many calamities were brought upon Egypt — Egyptian towns and villages were destroyed, thousands of innocent people were killed or maimed, serious damage was caused to the Suez Canal, and Egypt's trade and economy were impaired.

But Britain also has not achieved anything by the war against Egypt; she has only suffered heavy damage both politically and economically. The war closed the Suez Canal for the ships of Britain and other countries, it has deprived Britain of a great part of the Near-Eastern oil, it has confronted her with large military expenditures and internal economic difficulties. The war has undermined international positions of Britain, aroused profound hatred of Arab and other peoples of Asian and African countries towards the states that had taken the path of aggression, worsened Britain's relations with many countries. There can hardly be any doubt that all this will unfavourably tell in Britain for a long time.

I avail myself of the opportunity, Mr. Prime Minister, to resolutely refute fabrications disseminated in Britain, by officials, among others, that the Soviet Union allegedly pursues some special aims in the Near-Eastern area directed against the interests of the Western powers.

The Soviet Government maintains that for restoration of peace and tranquillity in the Near East and for liquidation of the consequences of the aggression against Egypt it is necessary in the first place that the Governments of Britain, France, and Israel should immediately withdraw from Egypt all their invading troops as demanded by the Government of Egypt and as provided for by the resolution of the Emergency Session of the United Nations' General Assembly.

At the same time we maintain that since Israel which committed aggression against Egypt has clearly expressed predatory intentions with regard to the Arab states, it is necessary to find such a decision through joint efforts as would put an end to Israel's provocations with regard to the Arab states; provocations which have repeatedly occurred in the past and which have been condemned by the Security Council. This would be of great importance for stabilizing the situation in that area and for eliminating the consequences of aggression against Egypt.

Justice demands that Britain, France, and Israel should recompense Egypt for all damages caused as a result of: the destruction of Egyptian cities and populated localities, the discontinuation of the functioning of the Suez Canal and the demolition of its structures. The Soviet Government considers it necessary that a special international commission should be set up with the participation of Egypt to consider and satisfy, as soon as possible, Egypt's lawful claims for compensation for the damage caused by the military operations of Britain, France, and Israel.

As to the question of setting up an international United Nations' force, the Soviet Union continues to believe that with the armed forces of Britain, France, and Israel evacuated from the territory of Egypt, there is no need for such an international force. However, considering the fact that the Government of Egypt has in principle given its consent to this, the Soviet Government has no objection to the introduction of the United Nations' force, having in view that it can be located on both sides of the demarcation line established by the armistice agreement. Those troops should not be located in the Suez Canal zone since this would contradict the 1888 Convention, and the Government of Egypt as the government of a sovereign state, ensures the necessary order in that area itself. It goes without saying that the question of the location of international armed forces and the question of the duration of their stay on the territory of Egypt must be settled only with the consent of the Egyptian Government and that military units of the states who supported the attack on Egypt cannot be included in these forces.

With sincere respect

N. BULGANIN

His Excellency Sir Anthony Eden,
Prime Minister of Great Britain,
London.

— ★ —

**MESSAGE OF N. A. BULGANIN, CHAIRMAN OF USSR
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS TO GUY MOLLET, PRESIDENT
OF COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF FRANCE**

The Kremlin, Moscow, November 15, 1956

Esteemed Mr. President,

I have received your message in reply to my letter of November 5 in which I outlined the Soviet Government's stand on the situation in the Near East. After your message we received information on the French Government's decision to cease fire in Egypt. We are gratified that the French Government has taken the decision to cease fire against Egypt, thus fulfilling the desire of the peoples, including wide sections of the people of France, and the requirements of the Emergency Session of the United Nations' General Assembly on a cease-fire and withdrawal of the British, French, and Israeli forces from Egyptian territory.

We believe that at the present time efforts must be directed towards finding the possibility to put an end to the dangerous situation that has been created in the Near and Middle East as a result of the unprovoked attack made by France, Britain, and Israel on Egypt, and not towards undertaking anything that might aggravate the situation. I do not conceal from you that some facts in this connection arouse our serious anxiety.

Although there has been a cease-fire in Egypt, the withdrawal of the invading forces from Egyptian territory is still being delayed and, according to certain information, the Anglo-French armed forces in that area are being built up. One can hardly doubt that this may lead to an aggravation of tension and by no means to the peaceful settlement of the issue which we, of course, must strive for. We express the hope that the French Government will not take steps which could be regarded as preparation for further military operations against Egypt. You will certainly not deny that the situation that has taken shape in that area is very tense and that one should not sow seeds of a storm, for in the given situation a single spark may rekindle the fire there.

I should like to remind you that in our personal correspondence quite recently we called your attention, in the most friendly manner, to the fact that a war against Egypt started by France and Britain could not but lead to very serious consequences, above all to France and Britain. And, indeed, the military operations against Egypt which lasted but several days have already brought about big destructions on the Suez Canal, the dislocation of oil supplies from the Near and Middle-Eastern countries, and a tremendous economic loss to France and many other countries of Western Europe. Let alone the fact that the aggressive war against Egypt struck a telling blow at France's international position, aroused profound hatred for the aggressor states among the peoples of the East, obviously worsening French relations with many states. The war did not and could not bring France anything good; its serious consequences will inevitably affect France for a long time to come.

The French, British, and Israeli troops that have invaded the territory of peaceable Egypt have, of course, brought many calamities to the population of Egypt, and caused serious damage to the economy of that state which is upholding the just cause of freedom and national independence; but all this did not cover with glory the arms of France and of the other states that have attacked Egypt.

I should like to avail myself of this opportunity, Mr. President, to deny emphatically the fabrications that are being spread in France, by officials included, that the Soviet Union allegedly pursues in the Near East some special aims directed against the interests of the Western powers.

The Soviet Government believes that the restoration of peace and tranquillity in the Near and Middle East, and the elimination of the aftermath of the aggression against Egypt, makes it imperative, above all, that the French, British, and Israeli forces be immediately withdrawn from Egyptian territory, in accord with the demand of the Egyptian Government and the decision of the Emergency Session of the United Nations' General Assembly.

Inasmuch as Israel repeatedly launched unprovoked attacks on the Arab countries, as pointed out in a number of Security Council decisions, and bearing in mind the armed aggression of that state against Egypt, it is necessary through joint efforts, to find such a solution as would preclude the further possibility of new provocations on the part of Israel against the neighbouring Arab states, provocations repeatedly denounced by decisions of the Security Council. This would help to stabilize the situation in that area and would be a big contribution towards overcoming the consequences of the aggression against Egypt.

One cannot ignore the fact that the military operations have caused a big material damage to Egypt. It therefore will be just if Egypt obtains from France, Britain, and Israel appropriate compensation for the destruction of Egyptian towns and villages, and for the suspension of shipping through the Suez Canal and damage of canal facilities. We believe that an international commission should be set up, with the participation of Egypt, to examine the corresponding claims of Egypt and to ensure their early satisfaction.

As for your wish for a Security Council session at ministerial level, the Soviet Government has no objections to it.

In connection with the question of setting up an international United Nations' force which you touch upon, I would like to inform you that the Soviet Union continues to adhere to the opinion that, given the evacuation of the forces of France, Britain, and Israel from the territory of Egypt, there is no need for an international armed force of this kind. Taking into consideration, however, that the Egyptian Government has, in principle, given its consent in this, the Soviet Government does not object to the introduction of the United Nations' armed force, having in view that it can be stationed on both sides of the demarcation line between Israel and Egypt established by the armistice agreement. The

international armed force should not be located in the Suez Canal zone, since this would contradict the 1888 Convention and also in view of the fact that the Government of Egypt itself ensures necessary order in that area. It goes without saying that the question of locating the international force in Egypt, as well as the question of the duration of its stay on the territory of Egypt, must be settled only with the consent of the Egyptian Government. It is also obvious that military units of the states which supported aggression against the Egyptian state cannot be included in the international armed force.

With sincere respect,

N. BULGANIN

His Excellency Monsieur Guy Mollet,
President of the Council of Ministers of France,
Paris.

— ★ —

**MESSAGE OF N. A. BULGANIN, CHAIRMAN OF USSR
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS, TO PRIME MINISTER
BEN GURION OF ISRAEL**

The Kremlin, Moscow, November 15, 1956

Mr. Prime Minister,

I have received your letter of November 8. In addition we have before us the texts of the official statements made by leaders of the Israeli Government in recent days which allow us to judge Israel's position in connection with the situation that has now taken shape in the Near and Middle East.

The Soviet Government's position with regard to the situation in that area was set forth in my letter to you of November 5.

Since in your letter of reply you try to defend the actions taken by Israel against Egypt I have to reply in brief to your arguments.

You allege in your letter that the invasion of Egyptian territory by Israeli armed forces was due to self defence, mentioning in this connection the existence on Egyptian territory of some danger to Israel.

In fact, as a number of Security Council decisions say, it was precisely Israel and not the Arab states that launched many armed attacks upon the neighbouring Arab countries. The Security Council expressed serious anxiety over the non-fulfilment by the Israeli Government of its obligations under the armistice agreement and urged the Israeli Government to fulfil these obligations in the future, threatening the application to Israel of appropriate sanctions under the United Nations' Charter.

Even your allegations that Israel launched an armed attack on Egypt because she was allegedly threatened by Egypt, mean that the Israeli Government does not want to take into consideration the demands of the United Nations' Charter prohibiting United Nations' member-states from using force and demanding a settlement of their disputes exclusively by peaceful means.

The Soviet Government cannot disregard the fact that the Israeli Government far from complying with the call of the United Nations' General Assembly for an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of the forces that have invaded Egypt even openly announced its annexationist intentions with regard to Egypt, the predatory plans of joining to Israel the Gaza area, the Sinai Peninsula, and the Tirana and Sanafir Islands in the gulf of Aqaba. In your speech in the Israeli Parliament on November 7 you referred to the "invalidity" of the armistice agreements concluded between Israel and the Arab states.

It is noteworthy that the Israeli Government, even after being compelled to take a decision on the withdrawal of its forces from Egyptian territory, still tries to make the fulfilment of this demand

conditional upon the conclusion of "satisfactory agreements with the United Nations" with regard to the entry of the international forces "in the Suez Canal zone" which is known to be an integral part of the sovereign state of Egypt.

All this obviously contradicts the assertions in your letter that the Israeli Government's policy is allegedly prompted by the "thirst for peace" and "the vital needs" of Israel.

The Soviet Government is convinced that Israel's present policy, resting on the fanning of hostility with the Arabs and their oppression, is in fact dangerous to universal peace and fatal to Israel. Such a policy, as recent events have confirmed, indeed accords only with the interests of the outside forces that seek to re-establish the colonial order in that area, but it is our profound conviction that they are alien to the interests of all the Near- and Middle-Eastern peoples without any exception.

The Soviet Government warned the Israeli Government of the consequences dangerous to Israel in case of the opening of aggressive armed actions against the Arab states. We regret that you did not pay attention to this. As a result of the aggression against Egypt unleashed by Israel, Egyptian towns and populated locations were ruined, thousands of innocent people were killed or mutilated, damage was inflicted on the communications, the trade and the economy of Egypt. But what has Israel achieved? One has to be blind not to see that aggression has brought nothing good to Israel.

Aggression against Egypt has undoubtedly undermined the international position of Israel; it has aroused the profound hatred of the Arab and other peoples of the East towards Israel; it has worsened her relations with many states and entailed more economic and other difficulties in the country.

The Soviet Government takes into consideration that the Government of Israel ceased fire and then announced the forthcoming removal of the Israeli forces from Egyptian territory. It goes without saying that the armed forces of Israel must be withdrawn from the territory of Egypt without delay.

At the same time, to stabilize the situation in the Near-East area and to eliminate the consequences of the aggression against Egypt, the Soviet Government deems it necessary to take such measures as would preclude the possibility of fresh provocations of Israel against neighbouring states and would ensure durable peace and tranquillity in the Near East.

Justice also demands that Israel, as well as Britain and France, should compensate Egypt, as the victim of unprovoked aggression, for the damage resulting from the destruction of Egyptian cities and populated localities, and from discontinuation of the functioning of the Suez Canal and the demolition of its structures. Moreover, Israel must return to Egypt all property taken from Egyptian territory by the Israeli armed forces who invaded the country.

The international United Nations' forces, to the formation of which the Egyptian Government has consented, as follows from the United Nations' decision, must be located on both sides of the demarcation line between Israel and Egypt established by the armistice agreement.

I should like, Mr. Prime Minister, to express the hope that the Government of Israel would draw appropriate conclusions from the lessons of recent events in connection with her participation in the aggression against Egypt.

N. BULGANIN

His Excellency,
Mr. Ben Gurion, Prime Minister of the State of Israel,
Tel Aviv.

— ★ —

SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S STATEMENT ON DISARMAMENT AND EASING OF INTERNATIONAL TENSION

The armed attack of Britain, France, and Israel on Egypt has created a situation dangerous for peace and has confronted the peoples with the threat of a third world war in all its acuteness. It is a fact that large-scale measures for mobilizing the ground, naval and air forces, calling up the reservists, and mobilizing industry, the transport and communication lines for serving war needs, have been carried out in the aforementioned countries. Thus, in effect, a wartime situation has been created in these countries, especially if account is taken of a fact that frenzied war propaganda has been launched in the NATO countries as a whole. The aggressive actions of Britain, France, and Israel against Egypt, the military measures they have launched, and the atmosphere of war hysteria, have made real the danger of extending the conflict with the use of the latest destructive weapons.

The unprovoked aggression against Egypt has naturally stirred into motion the peoples of the East who have risen to the defence of Egypt — which is fighting for her vital national interests, for independent national existence — and thereby also to the defence of their won national independence.

As a result of the heroic resistance of the Egyptian people and in face of the growing world-wide indignation at the military gamble in the Near East, which has been condemned by the United Nations, the organizers of the aggressive war were compelled to cease the hostilities against Egypt. Nevertheless it cannot be considered that the war danger has been eliminated, that the conflagration cannot flare up with still greater force. The peoples have grounds for caution because of the fact that Britain and France are now building up armed forces and materiel in Cyprus and also in Port Said, which has been occupied by Anglo-French troops; moreover all this has been done after the cease-fire statements by Britain and France and, consequently, in violation of the obligations they assumed before the whole world.

To carry out their military plans in the Near East, Britain and France have transferred large military formations to the area of hostilities including those stationed on the territory of Western Germany. Moreover, the French Government has transferred a considerable part of the army to North Africa with the object of crushing the national liberation movement in Algeria.

As a result of the hostilities against Egypt the Suez Canal has been put out of commission for a long time to come; all pipelines passing through the territory of Arab countries have been destroyed; and communications of Britain and France and other European countries have been seriously dislocated, communications which are of vital importance

for them, especially since all this has led to discontinuation of the shipment of oil to Europe through the Mediterranean. Thereby serious difficulties have been created for Britain, France, and other West European countries in obtaining liquid fuel, which is so necessary for the industry of these countries and is of decisive military significance, since in present conditions military facilities are dead and armies cannot fight without liquid fuel.

Thus, the military gamble against Egypt has resulted in a serious weakening not only of the political but also of the strategic position of France and Britain in Europe, to a serious weakening of all the military forces of the North Atlantic bloc on the European continent. It is not fortuitous that official circles and the press of the Western powers note with alarm that quite a delicate situation has arisen for the organizers of the aggression against Egypt in view of the fact that their main armed forces are concentrated in the Near Eastern area and in North Africa, while the forces in Europe have remained without sufficiently assured supplies.

Noteworthy is the fact that the circles of the Western Powers which are responsible for the aggression against Egypt are now trying, by fabrications about the aggressive intentions of the Soviet Union in the Near East and in Europe, to divert attention both from the naked aggression committed against Egypt, and also to cover up the failure that followed this gamble.

Attempts are being made to fan a slanderous campaign against the Soviet Union in connection with the failure of the counter-revolutionary military plot against People's Hungary, which, as it has become absolutely clear now, was an integral part of the general plot of the imperialists against the peace and security of the peoples both in the Near East and in Europe. All kinds of inventions are being circulated concerning the alleged concentration of Soviet forces in different countries of Eastern Europe, unusual movements of Soviet troops at the western and southern frontiers of the USSR, etc.

All this is used by definite circles in the West for reviving the "cold war", for the further stepping up of the arms race in the countries of NATO, this basic aggressive alignment, which of late, is being openly utilized for preserving and restoring the disgraceful system of colonial oppression.

The creation of a tense atmosphere, including the stepping up of the arms race, benefits, in the first place, the monopolists of the United States, Britain, and France who are raking in fabulous profits on war orders. Such a situation also enables them to preserve at a high level the taxes paid by the working people who are bearing the brunt of the expenditures for armament, for preparing for ground, naval and aerial warfare.

Thus, on the one hand, it is admitted that Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt has created a complicated situation for Western Europe and for NATO as a whole. On the other hand, all kinds of absurd schemes with regard to Western Europe, the Near East, etc., are ascribed to the Soviet Union, and the war hysteria is fanned in every possible way.

But those, who resort to such methods have become completely entangled.

If the Soviet Union were really guided by some kind of transient considerations, by the way the situation is shaping for it from the standpoint of the correlation of forces between the powers, and had the aggressive intentions which are ascribed to it, it would seem that the Soviet Union could use the present situation for coming out against the armed forces of the Atlantic bloc and could realize the military aims with regard to Western Europe ascribed to it, even without the use of up-to-date nuclear and rocket weapons.

It may be said candidly that the strategic situation in Western Europe is now even more favourable for the armed forces of the Soviet Union than was the case at the end of the Second World War when the fully mobilized and equipped Soviet army would have been able to gain a firm foothold in all of Western Europe, if the Soviet Union had set itself such aims.

But both at the end of the Second World War and at present the Soviet Union did not have, and does not have now any aims other than preserving and consolidating the peace yearned for by the peoples of all countries.

The last year alone the Soviet Union unilaterally made a big reduction of its armed forces by 1,840,000 men, cut its military budget by almost 10,000-million roubles and dismantled its military bases in Port Arthur and Porkkala-Udd. It is not carrying on, notwithstanding the false propaganda of the Western powers, any mobilizations and movement of its troops on the frontiers. Its troops are engaged in their usual military matters and are at their usual bases. The Soviet people are engaged in peaceful constructive labour on the vast expanses on the newly cultivated virgin land, at the huge construction projects of the Sixth Five-Year Plan, in laboratories and scientific institutes, in different spheres of culture, art, and science.

The Soviet Government declares that the Soviet Union is, as it always was, opposed to resolving disputes and differences between states through war. It has always been and is guided now by the Leninist policy of the peaceful co-existence of states, regardless of differences in their social and political system. In its relations with other states the Soviet Government is guided by the decisions of the historic 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which openly proclaim to the whole world the negative attitude of the USSR towards war as a means of settling international disputes, and enunciate its clear-cut position on the principles of peaceful coexistence of socialist countries with capitalist countries.

The Soviet Government has adhered and will continue to adhere firmly to these positions of principle, because this ensues from the very nature of the socialist state whose main aim is to raise the living standards of its people, to develop the productive forces of society free from the fetters of capitalist production relations. This can be ensured not in conditions of war but in conditions of peaceful development which makes it possible to utilize the inexhaustible potentials for the progress of socialist economy, culture, and science.

The Soviet Union has no social groups or classes which would profit on war and a war boom and which would be interested in the arms race, in the seizure of alien territories and in unleashing aggressive wars.

It is well known that Russia has been transformed in a brief historical period from a backward agrarian land into a mighty industrial state possessing all conditions and resources for the further rapid advance of its economy, for the rise of the material and cultural standards of the Soviet people. The unprecedented rate of development of the Soviet Union's economy is attested to by the fact that the total industrial output of the USSR has increased more than twenty times in the last 25 years, while the industrial output of all the capitalist countries has risen less than two-fold in the same period.

The Soviet Union possesses a huge territory, colossal reserves of coal, oil, iron ore and nonferrous metals, and inexhaustible power resources (including the latest methods of producing electric energy from atomic raw materials). The planned economy of the Soviet Union assures a normal sale of the goods produced and, therefore, the USSR is not confronted with the problem of conquering markets for the sale of its goods. It bases its economic relations with other states on the principle of equality and mutual advantage which ensures the possibility of exchanging goods normally in the interests of further economic progress.

The peoples of the Soviet Union, having taken the socialist path and having achieved unprecedented successes in developing their economy and culture, were able to learn from their own experience that the socialist system is most progressive and ensures the possibility of such an economic development in the USSR and in the other socialist countries as will ensure socialism absolute victory in peaceful, economic competition with capitalism. The Soviet people are engaged in accomplishing the task of overtaking and surpassing the most developed capitalist countries in per capita industrial output. Soviet men and women are confident that, relying on the mighty technique and on the great advantages of the socialist system of economy, they can achieve in a historically brief period of time the all-round development of the material and intellectual forces of man, and the harmony of social life which the building of communism will bring with it.

The Soviet Government is profoundly convinced that the interests of the Soviet people in maintaining and strengthening peace fully coincide with the interests of all other peoples both in the West and in the

East. What they need is neither atom bombs, tanks, nor guns; they need clothing, food, houses, schools for children, a tranquil and secure future. The peoples of the underdeveloped countries want to do away with the age-old backwardness, poverty — the grim legacy of colonial oppression.

The latest developments in the Near East have graphically shown how great are the forces which are interested in the preservation of peace and which are fully resolved to curb the aggressors. At the same time, these events have demonstrated that the aggressive circles of definite powers are ready, for the sake of their narrow interests, to plunge the world into the abyss of another world war, confronting the peoples with the menace of fresh military conflicts fraught with grave consequences for mankind.

That is why at this crucial moment the Soviet Union once again raises its voice for the discontinuation of the arms race, for the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and for the prohibition of the tests of these weapons.

For the practical and quickest realizations of these demands, in which all the peoples are vitally interested, the Soviet Government proposes:

1. To reduce, within two years, the armed forces of the Soviet Union, the United States of America and China to 1- to 1.5-million men for each of these countries, the armed forces of Britain and France to 650,000 men for each country, and to 150,00 to 200,00 men for each of the remaining countries.

As a first step towards this end, to reduce, during the first year, the armed forces of the USSR, the USA, and China to 2.5 million men and the armed forces of Britain and France to 750,000 men for each of these states.

The above countries are to reduce their armaments accordingly.

2. To implement within the specified period the banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons with the discontinuation of their production, the banning of their use and the complete destruction of their piles, and their withdrawal from national armaments.

As a first step to discontinue tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons at once.

3. During 1957 to reduce by one-third the armed forces of the United States, the USSR, Britain, and France, stationed on the territory of Germany, with the establishment of the appropriate control of this reduction.

4. To effect, during 1957, a considerable reduction of the armed forces of the United States, Britain, and France stationed on the territory of the NATO member-countries, and of the armed forces of the USSR stationed on the territory of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries.

5. To liquidate within two years the foreign military, naval and air bases on the territory of other states.

6. To cut the military expenditures of states in the course of two years in conformity with the reduction of the armed forces, armaments, the banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and the liquidation of foreign military bases on the territory of other states.

7. To establish, for supervision over the fulfilment of the disarmament obligations assumed by the states, strict and effective international control, vested with all the powers and functions necessary for these purposes.

In order to prevent a sudden attack by one state upon another, to set up, on a reciprocity basis, control posts at big ports, railway junctions, and on motor highways, and airfields, which will watch that there should be no dangerous concentration of armed forces and armaments.

The Soviet Government has repeatedly expressed its attitude towards the so-called aerial photography plan and stated that this proposal solves neither the problem of disarmament control, nor that of preventing aggression.

Taking into account, however, that the proposal on aerial photography is put forth as a condition for reaching agreement on disarmament, which seriously impedes the conclusion of such an agreement, the Soviet Government with the object of facilitating the earliest agreement is prepared to consider the question of employing aerial photography within the area of the location in Europe of the principal armed forces of the North Atlantic bloc and of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries to a depth of 800 km. (500 miles) to the east and to the west of the demarcation line between the afore-mentioned armed forces, provided the countries concerned give their consent.

In proposing the above measures, the Soviet Government believes that when they are implemented, the question should be raised of the complete abolition of armed forces and armaments of all types, the states retaining only such contingents of militia (police) as are necessary for maintaining internal security and protecting their frontiers.

The Soviet Government, loyal to its policy of ensuring peace, and desiring to inspire the nations with the confidence that arms shall never be resorted to for the settlement of disputes between states, once more proposes the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the countries of the North Atlantic and Warsaw treaties. Such a pact, considering that it would include among its signatories the Soviet Union and the United States — i.e., the states which possess the most powerful armed forces — would radically change the entire international atmosphere and help to ease international tension and to establish mutual trust between states.

Inasmuch as the consideration of the disarmament problem within the framework of the United Nations so far has not facilitated any practical results in settling the question of armaments reduction and the

banning of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Government holds it necessary, along with the continuation of efforts in this direction within the framework of the United Nations, to seek more effective ways of settling this problem. Considering that the present international situation imperatively calls for immediate measures for the prevention of war and the discontinuation of the arms drive, the Soviet Government believes that it would be expedient to convene a conference of the Heads of Government of the USSR, the United States, Britain, France, and India, as was proposed by the President of the Swiss Confederation. Such a conference could facilitate agreement on questions related to the disarmament problem. A successful conference of the Heads of the five Governments could pave the way for a broader conference to discuss these problems, in which there could take part the Heads of Government of all NATO and Warsaw Treaty member-countries. The Soviet Government considers it desirable that the Heads of Governments of a number of other countries, in the first place, of the People's Republic of China, India, Yugoslavia, Indonesia, and Burma, which are not signatories to the Warsaw Treaty or to such military groupings as the NATO, SEATO, and Baghdad pact, take part in such a conference.

If difficulties should arise in the way to the convocation of a five powers' Heads-of-Government conference, then, in the opinion of the Soviet Government, the convocation of a broader conference, as mentioned above, would be in the interests of easing international tension and of improving the international atmosphere.

The Soviet Government deems it necessary to stress in all seriousness the fact that the world is now confronted by two paths: either the path of a discontinuation of the "cold war" and rejection of the "positions of strength" policy, the path of disarmament and the establishment of all conditions for the peaceful coexistence of states with different economic and social systems, or the path of the continuation of the arms drive, the continuation of the "cold war", — the path leading to an unprecedentedly grim and destructive war which would bring untold misfortunes and sufferings to the whole world.

The Soviet Government has always maintained and maintains that there are no issues which could not be settled peacefully with due regard for the lawful interests of the countries concerned. As to the existing ideological differences, they cannot serve as a reason for the aggravation of relations between states, for the propagation of war and, the more so, for the use of force by one state against another. Such differences can and must be settled by means of an ideological struggle in which the advantages of this or that ideology or of this or that economic system will be proved by the course of historical development itself.

Advancing its proposals for disarmament, prompted by the interests of the maintenance and consolidation of peace among nations, the Soviet Government is confident that they will meet with the support of all those who seek — not in words but in deeds — to abolish the danger of a new war and to strengthen universal peace.

November 17, 1956.

**FROM THE SPEECH BY N. S. KHRUSHCHEV AT
RECEPTION IN KREMLIN IN HONOUR OF
DELEGATION OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
POLISH UNITED WORKERS' PARTY AND GOVERNMENT
OF POLISH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC ON NOVEMBER 17, 1956**

The imperialists rage and fume at the growing forces of socialism, the spreading national-liberation struggle of the peoples in colonial and dependent countries.

The piratic attack of Britain, France, and their puppet Israel against Egypt is a desperate attempt of the colonialists to restore their forfeited positions, to intimidate the peoples of dependent countries by force. But now is not a time when the imperialists can seize weak countries with impunity. The freedom-loving Egyptian people have administered a worthy rebuff of the aggressors and their just struggle against the foreign invaders has met the ardent support of all the world.



**FROM THE SPEECH BY N. S. KHRUSHCHEV AT A
RECEPTION IN THE POLISH EMBASSY IN MOSCOW,
ON NOVEMBER 18.**

When the representatives of the bourgeois world speak about the Hungarian events they use various horrible words regarding "Soviet aggression", "intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries", and the like. But when the question comes up of the aggression of the colonialists against Egypt, this, they allege, is not a war but merely innocent "police measures" aimed at introducing order in that country. But everyone sees now what "measures" these are and what "order" is being introduced there. These are measures of the colonialists to introduce a colonial order in Egypt which but recently liberated itself from the yoke of colonial oppression and wants to live and develop as a sovereign independent state. These are measures for the restoration of the colonial order.

But these are no longer the times when the colonialists were able to dictate their will to the peoples.

Our sympathies are wholly on the side of Egypt in its just struggle.

Not infrequently one can hear voices in the Western countries saying: "Nasser is a Colonel and nothing more". They are forgetting that Nasser is the President of a sovereign state and should be addressed in a proper way. It is well known that ideologically Nasser is not a Communist. Why then do we support him? Because he is a national hero, because he headed the just fight of the Egyptian people against the British, French, and Israeli troops which invaded the territory of the sovereign Egyptian state.

We know that we sent quite outspoken messages to the governments of Britain, France, as well as to Israel which was utilized by the big colonial powers for the unleashing of the aggression against Egypt.

We warmly support Egypt's just cause in the defence of its sovereignty and independence, and we are confident that Egypt will emerge victorious out of its struggle of liberation.

But we are realists and we do not want to fan the conflagration of war; on the contrary, we seek by every means in our power to extinguish the hotbed of war in the Near East.

Our position with regard to this problem is clear and frank and we believe that the leaders of Britain, France, and Israel will soberly weigh all circumstances and withdraw their troops from Egypt.

It is necessary to demand and insist upon the immediate withdrawal of all aggressors' troops from Egypt. I am confident that Egypt will defend its independence and that the courageous people of Egypt will continue their historic development, marching along the road of peace and consolidation of friendship with other nations.

**FROM THE JOINT STATEMENT IN CONNECTION WITH
TALKS BETWEEN DELEGATION OF CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF CPSU AND GOVERNMENT OF SOVIET
UNION AND DELEGATION OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF PUWP AND GOVERNMENT OF POLISH
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC**

Both delegations held that the aggressive circles of certain states are trying to frustrate the certain easing of international tension achieved in recent years. An expression of this policy is the attack of Britain, France, and Israel on Egypt which but recently cast off the yoke of colonialism and is striving to consolidate her freedom and national independence.

Both delegations declare that the aggression against Egypt cannot be justified in any way. They condemn this attack which entailed great loss of life and much damage, put out of operation the Suez Canal, so important for international shipping, including that of the USSR and Poland, and, at the same time, aggravated the situation in the Near East and throughout the world.

Both delegations declared that the states which unleashed the war must, in conformity with the United Nations' resolution, withdraw their troops from the territory of Egypt. The Soviet Union and Poland will render every support to the just demand of Egypt.



IT IS UNITED NATIONS' DUTY TO BAR WAY TO FORCES OF AGGRESSION AND REACTION

From a Speech by D. T. Shepilov, USSR Foreign Minister, at Plenary Meeting of United Nations' General Assembly on November 22, 1956

Aggression by Britain, France, and Israel Against Egypt

In recent weeks the world's keenest attention has been riveted to the ominous developments in Egypt. The unprovoked aggression by Britain, France, and Israel against Egypt has deeply agitated world public opinion. The peace-loving forces of the world clearly see the perfidious, inequitable, colonialist nature of the armed attack of Israel, Britain, and France on the people of Egypt. It is perfectly obvious at the same time that in attacking Egypt, Israel played the provocative role of an instigator in the far-conceived, aggressive operation in which Britain and France have been the principal participants.

Various motives and explanations of the sudden aggression against Egypt have been advanced and are being put forward in official documents of the French and British Governments. These motives, however, are utterly untenable.

Untenable is the thesis that the Anglo-French invaders started their war of aggression against Egypt in order to end the hostilities between Israel and Egypt and to separate the belligerents as Mr. Eden, British Prime Minister, has said. Indeed, have the bombardment of Port Said from air and sea, the monstrous destruction of such thickly populated Arab quarters as El Tamil, El Monah, the Abbas and other Port Said streets, served the purpose of separating the belligerents? Have the inhuman extermination of thousands of peaceful civilians in Port Said, mostly women and children, the strafing of the people of Heliopolis awaiting trams, the destruction of the Coptic Church in Cairo and of the Post Office and a Catholic Church in Alexandria, all been done to separate the belligerents? Who does not know that in all these places there was no contact between the belligerents (Egypt and Israel) necessitating their "separation"?

Untenable is the thesis of the aggressors, a thesis decrepit from over-use, that there existed in Egypt a "terrible Communist plot" to seize the whole of the Middle East, to seize all its oil riches, in consequence of which the Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggressors could not allegedly, if you please, evade the necessity of looking this danger in the face. This reason, which distinctly resounded in M. Pineau's speech today, could in all probability be used in some Hollywood film, but it is out of place in an analysis of the causes of such a grave deed as the armed attack of Britain, France, and Israel on the people of Egypt. It has become commonplace for aggressors, when they have nothing to say in justification of their criminal actions, to produce the bugaboo of communism.

Also untenable are the references that the aggression of Britain and France against Egypt stemmed from their desire to ensure freedom of navigation on the Suez Canal.

First, it is common knowledge that, in practice, the Egyptian Government had ensured freedom of navigation on the canal. The canal worked without a hitch after nationalization and there was no threat whatsoever to freedom of transit through it. Despite their declarations, the aggressors, far from taking care to ensure freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal, have on the contrary, by their actions, put this major international waterway out of commission for a long time to come. Britain and France are directly responsible to all the canal-users for the crying violation of the 1888 Convention on the freedom of navigation.

Second, on what legal grounds have Britain and France attempted and are attempting now to monopolize the solution of the Suez problem which affects the vital interests of many states, the Soviet Union included, and, moreover, one that rudely tramples upon the sovereignty of Egypt?

Third, on what grounds have Britain and France resorted to the use of armed force for settling a question upon which the Security Council has quite recently taken its decision? You know that the Security Council has approved six agreed principles, whose implementation would have brought about a full settlement of the Suez issue in a peaceful way. The Security Council's decision was welcomed everywhere as a big success for the peace-loving forces. Britain and France voted for these principles and agreed to negotiate with Egypt. It is clear now that this was a false gesture designed to lull the vigilance of the peace-loving peoples and to prepare the sudden attack on Egypt.

The Anglo-French-Israeli attack on Egypt was caused, of course, not by the motives presented here, which the aggressors are now trying to invent to conceal their real schemes.

Incontrovertible facts show that the attack on Egypt was only the beginning of a big strategic plan conceived by the imperialists.

The colonialists had in view the negation of the decision of the Egyptian Government nationalizing the Suez Canal and to regain control over it. They intended to crush Egypt, which dared to uphold her sovereign rights, to remove the Egyptian Government, which does not suit the imperialists, and to force the Egyptian people to their knees. They wanted by direct military action against the Arab peoples to abolish the national independence and sovereignty of a number of Middle Eastern states, to restore the regime of colonial oppression overthrown by the peoples of these countries, and to regain the positions, privileges, and sources for enrichment which the imperialists have lost there.

The military attack on Egypt by Israel and then by Britain and France, was, I repeat, only the first step towards realizing the overall colonialist plan of the imperialist oppressors.

The emergency session of the United Nations' General Assembly passed a resolution obligating Britain, France, and Israel to cease hostilities immediately and to withdraw their forces from Egyptian territory. But at the beginning this resolution did not produce the due effect.

A truly tragic situation arose. With British and French bombs raining down upon her peaceful population, Egypt, bleeding profusely, cried out for help. Any procrastination threatened disaster for Egypt and held out the danger of expanding the war. In these conditions the Soviet Union thought that resolute measures must be taken. On November 5 it urged the Security Council to tell the Governments of Britain, France, and Israel to cease all hostilities against Egypt forthwith, and to withdraw, within three days, the troops which had invaded Egyptian territory. At the same time the USSR recommended that the Security Council recognize the need for all United Nations' member states, and in the first place the United States and the USSR as permanent members of the Security Council possessing powerful air and naval forces, to render armed and other assistance to the victim of aggression, the Egyptian Republic, by sending naval and air forces, military units, volunteers, instructors, material and other assistance, were Britain, France, and Israel not to implement, within the specified time, the Security Council resolution on ending aggression.

Simultaneously the Soviet Government proposed to the Government of the United States to pool within the United Nations, together with the other states, the efforts of the Soviet Union and the United States to cut short aggression and to end further bloodshed.

The United States Government, unfortunately, did not give support to the initiative of the Soviet Union which had been dictated by the acuteness of the situation and the sense of responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the Middle East.

Lastly, the USSR appealed to Britain, France, and Israel to take into account the full danger that had arisen as a result of their attack on Egypt and to discontinue aggression at once. In doing so the Soviet Government declared it was ready, upon a United Nations' decision, to participate, in fact, with its armed forces, together with other states, in ending the aggression in the Middle East.

Malicious, anti-Soviet propaganda has tried and is still trying to present these resolute actions of the Soviet Government against aggression in Egypt as proof of the special, self-seeking interests of the USSR in this area. Calumniators have asserted and are still alleging that in the Middle East the USSR pursues some special, selfish ends directed against the interests of the Western powers.

Such assertions are utterly groundless. The Soviet socialist state has no concessions, no military bases, nor any political, economic, or military privileges in the Middle East, nor does it want to have any. All expansionist aspirations are utterly alien to the Soviet state. All this is incompatible with our principles. At the same time the Soviet Union, like many other states, is interested in securing the freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal.

Gentlemen, the delegation of the Soviet Union notes with profound gratification that hostilities in Egypt have now ended. The courageous resistance of the heroic Egyptian people, who, in their just struggle, relied on the immense moral support of all freedom-loving mankind, has compelled the aggressors to retreat. This success is significant, among other things, because two great powers, possessing first-class materiel, proved unable to break the resistance of the young Egyptian Republic which is much weaker militarily but is strong by virtue of its indomitable spirit. This example is a source of inspiration to all the peoples fighting for their freedom and independence.

Thus the war conflagration which flared up in the Middle East has begun to die down. But red-hot coals are still smouldering under the fresh ashes and unless care is taken raging flames may flare up again.

The Soviet Union is seriously disturbed by the fact that though formally there is a cease-fire in Egypt, the withdrawal of the troops of Britain, France, and Israel from Egyptian territory is being delayed, while, according to some sources, a build-up of the armed forces of the interventionists is even taking place in this area. The Egyptian Government's note, handed to the United Nations' Secretary-General on November 18, points out that Britain and France, far from withdrawing the armed forces from Egypt, are, on the contrary, "strengthening their positions on Egyptian territory". "These armed forces", the note points out, "continued their aggressive actions in Port Said and in the canal zone, opening fire on the civilian population, which has led to much loss of human life. To this the searches and looting of private homes and shops, and the use of repression and violence to compel Egyptian workers to work for the aggressive forces, should be added." Such a situation is fraught with grave dangers.

As long as the troops of the aggressors remain on Egyptian territory there is no guarantee that the war will not be resumed. The Soviet delegation holds that the General Assembly must again demand, in the most resolute way, the immediate and full withdrawal of the forces of Britain, France, and Israel from Egypt. This is all the more necessary since the Israeli ruling circles, for example, do not want to withdraw their troops from the Gaza district, declaring it an "integral part of their territory".

The Government of Israel is openly voicing its annexationist plans directed against Egypt, which include the joining to Israel of the Gaza area, the Sinai Peninsula, the Tiran and Sanafil Islands in the Aqaba Bay.

The Soviet delegation thinks the kind of measures should be taken that would preclude the possibility of fresh provocations by Israel against neighbouring states and should assure peace and tranquillity in the Middle East.

The voice of commonsense should suggest to the Governments of Britain, France, and Israel the need for withdrawing their forces from Egypt without any procrastination and without aggravating the situation

again. Account should be taken of the fact that the sympathies of all the peace-loving peoples are on the side of Egypt.

As for the decision taken by the special session of the United Nations' General Assembly to establish the United Nations' international police force, the following considerations suggest themselves:

First, we must recall that the setting up of international armed police forces and guidance, according to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, is a prerogative of the Security Council. In this case this provision of the Charter was clearly violated.

Second, with the armed forces of Britain, France, and Israel withdrawn from Egyptian territory, there is no need for a United Nations' international police force.

The Soviet delegation however takes into account the fact that Egypt has agreed to the introduction of United Nations' armed forces. It is understood that the international force may be located along the demarcation line between Israel and Egypt, established in its time by the armistice agreement. It goes without saying that the international force must not remain in Port Said, and in the Suez Canal zone in general, after the British and French units leave Port Said. The further presence of United Nations' forces in that area would run counter to the Constantinople Convention of 1888 and would be a clear infringement of Egypt's sovereign rights. It is self-understood that the United Nations' forces must also leave at once the demarcation line and the territory of Egypt in general as soon as this is found necessary by the Egyptian Republic.

Attention must be drawn to the alarming fact that influential Anglo-French and also some American circles associate far-reaching and extremely dangerous plans with the shipping of United Nations' forces to Egypt. We refer to the plans for removing the Suez Canal from Egyptian administration and establishing foreign "international" control over the canal in one form or another. Demands are made that the United Nations' forces be stationed in the entire Suez Canal zone and remain there until a solution of the Suez problem on the basis of the well-known Western proposals is imposed on Egypt.

Such statements mean that the powers which sustained defeat in the colonial war against Egypt evidently would like to make use of the presence of foreign armed forces in the Suez Canal zone to carry out their old plans of "internationalizing" the canal.

It is not difficult to divine that such an interpretation of the functions of the United Nations' armed force can only lead, in practice, to an infringement of Egyptian sovereignty and to a violation of the International Convention of 1888.

In this connection we cannot but subscribe to the correct remark of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of the Republic of India who, discussing the Suez Canal issue, stated on November 16: "This question must be considered separately and only after the re-establishment of

peace and the withdrawal of foreign forces. The international police force must not occupy the Suez Canal as such. Its main task should be to ensure the withdrawal of the Israeli armed forces beyond the demarcation line established on the basis of the former armistice agreement”.

It is clear that the question of stationing the United Nations' international force and the term of its stay in the territory of Egypt can be decided only with the agreement of the Egyptian Government. It is likewise clear that the question of ensuring freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal, and the Palestine problem, cannot be discussed on their merits and settled, as long as the forces of the Anglo-French-Israeli aggressors are not fully withdrawn from the territory of Egypt. *At the present moment, however, it is a matter of duty for the United Nations, a matter of duty for all the peace-loving forces, to secure the immediate withdrawal of the invaders from Egyptian territory.*

The United Nations must also demand that Britain, France, and Israel discontinue at once any action creating a threat or tension on the Israeli-Jordani and the Israeli-Syrian frontiers (concentration of troops along the frontiers, flights by reconnaissance planes, etc.) so as to achieve real pacification in this area of the Arab East. There are some facts that prove certain Anglo-French-Israeli forces to be nursing new aggressive plans against the countries of the Arab East. It is the duty of the United Nations to expose and to frustrate such schemes.

Only short-sighted people can think the aggression against Egypt or the punitive actions of the French colonial authorities in Algeria are capable of strengthening the positions of colonialism. The peoples of North Africa — both those with national freedom already won and those still fighting for it — have taken their destiny into their own hands. It is impossible to halt the great process of their national regeneration.

— ★ —

**TO PUT AN END TO THE AGGRESSION AGAINST EGYPT
AND TO LIQUIDATE THE AFTERMATH OF
THE AGGRESSION**

*Speech by D. T. Shepilov, Foreign Minister of the USSR, at the
Plenary Meeting of the United Nations' General Assembly, on
November 23, 1956.*

Mr. President, Gentlemen,

We have received the reports by the United Nations' Secretary-General Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld concerning the compliance with the General Assembly's resolutions of November 2 and 7, 1956, on the results of his talks with the Egyptian Government on the main question pertaining to the presence and functioning in Egypt of the United Nations' emergency forces, and on the arrangements for clearing the Suez Canal and the draft six-power resolution on this question. We also have before us the draft resolution introduced by 21 countries of Asia and Africa on the immediate and complete withdrawal of the Anglo-French-Israeli forces from Egypt.

The most important of the submitted documents which demand immediate action by the United Nations is the report of the compliance with the General Assembly's resolutions of November 2 and 7, and the draft resolution of the 21 countries. It follows from the above-mentioned report that Britain, France, and Israel far from complying with the Assembly's recommendation for the immediate withdrawal of their forces from Egypt, evidently are not going to do this in the near future.

Such a conclusion suggests itself while studying the aide-mémoires of the governments of the three countries, drawn up in reply to the inquiry by the United Nations' Secretary-General.

All three governments, instead of withdrawing their forces from Egypt, advance all kind of conditions which would allow them to avoid carrying out this task.

The United Nations is now confronted with the urgent task of taking effective steps to put an end to these subterfuges and of securing the immediate compliance by Britain, France, and Israel with the demands of the General Assembly on the withdrawal of the forces.

This is the only way to put an end to the aggression against Egypt and to liquidate the aftermath of this aggression. One can say without exaggeration that the destiny of peace in the Near East, and not only in the Near East, largely depends on the solving of this task.

The Armed Aggression Against Egypt — An Integral Part of the Plot of the Colonialists Against the Peoples of the Arab East.

The appearance of a highly dangerous hotbed of war in the Near East as a result of the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt is the most dangerous factor in the present-day international situation. The political horizon has immediately been darkened by black threatening clouds and mankind has been confronted with the possibility of being plunged into another destructive world war.

The place and time selected for the armed attack by the two biggest colonial powers — Britain and France — and also by Israel, which has played an exceptionally unseemly, I should say, provocative, role in the sinister political game of the imperialist forces, cannot, of course, be explained by fortuitous motives.

Irrefutable facts show that this aggression has been conceived a long time ago and constituted an integral part of an extensive and far-reaching plan. It was not in vain that such a heated atmosphere has been created around the lawful act of the Egyptian Government on the nationalization of the Suez Canal Company. One cannot but acknowledge that the stratagems of the reactionary forces, connected with this problem, have been the chief source of international tension in the last six months.

The matter is not confined to the fact that the colonial powers saw in the lawful decision of the Egyptian Government on the nationalization of the Suez Canal damage to their self-seeking, egotistic interests, although this circumstance also was of certain importance. The fact is that on Egyptian territory the colonialists decided to fight for the preservation, and, if possible, for the extension, of their positions in the colonial world as a whole.

At the present time it is precisely in the Near Eastern area, in the North African zone, that the heroic struggle of the peoples of the Arab world for freedom, for complete national liberation from imperialist oppression by France, Britain, and other colonialist forces, has developed.

The successful wide-front offensive developing in almost all countries of the Arab world against colonialism, the just national-liberation struggle of the peoples, which has endangered the colossal super-profits of foreign monopolies and all sorts of privileges enjoyed by the imperialist powers, have alarmed the colonialists. Indeed, it is in the Arab East that vast oil resources are concentrated to which foreign monopolies cling with such tenacity! It is known very well that in the strategic plans of the imperialist powers the Near East is assigned an important, if not the primary, role! How "dare" the Arabs claim full mastery over their own land?!

How "dare" Egypt, for instance, claim administration of the Suez Canal which passes across her territory and which was built by Arabs?!

The essence of the plans, long since hatched in the quiet offices of London and Paris, was to strike a sudden and heavy blow at the rising peoples of the Arab East so as to regain the positions lost by the imperialists and to crush the national-liberation movement in that area.

Egypt was to be the first victim of the aggression. The first but not the only one! The imperialists' plan was to crush Egypt in the first place because she, by her resolute actions in defence of her national sovereignty, has earned the universal respect and sympathies of the Arab world, and then to go on. As conceived by the colonialists, the routing of Egypt should demoralize other Arab states and open the way for further acts of aggression, for the liquidation of national independence and the restoration of imperialist domination throughout the Near and Middle East and North Africa.

Now it is clear to everyone that the propaganda hue-and-cry started by the ruling circles of Britain and France in connection with the nationalization of the Suez Canal Company by the Government of Egypt was a kind of smoke-screen behind which an armed attack on the Egyptian Republic was prepared.

At the very time when international negotiations on the Suez question were in progress, the three states were planning the aggression and were actively preparing to carry their plan into practice. As reported by the American press, as early as last August, that is during the period of the London Conference on the Suez issue, French arms — aircraft and tanks — began arriving in Israel. British and French shock paratrooper units were sent to Cyprus. The British and French navies made for the Eastern Mediterranean. French military vehicles specially painted yellow — the colour of the desert — were moving from Marseilles and Algeria to Famagusta on Cyprus. The commanders of the French units concentrated in that area were issued Egyptian pounds forged in Clermont Ferrand.

It should be also stressed that the armed attack on Egypt almost coincided in time with the attempt at a fascist putsch in Hungary. The aggressors obviously hoped that public attention would be diverted from their actions by the clamour raised by reactionary propaganda around the Hungarian events.

Aggression Against Egypt Had the Nature of a Cruel Colonial War

Those who prepared the aggression obviously expected to succeed in conducting a "lightning war", completely breaking Egypt's resistance in one or two days and thus confronting world public with a fait accompli. But the heroic resistance of the Egyptians and the powerful wave of resolute protests against the aggressors' actions have frustrated all their expectations. They saw that their plans for a "blitzkrieg" were failing. The aggression of Britain, France, and Israel acquired the nature of a typical colonial war with the barbarous cruelty inherent in it.

The aggressors' aircraft hurled its bombs on peaceful towns and villages where there were not, nor could there be, any military objects. The organizers of the air terror were guided by cold-blooded calculations: they thought that their attacks would intimidate the Egyptians, cause panic among them and compel them to surrender. In Ismailia some 60 houses were bombed by aircraft and tangible destruction was also caused in Alexandria and Ferdane. But the worst destructions were caused in Port Said.

It is impossible to remain indifferent when listening or reading the stories of the people who have seen Port Said with their own eyes, demolished by barbarous bombings, bestrewn with corpses of women and children. It is impossible to look without indignation at the photographs published in the press of the ruined streets of Port Said, bestrewn with corpses of innocent people.

Here is what the Swedish journalist Anderson writes after visiting Port Said when the city was in the hands of aggressor troops: "Several hours after the announcement of a cease-fire I found my way to Port Said and discovered there an inferno of flames and smoke. I saw children in bombed houses looking for their parents among the ruins. I saw thousands of corpses among the smoldering and smoking debris behind several hospitals which still remained intact after bombing. Two hospitals were completely destroyed by bombs together with 900 patients who were in them. Can the flights of aircraft over streets and machine-gunning of houses and streets be called 'police action'? I call it terror and murder".

A group of foreign journalists, including correspondents of Italian, German, Swiss, Turkish, Japanese, and Soviet newspapers, visited Port Said and had the opportunity to see how barbarously and inhumanely this city had been destroyed by the invaders. Thousands of civilians were buried under the ruins of buildings in Port Said. Tens of thousands of Port Said citizens were left homeless. The wounded were dying without any medical aid. Children asked water but there was nothing to drink since the water supply was cut.

As soon as the Anglo-French troops broke into Port Said its streets became scenes of indescribable tragedies. The soldiers who broke into this city rushed to plunder the warehouses of the Egyptian Suez Canal Administration, the Custom House, the shops and Egyptians' homes, killing civilians. On November 12, that is, several days after Britain and France had officially announced the cease-fire 20 foreign correspondents who had arrived in Port Said witnessed one of the barbarous outrages committed by the invaders against peaceful citizens. They drove a group of citizens out of the city towards the Manzela Lake and when the boats carrying these people left the shore, British soldiers opened fire on them. The journalists, with their own eyes, saw women and children die in the boats from the invaders' bullets.

According to reports published in the Egyptian press on November 18, British soldiers in Port Said opened fire on an Egyptian ambulance car as a result of which the leader of a medical team was killed and a

nurse seriously wounded. On November 20, the Egyptian press published reports about the wild man-hunt arranged by three British soldiers. Chasing a lorry, which was taking women and children from Port Said they hurled ten air bombs into it.

In Rafa and El Arish, Israeli troops resorted to provocative acts and reprisals, firing on the peaceful population and killing a great number of civilians. Having driven out of the Gaza area the United Nations' truce observers, the Israeli troops committed endless outrages against refugees and many of them perished.

And after all these grave crimes Mr. Lloyd, the British Secretary of State For Foreign Affairs, without any shame, has declared today from this rostrum that the aggressors had landed their troops on Egyptian territory in order to "establish peace in this disturbed area".

The Soviet Union supports Egypt's demand for an investigation of the atrocities perpetrated by the invading forces against the Egyptian people, for an investigation of the destructions and killings committed by the British and French troops in Port Said and by the Israeli forces in Gaza, Rafa, and El Arish. Egypt rightly demands the punishment of the aggressors.

Eliminate the Aftermath of Aggression, Safeguard Enduring Peace in Near East!

Gentlemen, the aggression against Egypt has confirmed, with renewed vigour, Clausewitz's old formula that war is the continuation of politics by other means.

What does the policy of Britain, France, and Israel look like in the light of the results of their aggression against Egypt? What are the objective results of the War?

The aggressors expected that by unleashing war in the Near and Middle East the colonial powers would be able to take revenge for their defeats in recent years. These were miscalculations. The aggression against Egypt far from strengthening colonialism led to the further weakening of its rotten foundations. In the face of this aggression the peoples of all Eastern countries strengthened their determination to expedite the liquidation of the vestiges of colonialism on their soil.

The aggressors expected that having attacked Egypt they would completely seize the Suez Canal zone, take control of the administration and reconvert the canal into a source of enrichment for the Anglo-French billionaires. And what was the result? First and foremost the aggressors sustained a military defeat. They failed to seize the canal. They only put it out of commission by their bombings and thus struck a telling blow at their own economic interests. The commercial contacts of the European and Asian countries have been dislocated. The West European countries' system of oil supplies has been dislocated. Yet the import of oil by these countries from the Near and Middle East areas amounted to some 100-million tons per annum. This could not but worsen the economic situation of such countries as Britain, France,

Western Germany, Sweden, and others, since these countries obtain from 60 to 90 per cent of the oil they consume from the Near East. And it is not accidental that a number of these countries have already introduced restrictions on the industrial and household use of oil and oil products.

The situation created undermines the competitive positions of the British, French and other West European monopolies in face of the onslaught of American monopoly capital, which, taking advantage of the present situation, is intensively pumping out of the West European countries their gold and dollar reserves by supplying them with expensive oil from the Western hemisphere.

If the aggression against Egypt was engendered by Britain's and France's preceding policy, it, in turn, threw this policy into the throes of a serious crisis.

Nevertheless, the new stage in the Suez problem, which began with the enforced cease-fire in Egypt, is primarily characterized by the fact that the ruling circles of Britain and France seek again to carry through the same policy which has sustained such a grave fiasco. This is seen primarily by their desire to retain their forces on Egyptian territory on any pretext. Three weeks have already elapsed since the moment when the United Nations adopted a resolution calling, for the second time, upon Britain and France to withdraw their forces immediately from Egyptian territory, and upon Israel to withdraw her troops beyond the truce line established at one time by a United Nations' decision. Yet the impression is being created that Britain, France, and Israel are not going to withdraw their forces.

Indeed, what is the meaning of the replies of the governments of the three countries to Mr. Hammarskjöld's letter? They only contain vague promises to effect, as a goodwill gesture, the partial withdrawal of some units. At the same time a number of absolutely unacceptable conditions are advanced as if Britain, France, and Israel are in Egypt by right, and the United Nations is an almoner.

While this exchange of messages takes place the aggressors are reinforcing their positions on occupied Egyptian territory. The legitimate question arises: *Is the British-French decision on the cessation of hostilities against Egypt a manoeuvre designed to gain time, to obtain a breathing spell for building up forces with the object of resuming an aggressive war not only against Egypt but also against the other countries of the Arab East, on a still larger scale?* No delay can be tolerated in the question of the withdrawal of the armed forces that have invaded Egypt's territory. Continuation of the occupation of Egyptian territory is tantamount to a continuation of the war against Egypt. As long as the armed forces that have invaded Egypt are not fully withdrawn from Egyptian territory, one cannot consider that the threat to the peace in the Near East has been allayed to any extent.

This withdrawal becomes the more topical since the reactionary forces have of late markedly stepped up their intrigues in the countries bordering on Egypt. They seek to provoke international complications in those countries so as to resume the aggression on a still larger scale after artificially creating a strained situation on the borders of Egypt.

It is common knowledge that in recent days the air forces of Britain, France, and Israel have stopped up their penetration of the air space of the Arab countries, specifically Syria, and Jordan. The Island of Cyprus is still the base for the aggression.

Speaking in the general debate I have already had the opportunity to point out that the Soviet Government proceeds from the fact that the Egyptian Government has consented to the temporary stationing of the international United Nations' forces in Egypt. I repeat, in doing so we regard as an important principle the observance of the unalienable right of the Security Council to decide in each concrete instance the question of the formation and use of United Nations' armed forces.

It is, however, imperative to fully elucidate the question *where* the United Nations' armed forces must be stationed, *how long* must they stay in Egypt, and *what functions* must they discharge. The Soviet Government supports Egypt's stand on this question. After the evacuation of the British and French forces from Port Said the United Nations' forces must exercise no functions either in Port Said or in the Canal zone in general.

The units of the international forces which entered Port Said on November 21 must remain there only until the Anglo-French troops complete their evacuation.

Thereafter they must immediately withdraw and join the units of the international forces which will be stationed along the demarcation line dividing the forces of Egypt and Israel according to the well-known truce agreement. But even there they must remain only as long as Egypt considers it necessary.

It must be said, however, that the ruling quarters of those countries that committed the aggression against Egypt are making many attempts to interpret to the contrary the mission and the functions of the United Nations' armed forces. Thus, the idea is current in those countries that the United Nations' armed forces are a kind of replacement for the British, French, and Israeli occupation forces. At the same time it is being ever more frequently asserted that the Anglo-French troops must remain on occupied Egyptian territory until the idea of the so-called "internationalization of the Canal" has been translated into reality. This, for instance, was hinted today by Mr. Lloyd when he said that the presence of the forces on Egyptian territory was connected with settling the problem of freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal and other problems.

It is not without reason that officials of the former Suez Canal Company were in the train of the Anglo-French forces which landed in Egypt, taken there to resume the administration of the Canal.

Now, after the cease-fire, there is no doubt that the task of restoring shipping in the Suez Canal is an urgent and pressing task. It is evident, however, that some people would also like to use the solution of this technical problem for their political ends. That is precisely why attempts are now being made to artificially link it with the question of the presence of the United Nations' forces in the Canal zone. The Egyptian Government considers, as Mr. Hammarskjold reported to us, that the clearing of the Canal must be started immediately after the evacuation of non-Egyptian armed forces from Port Said and the Canal area and that the conclusion of contracts with appropriate firms is a matter for Egypt to settle.

The role of the United Nations in this highly important problem must be to assist Egypt in this respect. It would be strange, to say the least, if the United Nations, as some people now suggest, would run the Suez Canal, would act as if it all but leased the Canal.

The attempts to artificially link the question of the stay of the United Nations' emergency forces in Egypt with the exploitation of the Suez Canal reflects the plans of those Anglo-French quarters that do not want to reconcile themselves to the fact that the Canal is the unalienable property of Egypt, and which seek to restore the old order.

In this connection one cannot ignore the broad plans, now being discussed by circles close to the imperialist monopolies, of refashioning the map of the Arab East. To justify these plans the theory is being advanced that a political settlement in the Near East in our century has always taken place after wars and that the time is now favourable for such changes in that area.

Thus, opposing the restoration of the status quo in the Arab East prior to the hostilities, the supporters of the afore-said plans advance the following concrete ideas:

First, they propose that an entire Arab country — Jordan — be liquidated for "insubordination" and that her territory be transferred to Iraq which in turns must consent to conclude peace with Israel and to become the vehicle of a definite policy in that area.

Second, they propose not to return to Egypt the Gaza strip and the Tiran and Sanafir Islands in the Gulf of Aqaba, but to "internationalize" them and to leave them under United Nations' control.

Third, they recommend that Egypt be forced to give the Western powers "guarantees" suitable to them on the Suez Canal issue, in other words, to renounce her sovereignty and to agree to the plans for international control over the Canal.

Fourth, they propose that the United States join the Baghdad pact. The sponsors of this proposal declare that the object of the United States joining the Baghdad pact should be to legalize United States' interference in Near and Middle Eastern Affairs. A significant analogy is even made between the Baghdad pact and the treaty concluded by the United States and the Chiang Kai-shek men entrenched on Taiwan.

All this proves conclusively that definite United States expansionist elements harbour new colonialist schemes fraught with serious danger to the vital interests of the Arab peoples and the cause of peace.

It must be noted, however, that the sponsors of such kind of plans do not take into account the real state of affairs. The Egyptian people, like the other peoples of the Arab East, relying on the moral support of all peaceable peoples, are fully determined to uphold their sovereignty. In these conditions Britain, France, and Israel have only one reasonable way out: to withdraw their troops from Egypt immediately.

The attempts to revive the plan for the "internationalization" of the Canal on the basis of the so-called "18-nation platform" and the "Dulles plan" and to link it with the question of the mission and functions of the United Nations' force are absolutely groundless. First, the settlement of the Suez problem presupposes the preliminary removal of all foreign troops from Egypt; second, the settlement of this problem is possible only through negotiations based on respect for the inalienable sovereign rights of Egypt, and the utilization of any foreign armed forces to exert pressure on Egypt is impermissible. Hence it follows that the United Nations' force cannot have anything to do with the problem of the final settlement of the Suez problem.

The United Nations would make a serious mistake should it permit the presence of its emergency armed force in Egypt to be utilized for covering up the implementation of the above-mentioned plans.

The United Nations should resolutely dissociate itself from these plans not only because their authors ignore the sovereignty of Egypt and other Arab nations but also because they are out to convert the United Nations into a tool serving the self-seeking interests of colonialist forces seeking to restore and regain their positions in the Arab countries.

Gentlemen! The recent developments in the Near East have shown that aggressive circles in certain powers are prepared, for the sake of their narrow interests, to plunge the world into an abyss of a new military conflict fraught with grave consequences for mankind. At the same time these developments have graphically proved the great strength of the forces who are concerned with the preservation of peace and who are prepared to curb aggressors with full determination.

In the present tense situation we cannot but be deeply alarmed by the fact that definite circles are making attempts to divert the General Assembly's attention from the basic question — from the fact that the aggressors have not so far fulfilled, and do not wish to fulfil, the recommendations on the immediate withdrawal of their troops from Egypt.

The speech made today by Mr. Lloyd does not inspire much hope in this respect. He did not give a direct answer to the General Assembly as to whether or not Britain, France, and Israel intend to fulfil the repeated decisions of the General Assembly on the immediate and complete removal of invading troops from Egyptian territory. He limited himself to a rather elastic formula to the effect that the aggressors' troops would be evacuated from Egyptian territory as soon as possible. Mr. Lloyd tried to camouflage the unwillingness of the powers which committed aggression against Egypt to comply with the Assembly's decisions by alleging that Britain is concerned over the prestige of the United Nations' force, that they need time for settling and gaining ground in Egypt, that we — as Mr. Lloyd stated — want to do so as to protect General Burns' force from being jeered at and so on. Surely everyone sees through the fictitiousness and, I should say, comic nature of arguments of this kind.

— ★ —

