

Friday, 21 December 1956,
at 10.30 a.m.

New York



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ELEVENTH SESSION
Official Records

UN. LIBRARY
1 JUL 1957
UNISA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

Agenda item 66:

Question considered by the first emergency special session
of the General Assembly from 1 to 10 November 1956
(continued) 781

President: Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON
(Thailand).

AGENDA ITEM 66

Question considered by the first emergency special session of the General Assembly from 1 to 10 November 1956 (continued)

1. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): Yesterday, the representative of France was given the floor to make a statement. I thank the President for allowing me to follow a similar procedure.
2. The French representative referred in his statement to my country and to its delegation. He said: "The representative of Syria, speaking from this rostrum, used a figure of speech. He said: You do not go to the judge with dirty hands. I would go further and say: when you have dirty hands, you do not substitute yourself for the judge." [629th meeting, para. 134.]
3. With all due respect to the French representative, may I remind him that at no time was such a metaphor used by the Syrian delegation. It was never said. I wonder where he got it. Is it a mistake? Or is it an act of imagination? If his juridical research into other matters to which he refers is of the same veracity as this part of his statement, then he surely will have demonstrated again that his statement was ill-conceived as to facts and other considerations.
4. I would like to find an excuse for him, if I may. He certainly did not commit this mistake easily. He was overwhelmed by the fact that he stood alone, unsupported except by the United Kingdom and Israel, the two other consorts of the unholy marriage of the three that was undertaken so that they might act together aggressively in the Middle East. That lack of support, that emptiness around him, might have been the reason for his falling into that mistake.
5. This, however, is not the important consideration that has prompted us to come to this rostrum. The representative of France went on to state something about Syria which is really important. Syria, according to him, is "the State that is piling up arms on its territory which may cause conflict to flare up anew in the Middle East" [ibid.].
6. In all sincerity and frankness, his statement is unfounded. I am using the term "unfounded" in order

to avoid other more frank and candid terms that could have qualified such a statement. I use this mild term "unfounded" out of respect to the Assembly and out of decency, if I may say so, in the hope that the French representative in the future will find the means to use a more decent remark in respect of the Syrian delegation.

7. Syria is not piling up arms. We have neither the means nor the will to pile up arms. We have no desire whatsoever to see the conflict flare up anew in the Middle East. We have some arms, a part of which, however, has been bought from France. We have these arms in order to resist aggression. Every State has the right to defend itself and the duty to resist aggression. It is the duty of all other Member States to extend help and comfort by every possible means to the State that may be exposed to aggression. That is in the Charter and cannot be waived.

8. The French statement, however, comes at a time when it appears to be of some consequence, an indication of some kind of policy. That is why we have taken the floor to deal with it.

9. Indeed, it comes in the light of statements made during the last two days in London by Sir Anthony Eden and in Paris by the French Prime Minister, Mr. Mollet, and by Mr. Ben Gurion, so dear to Mr. Mollet and Sir Anthony Eden. In those statements, particularly in one made before the French Parliament, it was said that had France not intervened, Mr. Mollet would be today weeping over a destroyed Israel. Sir Anthony Eden, the British Prime Minister, tells us that there was no collusion between the three colonial Zionist Powers in their action. Mr. Ben Gurion, however, goes on to express the desire and the will not to withdraw except, if ever, upon his own terms.

10. The French delegation tells us that Syria is piling up arms to make the conflict flare up anew in the Middle East. We certainly do not want to see Mr. Mollet have any fit of weeping over a destroyed Israel or anything else. Surely also we are not going to let him have a fit of laughter after his aggression. A fit of laughter in this case, I would respectfully submit, is one which would be exceedingly dangerous for world peace. He may have his smiles, but then the ruin of world peace would be the sight upon which Mr. Mollet would have smiled.

11. But these statements imply—and this is very important—that the three Powers which committed aggression in the Middle East persist in their co-operation and persist in their denial in front of the world of their collusion and their common action and objectives. While we hate aggression, allow me respectfully to say that we despise conspiracy. And we are very sorry indeed to see the persistence of denial of such action. That denial may be useful politically, yet we think that it is neither justifiable nor acceptable to the decent opinion of mankind.

12. In the circumstances, I would like to state that my Government might deem it fit, at the right time, to request the United Nations to proceed to an investigation so as to ascertain the collusion between the three colonial Zionist Powers and to demonstrate to the world the facts, among which are the following.

13. First, on 23 October, six days before the aggression, French forces moved from the port of Haifa into Israel; secondly, French forces, approximately half a division, were used in the Sinai peninsula in the attack against Egypt; thirdly, the action of the British fleet across the Gaza Strip at the time of the Zionist attack was in co-operation with the Zionist attack itself; fourthly, there was air activity by the three allies over Syria; fifthly, the utilization of Israel airports by the French and British was for the same purpose; sixthly, there was a constant supply of arms by Britain and France prior to and during the aggression of Israel; seventhly, there are at present preparations in Israel and on the island of Cyprus which continue to be very disquieting.

14. There are other facts which I shall not mention at this stage but which might be mentioned at a later stage so that such an investigation might reveal them conclusively.

15. The policy of Syria has been expressed to the best of our capability in our speech in the general debate [610th meeting]. Essentially, it consists of an effort to try to substitute international co-operation for colonial domination in the Arab countries and elsewhere. It has nothing against residents belonging to any nationality, legal persons or real individuals, unless they try to undertake subversive activity nefarious to the legitimate right of self-defence.

16. At this crisis it befits us all, with no exception, to remember the wise words uttered from this rostrum yesterday by the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru.¹ His words represented the wisdom of the Orient—a wisdom that only millenniums of culture could have bestowed.

17. While we are determined to resist aggression, we are equally determined to see to it that peaceful developments are encouraged in every possible way. If we take issue with the French statement, it is because we wish to see restored to this Assembly—little by little, if not suddenly, by magic—an atmosphere of harmony, so that the Assembly may function effectively and fulfil its mission: the mission of the Charter.

18. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): The United States has received information concerning the treatment of certain nationals and stateless persons in Egypt which occasions concern. It has not yet been possible to evaluate this information fully, nor has it been possible to obtain a clarification of some aspects of the situation which are still obscure.

19. The information which is presently available to my Government indicates that an indeterminate number of persons in Egypt, including British and French nationals and persons of Jewish origin, have been subjected to pressure and intimidation, and in some cases have been ordered deported. While we recognize the right of any Government to take measures which are necessary in the interests of its security, the United States must express its concern at any unwarranted pressures exerted against minorities.

¹ Mr. Nehru addressed the General Assembly informally in the afternoon of 20 December.

20. The United States Ambassador in Cairo has been requested to bring to the attention of the Government of Egypt the concern of the American people over these reports. The United States hopes that everything possible will be done to ensure that measures will not be employed which will discriminate unjustly against human beings merely on racial or religious grounds or on the basis of foreign nationality.

21. I make bold to conclude with a plea. I suggest that the matter we are now discussing is not one which is likely to benefit from prolonged discussion here; certainly it will not benefit from any intemperate discussion. That is why, without in any way wishing to cut off speakers whose names have been inscribed on the list of speakers and who will follow me to the rostrum, I would suggest to them, as well as to other representatives who may desire to speak on this subject, that the most useful thing we could do would be to bring this phase of the discussion to an early end.

22. Mr. EBAN (Israel): On 18 December [624th meeting], the General Assembly's attention was drawn to measures taken by the Government of Egypt against people of various nationalities, in violation of international law and common humanity.

23. The representative of Egypt has admitted and sought to justify the arrests, expropriations and expulsions carried out against innocent people on the sole ground of their nationality or religious persuasion. Some delegations have spoken here on behalf of their fellow citizens undergoing discrimination in Egypt. But there are broad issues of humanity here involved for which no delegation is less responsible than any other and for which Israel feels a legitimate concern, arising from a long and profound historical sentiment. There are stateless persons for whom all States are spokesmen. Moreover, hundreds of people expelled from Egypt are reaching Israel's shores, so that we have become one of the most authentic sources of information about the dark and ominous deeds for which the Government of Egypt has assumed and confessed responsibility.

24. At the centre of the rampant xenophobia which is now going on, there stands an event of terrible import for the moral conscience of this generation. I refer to the spoliation and persecution of the ancient Jewish community of Egypt. It is an undeniable and sombre fact that in Egypt today adherence to a certain cultural and religious tradition—namely, the tradition of Judaism—is regarded as grounds for dispossession, disenfranchisement and often expulsion.

25. I shall not ask the Assembly to listen here to a detailed analysis of these events. My delegation has presented information from time to time to the General Assembly, through the President of this session. I should, however, like briefly to summarize some of the elements in the picture which cause us and others such deep and sincere concern.

26. Some thousand Jews of foreign nationality have been imprisoned in the Barrages Prison in Cairo. Special detention centres are operating in various public buildings, including the Jewish community school in Cairo, where hundreds of Jews—both stateless and of Egyptian nationality—are interned; and the Abraham Beterich school in Heliopolis, where a great number of Jewish women of foreign nationality are being held. Among those who have been held in arrest from time to time, including those still held in arrest, are practically all the leaders of the Jewish community.

27. The fate and the whereabouts of some 900 arrested persons are quite unknown. They are for the most part

individual members of deported families, and are being held as hostages to ensure the silence of these families after they leave the country. Those leaving, many of whom have reached Israel and told of their experiences, are allowed to take with them one suitcase of clothes and twenty Egyptian pounds. They are made to sign declarations that they will never return to Egypt, that they renounce all property and financial claims, and that the assets which they are leaving behind in Egypt are being donated to the Government.

28. There are 50,000 Jews in Egypt, of whom 16,000 are of foreign nationality, and 15,000 stateless; the remainder are Egyptian citizens. But according to a proclamation by the Governor of Cairo, published on 22 November 1956, all those of Jewish faith who became Egyptian nationals after 1 January 1900 may be deprived of their nationality and expelled, except that those who became naturalized before 1932 may be allowed to remain unless the Ministry of the Interior chooses to define them as lacking in loyalty or as Zionists—subjective definitions, in terms which are not made precise.

29. Economic measures of the utmost stringency have been taken against this community: bank accounts have been frozen, property sequestered, industrial and commercial concerns taken over by the Government and Jewish employees generally dismissed. No Jewish doctor is allowed to practise medicine; no lawyer of Jewish faith is allowed to practise law. I hold in my hand a copy of the exceptional legislation published by the Government of Egypt on 20 November 1956 under the heading: "State of siege; military proclamation; sequestrations; persons affected by restrictions; requisition orders and orders for the execution of arrests and confiscations." This document includes a long list of persons whose property is placed under sequestration and who are laid open without cause or process to the full brunt of these exactions.

30. Thus decree No. 170 speaks of 186 persons in Cairo, 194 persons in Alexandria, 28 persons in Port Said, 20 persons in Giza and 12 persons in Suez, all of whom are liable to these arbitrary processes of arrest or expulsion at the discretion of the officer named in this decree itself. Decree No. 171 mentions thirteen other persons, including the eminent President of the Jewish community in Cairo, whose goods, possessions and persons are also made subject to this legislation. Decrees Nos. 174 to 196 speak of the thirteen chief mercantile and business enterprises of the Jewish community which are entirely placed under governmental sequestration. Decree No. 197 speaks of the Grands Magasins Cicurel, the largest department stores in Egypt, the administrative council of which has as its president the head of the Jewish community of Cairo.

31. On 4 December 1956, further legislation was published in Cairo citing most of the other important Jewish-owned concerns held by Egyptian Jews or stateless Jews, all of which are also placed under sequestration.

32. As one studies this long list of hundreds of names, an extraordinary circumstance comes into view. Every single one of these names is the name of a person of Jewish faith and persuasion. Can the General Assembly think of anything more extraordinary than the situation in which a particular legislative act defining so-called breaches of security should in fact happen to fall exclusively upon persons of a certain religious faith and tradition? This amply establishes the principle of discrimination to which the representa-

tive of the United States has called attention in his eloquent plea for abstention from any acts which discriminate against people on the sole grounds of their race or religion.

33. There can be no doubt that the only cause and motive for these sequestrations and expulsions lies in the religious and national and cultural identity of those affected. We have in our possession actual expulsion orders issued to those called upon to leave Egypt. These are phrased in the most brusque and concise terms. The governor of the province concerned addresses the individual in one sentence: "It is requested that you leave the country within a period of eight days." We have in our possession receipts which indicate that those who reach the frontier in the course of these dispossessions are deprived of their personal items of jewellery and of other items of sentimental importance. Here, for example, in my possession is a receipt issued by the Egyptian authorities to a person leaving Egyptian shores under this system of spoliation. The Egyptian official acknowledges receipt of the man's tie pin, of his watch and of certain sentimental articles of jewellery affecting his wife and his children.

34. I have said that many persons who have suffered these indignities and brutalities have reached Israel's shores. Our gates, of course, are open to them in wide hospitality, but my delegation finds it necessary to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that, under the system of economic deprivation, destruction of the entire life of the community and humiliation of all its members, absence of expulsion becomes even more cruel than expulsion. And what the respect for human rights would require would be not merely abstention from deportations by force but also the elimination of measures which destroy and ruin the lives, the subsistence and the basic human dignity of these tens of thousands of persons.

35. The Egyptian Press, which, as the General Assembly knows, is not totally free from governmental influence, contains articles of rampant racial hatred. I refer to an article in *El Tahrir* of 27 November, which describes the history, the tradition and the sacred religious principles sustained by the Jewish people throughout the centuries in terms as odious and as vile as any that can be evoked in the journalistic traditions of Europe in the thirties and forties of this century.

36. It is plain, then, that the world here faces a process which challenges its conscience. These are not acts carried out in the heat or the passion of war, for all of these measures were enacted and implemented after the cease-fire had been universally accepted, and, indeed, after there had been universal agreement for the withdrawal of non-Egyptian troops from Egyptian soil. These are measures taken not against armies but against helpless people who are totally within the power and jurisdiction of those who victimize them. These are not incidents suddenly improvised in a moment of tension. These are policies ordained by the Government itself and clearly, by the very perfection of these techniques, planned a long time ago.

37. My delegation is, therefore, convinced that the Assembly here faces a violation of human rights and of international obligations. The Government which is practising these policies surely is not in a position to invoke the protection of the Charter and to continue these processes which violate all the principles and aspirations of the Charter's system. The fact that the United Nations is operating on Egyptian soil in the

cause of restoring international peace and security, and has been operating to that extent on Egypt's behalf, surely associates the United Nations, in the moral sense, with the responsibility for what is happening in that place and during the time when United Nations action is going forward.

38. This, then, is the challenge to the United Nations in the exercise of its responsibility in Egypt. Can it turn a blind eye to the existence of these abuses, which violate all the decencies which all Members are called upon by the Charter to observe?

39. For Israel itself the poignancy of this position is plain. The tide of sentiment flows so swiftly that it is obvious that these events must affect every single aspect of Israel's relations with Egypt. We cannot forbear to reflect that these acts against the Jewish community in Egypt come as the climax of the other acts of hostility and belligerency on the international plane. After the tearing up of treaties, after the constant advocacy of a state of war, after the unilateral seizure of the jugular vein of the world's communications, after the plunging of the Middle East into a disastrous arms race, there comes this assault upon the basic human rights of a helpless community in Egypt.

40. We are convinced that the United Nations will not wish to look upon this with indulgence or in silence, and it was not to condone such acts as these that the peoples of the world established this union of sovereign nations and consecrated it by the Charter to the high ideals of humanity and peace.

41. Israel, therefore, is confident that the United Nations will find a solution for this problem by continually focusing upon it the clear light of public opinion and indignation. The fate of this community calls exigently for a supreme act of revolt—the revolt of the human conscience against policies and attitudes which have left such a tragic mark upon the history of this century.

Mr. Urquía (El Salvador), Vice-President, took the Chair.

42. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan): On 18 December [624th meeting], the representative of France reopened the debate on the Middle East with a statement containing allegations against the Government of Egypt. The French representative had previously circulated two documents [A/3400 and Add.1] accusing Egypt of mistreating French nationals within its territory. He also held a press conference to the same effect. He again spoke yesterday to make a further statement on the same subject.

43. The same example was followed by the Israel representative who also circulated documents [A/3398, A/3412 and A/3457]. He spoke on a previous occasion, and he has just made a statement similar to that of the French representative.

44. The representative of the United Kingdom did not wish to exclude himself from the campaign and associated himself [624th meeting] with the representative of France.

45. The three of them contemplated this new action, overlooking the fact that, if any party was to bring the issue up for further debate, Egypt and the Arab States should be that party. The reason is that we are the aggrieved people and that we have lots of complaints to submit for consideration by the representatives. Thus we are now given the opportunity not only to refute the allegations made against Egypt, but also

to state to the Assembly the true facts of the situation in Egyptian territory arising from the military attacks of Israel, France and the United Kingdom.

46. In its first stage, the assault against Egypt was performed by armed forces. Now it is taking the form of extensive violations on the part of Israel in Egyptian territory and of wide-scale accusations and distortions by the three invaders, aiming to weaken the moral victory of Egypt which has been demonstrated vigorously in this world forum.

47. Perhaps the French representative wishes to use such tactics for domestic political purposes. If that is the case, I wish to say that this rostrum is not supposed to be used as a platform for the internal political consumption of any country. However, such attempts at making allegations can never meet with success, because they are broken arrows.

48. I take this opportunity to review what has happened since 24 November 1956, when the Assembly adopted its last resolution [1120 (XI)] reiterating its call to France, Israel and the United Kingdom to withdraw their forces from Egyptian territory behind the armistice demarcation line.

49. The progress achieved in regard to the formation of the United Nations Emergency Force was matched by a slow withdrawal on the part of the United Kingdom and France and by complete disregard on the part of Israel in carrying out its obligations under the aforementioned resolutions. Moreover, new flagrant violations were committed by Israel during the last month. I shall report to the representatives here some of them so that they may consider what action should be taken in this respect.

50. I need not dwell on Israel's basic violations of the General Armistice Agreement or of the United Nations Charter. This has been said at the early stages of the present debate. But I need to bring to the attention of the representatives here the truth of what is being committed by Israel, in a manner which constitutes the ugliest crimes of genocide and the most inhuman acts that man could imagine. The tragedy begins as follows, and is verified and confirmed by eye-witness reporters, by press and news agencies and by official sources.

51. When the Israel forces occupied Gaza and Sinai, news of their atrocities among the civilians and helpless refugees in that sector started to spread everywhere. The unhappy population fell a victim to the cruel Israel army. The Israel forces went through the villages searching, investigating, screening, arresting and deporting to unknown places all those who were suspected by the Israel authorities. Three thousand Arab young men of the population in the Gaza Strip have been taken to places inside Israel, and then disappeared. Scores of miserable refugees and civilians were killed and hundreds were expelled, while large numbers fled to the Jordanian borders.

52. I will give the Assembly a short summary of these tragic events. On 17 November, the *New York Herald Tribune* published the following:

"Lieutenant Colonel Chaim Gaon, Israeli military commander of the occupied Gaza Strip, faced a hastily convened press conference at Israel army headquarters to detail the story of Arab refugee killings in his command.

"Meanwhile, at Gaza, Thomas Jamieson, United Nations Relief and Works Administration observer for the area, disclosed still other killings.

"According to Colonel Gaon, Israel units moved back in Rafah, and the next morning, loud-speaker trucks toured the town ordering all men to report for screening.

"The result was that Israel soldiers then began entering houses to force men out; and shooting followed. Some Arabs took off over the sand dunes trying to get away from Rafah, and shots were fired at them. Colonel Gaon said it was difficult to determine the exact number of casualties because not all bodies were recovered."

53. In Khan Yunis, when the Israel invading forces entered the town, they gathered all the men of the town from the ages of eighteen to forty. The Israel forces assigned three places for the firing squads in Khan Yunis: one in front of the Qal'a, the citadel; another behind the house of Abu Hilmi As-Sagga and the third near the municipal house. The victims were shot *en masse* in these three places by the Israelis. The following list shows the number of persons of specific families who were shot in Khan Yunis: 20 of the Barbakh family; 17 of the Najjar family; 9 of the Shahwan; 7 of the Jarboua; 5 of the Al-Farra; 5 of the Al-Agha; 4 of the Wafi; 4 of the Al-Azaar; 3 of the Al-Battah. The rest were Arab refugees.

54. On 16 November, *The New York Times* published an Associated Press report that 50 Arabs had been killed and 25 wounded by Israel soldiers in food riots near the Gaza Strip. These poor Arab refugees, who had been driven from their homes and property in Palestine by the Israel terrorists, had found shelter in Gaza. They had lost all their possessions but had escaped with their lives. But their sad destiny led them to fall once again into the hands of Israel. This time, death was their fate. They asked for their daily ration, for their loaf of bread—but instead they were given death by the Israelis. Others of their brethren were thrown out into the desert for the second time or across the Jordanian borders.

55. I wish to say in this connexion that the official reports which my delegation has received from the Jordan Government state that, between 30 October and 15 December, the Arab civilians who fled the Israel terror from the Gaza Strip and entered the kingdom of Jordan, seeking shelter, reached the number of 1,865 persons. Other Arabs from Gaza who are able to escape continue to flee to Jordan every day.

56. On 11 December, news of the most horrible incident committed by the Israelis was disclosed. Innocent persons, defenceless and peaceful Arab villagers, irrespective of sex and age, were selected as victims. I am referring to the recent massacre of Arab men, women and children at Kafr Qasim, as admitted by the Prime Minister of Israel. That incident took place on 29 October.

57. Kafr Qasim is a small village of 1,500 inhabitants and it lies inside Israel, barely half a mile from the Jordanian border. The victims were a cross-section of the hard-working and peaceful villagers of Palestine who go about their lawful daily work. These persons had gone out to the fields early in the morning with their draft animals and ploughs, to till the land that would provide some security against the uncertainties of the life which they were leading under Israel's heavy yoke. Upon returning home, they were rounded up at the outskirts of their village and herded into the village square. They were told that they had committed a crime: the crime was that they had broken the curfew

order which had been imposed in the morning during their absence in the fields—a curfew of which they had had no knowledge. The Israel commander told them that they were to pay for that crime with their lives. No sooner had he pronounced that verdict than there was a burst of gunfire and they all fell to the ground, writhing in blood.

58. This was the information which reached the Jordan Government from very reliable sources. The Israel Prime Minister, however, withheld the news of this massacre for some weeks. He then had to report it to the Israel Parliament. He attempted to whitewash it with the suggestion that some compensation had been allotted to the relatives of the victims and that the officer who had ordered the killing was to be punished. The number of poor villagers who were slain was 94, including men, women and children, while the Israel Prime Minister admitted to only 48.

59. An Israel poet, named Nathan Ultraman, composed a poem on this brutal incident and described it as a most horrible crime committed by the Israelis against humanity at large.

60. In its horror and cold-bloodedness, this massacre is bound to bring back to our memories many other terrible crimes committed by Israel. I am not referring to Deir Yassin, because that massacre is well known to everybody. I am referring to those crimes as to which little information has been published.

61. One of these was at Lydda. There, according to the evidence gathered to date, the Israelis rounded up many young men of the unarmed population of Lydda and herded them into the mosque of the town. They numbered several hundred. In the mosque they were screened about the religion which they professed. Yes, about their religion—not their race or their nationality. Christians were taken to the Church of St. George; Moslems were ordered to remain where they were. The fate of the few Christians is not known. A short while later, a posse of armed soldiers took up positions in front of the young men who had been gathered together and opened up with their automatic weapons, felling every single one. Their cries and shrieks were heard by their brothers and sisters, mothers and children, who were being driven away from the town by the Israelis.

62. I could recount the details of another half-dozen such heinous crimes committed by the Israelis—by those same Israelis who are now impudently clamouring for the protection of their co-religionists in Egypt and accusing Egypt and the Arabs everywhere of disrespect for Jewish private property and Jewish individual liberty.

63. These incidents and other similar ones belong to the first category of Israel violations committed in defiance of the orders of this world forum and in complete disregard of every moral value.

64. The second category of violation is the scorched-earth policy which is being carried out extensively by the Israel armed forces in Sinai. I should like to read a part of the text of a cablegram received by the American Friends of the Middle East from their representative in Cairo, Commander E. H. Hutchison, former chairman of the Jordan-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission. The cablegram is dated 11 December and reads as follows:

"Israelis making ruthless scorched-earth withdrawal from Sinai. Yugoslav United Nations forces bogged down only 27 kilometres east of Suez Canal.

Roads, railroads, communication lines, bridges, villages, water tanks, mines, oil wells demolished completely . . . Inhabitants in miserable state spread over Sinai."

65. On 6 December, the *New York Daily News* published the following message from its correspondent in Tel Aviv:

"Israel forces withdrawing from Sinai peninsula are destroying air fields, roads, telephone lines, and all other facilities that could be used for an Egyptian military build-up in the border area, informed sources said today. All available pipe is being transferred to the southern Israel port of Elath, for the construction of a proposed Israel oil pipe-line from Elath to Haifa."

66. The *New York Times* published on the same day a report of the meeting of Major General Burns, Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force and Major General Dayan, commander of the Israel army. The report says:

"All during the time General Burns and General Dayan were in conference muffled explosions like distant thunder were heard by those at the airport where the talks were held.

"'Can that be thunder?' one crewman of the United Nations plane asked an Israel officer.

"'That is not thunder,' an airport staff officer replied. 'We are just making sure that the Egyptians will not be back here in a hurry.'"

67. The *New York World Telegram* published on 10 December a report dispatched by its staff writer, Mr. Sparks, who accompanied the United Nations forces into the Sinai desert. Here are some passages of that report:

"Yugoslav troops sent by the United Nations to restore peace to the Sinai desert of Egypt are now bogged down because the roads they must use have been torn up and mined by . . . Israel forces.

"On the heels of withdrawing Israel soldiers, this correspondent—and reporters from ten other countries—have seen a great sweep of land blackened in what looks like a scorched-earth policy . . .

"We have seen three villages without a living thing, the civilian population dispersed or deported, the cattle killed and previous water towers destroyed, every home and facility dynamited or pulled to the ground . . .

"I saw a pathetic camp of refugees cooking meagre rations over a thin twig fire, huddled deep in white robes against a constant, penetrating wind . . .

"I slowed to watch refugees walk barefooted along the railroad ties. An Iranian colleague asked them where they were going. They pointed to the nearby shambles and said, 'Home—to see if anything is left.'"

68. The third category of Israel's violations is its non-compliance with the terms of the resolutions on the immediate withdrawal of its forces behind the armistice line and its defiance of the will of the international community.

69. It is evident that Israel refuses to comply with the requirements of the successive resolutions of this Assembly for an immediate and unqualified withdrawal of its forces behind the Egypt-Israel armistice demarcation line, except for what it calls a token withdrawal or a withdrawal "to some distance", which in itself is a challenge to the dignity of the United Nations. Israel has been encouraged, no doubt, by its old habits

of defying the resolutions of the General Assembly whenever such resolutions place some obligations on it. It has been challenging United Nations resolutions throughout the past nine years, and no one has tried to take any action against it, not even a condemnation. Now again it takes the same attitude towards the present decisions on the cease-fire and immediate withdrawal.

70. On 2 November 1956, this Assembly, by an almost unanimous vote, called upon Israel to withdraw its forces immediately behind the Egyptian-Israel armistice line [resolution 997 (ES-I)]. In reply to this call, which was conveyed to Israel by the Secretary-General, the Government of Israel sent a letter, dated 4 November 1956 [A/3291], which lacked all decency and sense of responsibility. In that letter, Israel assumed to itself the role of conqueror, while it was aware of the fact that, owing to the actions of its two protectors, the United Kingdom and France, which had stabbed Egypt in the back, it has escaped the consequences of a definite defeat at the hands of Egypt.

71. On 21 November, the Israel representative, in a reply [A/3384, annex II] to the questions of the Secretary-General concerning the withdrawal of the Israel forces from Egyptian territory, repeated his Government's same equivocations. Although the resolutions of the first emergency special session called upon Israel, in a very clear and emphatic manner, to withdraw its forces immediately behind the armistice line, the Israel Government ignored such orders and informed the Secretary-General that it had withdrawn its forces only for varying distances along the Egyptian front.

72. On 11 December, that is, forty days after the first resolution demanding an immediate withdrawal, the Foreign Minister of Israel declared in Washington that the Gaza Strip was a special problem. Mrs. Meir added:

"I do not think I should come to any conclusions about it at this moment."

On 18 December, *The New York Times* published the following:

"Premier David Ben-Gurion said today Israel would not allow the Egyptians to return to the Gaza Strip. In an interview in Jerusalem, he twice emphasized that 'under no conditions can the Egyptians come back' to the Gaza Strip. 'We will not let them back,' he said."

73. Yesterday afternoon, I received a cable communication from my Government informing me that the Israel authorities in Gaza are enforcing a very serious policy of repression. The communication discloses that the Arab population there is being forced to sign petitions asking Israel to remain in occupation of the area. Whoever refuses to sign such a petition, is sent to prison.

74. My Government considers that this action constitutes a dangerous development and a further proof of Israel's intentions not to withdraw behind the armistice lines and not to abide by the General Assembly's resolutions.

75. My Government also considers any petition of this kind as having been extorted, and therefore such a petition should not have any legal value, nor does it reflect the wishes of the inhabitants of Gaza.

76. On 14 December, it was reported that the Israel army had stopped the advancing Yugoslav unit of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Sinai penin-

sula and told it to go back. The Israelis told the Yugoslavs that they had instructions not to permit the United Nations Force to advance.

77. I have submitted to the consideration of representatives the true facts of the situation in respect to the Israel behaviour—facts that are indisputable. My delegation takes the floor today not only to remind representatives of the aforesaid violations and atrocities but also to urge the General Assembly to consider what action it deems necessary to take in order to give effect to its resolutions.

78. I am conscious of the fact that my colleagues here might be waiting for a progress report by the Secretary-General so that they would act in the light of it. I am confident that the Secretary-General will be in a position to give us such a report before the Assembly recesses. My delegation is anxious to hear from the Secretary-General, today if possible, a statement in which he would kindly clarify the situation in respect to the withdrawal of the Israel forces behind the armistice line and the withdrawal of the British and French troops from Egyptian territory. On the other hand, we should be grateful if he could give us information about the destruction which took place in Port Said and about the extent of the demolitions in Sinai. Other matters of particular importance to my delegation are the atrocities practised on the Arab population in the Sinai peninsula and the Gaza Strip and the policy of Israel in that area. I hope that my request to the Secretary-General will not be inconvenient to him.

79. On 30 October 1956, fifty days ago, the representative of the United States brought the case of Israel's aggression against Egypt to the Security Council and submitted then a draft resolution [S/3710] providing, in paragraph 2 (c), that the Council called upon all members "to refrain from giving military, economic or financial assistance to Israel so long as it has not complied with this resolution". In introducing the draft resolution to the Security Council, the representative of the United States stated: "This, of course, is a minimum sanction".²

80. The United States draft resolution was vetoed then by the United Kingdom and France, and therefore was not adopted.

81. Here in the General Assembly, luckily, we do not have any veto power, and the same conditions with respect to the non-withdrawal of the Israel forces from Egyptian territory still stand. What was good as a draft resolution in the Security Council on 30 October is good as a draft resolution in the General Assembly today, especially after Israel has failed to comply with the resolutions which have been supported by sixty-five Members of this Assembly. In any event, I shall not press this particular point any further at the present moment.

82. I should like, however, to add that the slowness of the withdrawal of Israel out of Egyptian territory is impeding the advance of the United Nations Emergency Force in taking its position along the Egyptian-Israel armistice line. As everyone knows, this Force was established to act as a shield between the Egyptian and Israel forces and to take up positions astride the armistice demarcation line. Therefore, it has to leave its present bases and camps in the Suez Canal zone and proceed through the Sinai peninsula towards its

final destination. The non-withdrawal of the Israel forces is thus hampering the efforts of the United Nations and the functions of its Emergency Force.

83. In view of this situation, it becomes ludicrous to see the Israel representative coming forward to launch an attack of distorted facts and allegations against Egypt. He accuses Egypt of taking harsh measures against the Jews in Egypt and of treating them improperly. He whose house is built of glass should not throw stones at others.

84. The Israel representative talks of alleged intimidation that befell the Jews in Egypt and forgets that the 180,000 Arabs who were left in Palestine under Israel tyranny are treated as second class citizens and deprived of most of their civil rights and individual liberty. The 180,000 Arabs who live in Israel are considered by the Israel authorities as Israel citizens, but not on an equal footing with those of the Jewish faith. They live under martial law and discriminatory legislation. They are prohibited from movement and travel in Israel except within restricted areas. They are not entitled to be employed in civil administration except in certain secondary departments. They cannot join the army except in minor services.

85. The Israel discriminatory legislation empowers the civil and military authorities to confiscate their property and to remove them at a moment's notice from their dwellings and lands. Educational opportunities open to the Arabs of Israel are far below those available to the Israelis. The Arab young men there are not given access to secondary or higher education except very rarely. The identity cards of the Arabs of Israel carry the letter "B" as a mark of inferiority.

86. Yet the Israel representative comes to this rostrum and talks about human rights. The Israel representative forgets what his Government and people have done to 900,000 innocent Arab inhabitants of Palestine, who are now destitute refugees scattered here and there and denied every right by his Government. He forgets how his people's bandits rushed through the Arab villages of Palestine, murdering, plundering, expelling and perpetrating varied forms of torture against tens of thousands of Arab civilians.

87. Does he not remember how his Government used to load Arab men, women and children in trucks and large vehicles and throw them out in the barren lands, valleys and deserts, where numbers of them died of hunger, thirst and fatigue, while others were killed and devoured by wild beasts? Does he not remember how the so-called Israel army launched numerous treacherous attacks against the little, peaceful frontier villages of my country and killed as many as it was able to kill? Does he not remember the tragic incidents of Qibya, Nahhalin, Wadi Fukin, Gaza, El Sabha, Tiberias, Husan, Rahwah, Gharandal, Qalqiliya and others?

88. I am sure that he recalls all of this and more, yet he takes the floor to bring false accusations against Egypt of expelling a small fragment of Jews.

89. I wish to stop here for a while to analyse the fallacy of this Israel claim. I must stress before anything else an important point which is very essential in clarifying the facts, namely, that there is not a single Jew of Egyptian nationality who was expelled from Egypt. The very limited number of Jews who have left Egypt were either of various nationalities or stateless.

90. We heard the Israel representative give figures of the number of Jews who have left Egypt since the

² Official Records of the Security Council, Eleventh Year, 749th meeting, para. 19.

military attack against it. Apart from the fact that the figures which he gave are far from being accurate, I should like to point out that those Jews include French and British nationals. The question therefore becomes: are the French and British nationals who are of Jewish faith included in the Israel figures as part of the number of Jews who left Egypt? And is this same number of Jews included in the lists of France and the United Kingdom as French and British nationals? In other words, how does Israel count a French Jew who left Egypt? Does it consider him just a Jew or a Frenchman, or does he appear on both lists, once as a Frenchman, thus marking a number here and a number there?

91. The proper answer to this question is that Israel has no claim to make with respect to any Jew who might have been asked to leave Egypt, because he is not one of its subjects but is a subject of some other country, be it France, the United Kingdom or the United States. He is not identified as a Jew, but as a Frenchman or as having British or any other nationality.

92. The net result is, therefore, that Israel has no case to present in this matter and no complaint whatsoever to submit.

93. I shall read out a report published in today's *New York Times* concerning a statement made by the Chief Rabbi of Egypt:

"Haim Nahoum, Chief Rabbi of Egypt, said today that no foreign Government, and especially not Israel, was authorized to speak on behalf of the Jews of Egypt.

"The religious leader of the Jewish community in Egypt said his constituents 'denounce the brutal Anglo-French-Israel aggression against our dear motherland Egypt' . . .

"We participate in the sentiments expressed by all our constituents, and we denounce the brutal Anglo-French-Israel aggression against our dear motherland, Egypt,' the statement said, according to an unofficial translation. 'We address to God our warmest prayers for the grandeur of Egypt, its prosperity and the welfare of its sons.

"The Jews of Egypt represent an integral part of the Egyptian nation. For this reason no foreign government, especially not Israel, is authorized to speak on their behalf because, in the first place we are Egyptians, and we are associated with them [Egyptians] and their sentiments of independence and patriotism. . . ."

94. If Israel considers that all the Jews of the world are Israel nationals, or if those Jews would accept the theory of owing allegiance to Israel rather than to the country to which they belong, then Israel should expect that whatever conditions might involve it should at the same time involve those Jews. If Israel continues to interfere in the affairs of the Jews all over the world, then Israel itself will be doing harm to them by disturbing their stable life.

95. I as an Arab, and as a Moslem, do not bear the slightest antagonism against any Jew. On the contrary, I recognize him as an adherent of a divine faith whose doctrines I admit and respect. But once he becomes influenced by the politics of Israel which are detrimental to my people's interests, or once he affiliates himself with the destructive Zionist movement, then there we separate.

96. In Egypt there are 66,000 Jews. They lived and were brought up in Egypt like any other community. The Egyptian Government has always been considerate to them, in spite of all that has befallen the Arabs of Palestine at the hands of the Jews of Israel, and in spite of the strong evidence that Israel has tried to exploit their favourable conditions and employed some of them in spying for its benefit. When the last Israel aggression was carried out against Egypt, the Egyptian Government controlled and restrained itself *vis-à-vis* the subversion activities of some of those Jews in Egypt. Yet it would have been poor administration on the part of the Egyptian Government not to take precautionary measures against some Jewish individuals who were strongly suspected of being agents of Israel.

97. It is because of national security in Egypt that certain measures were taken against some Jews there. Egypt reports that only 120 Jews out of 66,000 have been interned for valid reasons of public security, and that only 280 stateless Jews were evacuated through the Red Cross.

98. It is very natural for Egypt to take such measures at a time when it is invaded by Israel. But what about the measures that were taken by Israel, the invader, against the Arabs living under its rule. Here is what the Israel daily newspaper *Haaretz* published in its issue of 17 December: that the Israel authorities had arrested for security reasons a great number of Arabs living in Israel when the Israelis started their assault on Egypt. The paper added that so far the Israel Government had refused to release those Arabs.

99. In any event, Israel has no juridical or international right whatsoever to interfere in the affairs of the Jews of Egypt because they are Jews. Such an attempt on its part would only serve to confirm the belief that it claims patronage over those Jews, and it creates more uncertainty in regard to their proper conduct.

100. That is as far as Israel is concerned. As for France and the United Kingdom, we wish that they had implemented their withdrawal with what might have restored some of the confidence and reliance that existed between them and the Arab countries. We expected to hear an expression of apology for what they had committed in Egypt, for their aggressive military intervention in Egypt, and for their association with Israel for invading Egypt and the southern part of Palestine.

101. We expected to hear from them a word of condolence for the killing of thousands of Egyptians as a net result of their bombardments, or a word of sympathy for the damage, loss and misery which they had caused to the Egyptians. But instead of that, they kept on insisting that their action against Egypt was right and justifiable, and that there was nothing wrong in it. Instead of that, they are evacuating Port Said and causing new large death tolls among its civilians.

102. British and French heavy tanks and infantrymen rumbled through the various quarters of Port Said on 16 December, firing and killing scores of innocent civilians and wounding a hundred others in what they called a retaliation for an officer. They committed that after they had rounded up and interrogated hundreds of inhabitants in Port Said. One should ask with what authority, except the authority of aggression, were the British and French troops entitled to kill the inhabitants in a land which they had occupied by invasion; and what right were they given to arrest Egyptian civilians in Egypt itself.

103. Instead of leaving the country in which they exhibited their violence with regret and atonement, they are now trying to turn back the wheel and accuse Egypt of expelling their nationals. I would have wished to see the United Kingdom and France refrain from these tactics and try to heal the deep wounds rather than to open them.

104. I have listened to the allegations of France against Egypt and tried to see whether the French representative himself believed in what he said. After all, there was nothing in his statements except sweeping allegations that fall short of verification and lack sound arguments. France, which showered Egypt with fire and death, now accuses Egypt of expelling French nationals from its territory. It seems to me that the rules of logic have changed altogether.

105. I do not wish to remind the French representative of his Government's history in the Arab homeland. That history is marked with blood and fire. I do not wish to remind him of that because I myself hate to recall those days during which the man who is addressing you this very minute fell an innocent victim to French bullets which had penetrated his body. After all, what is happening in Algeria under the French yoke leaves little room for other sad memories.

106. For France, all of that is forgivable and is all right. But for Egypt, it is not permissible to take certain security measures against a small number of French and British nationals.

107. The administrative measures which Egypt has adopted against a small number of French and British nationals in Egypt is a matter necessitated by the requirements of national security in Egypt. Egypt is fully entitled to take such measures against individuals whom it suspects, especially when its territory is the target of the military attack of the Governments of these individuals. Moreover, it has been proved by strong evidence that a considerable number of enemy aliens in Port Said and Port Fuad had taken an active part in undermining the national resistance of the Egyptian defenders when the two cities were invaded by the French and British forces.

108. In spite of this fact, it is reported that the Egyptian Government has taken all possible measures to protect the lives and possessions of all foreigners on Egyptian soil, including the British and French, in spite of the excitement and fury of the Egyptian population aroused by the tragedy which struck Egypt. Everyone of us knows how difficult it is to control the fury of the people when their fellow countrymen are subjected to death and destruction by an invader.

109. The Egyptian Government deserves to be commended and praised for the order it was able to maintain internally under the unusually grave conditions that existed in Egypt during the days of the French-British-Israel attacks. No Government, however efficient and active, could be expected to prevent its people from rising against enemy aliens amongst them; yet, the Egyptian Government was able to control the situation and to preserve public security and the safety of those foreigners themselves by taking the necessary measures with respect to Egyptians and foreigners alike.

110. We have been told the true facts in the persuasive reply of the representative of Egypt, facts which leave no shadow of doubt.

111. Finally, my delegation would have gone into more detail, but, since the arguments that have been adduced in all these allegations against Egypt were

totally unwarranted, I feel that I need not deal with other points.

112. I am sure that the General Assembly will not take into serious account any of the accusations which have been made against Egypt. We have more important matters before us. We must place the responsibility on those who planned the last tragic events in the Middle East. They must pay for the death which they caused and the destruction which they brought about.

113. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Before calling upon the next speaker on my list, I wish to point out to you, as I have been asked to do by several delegations, that up to this point in the discussion of item 66 no draft resolution has been presented by any delegation. Consequently we are engaged in a general debate.

114. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The United Kingdom, France and Israel have lodged with the United Nations a complaint of violation by the Egyptian Government of human rights and the principles of international law with regard to British and French nationals and Jews in Egypt.

115. The very fact that this so-called complaint has been submitted by States which recently launched a war of aggression against Egypt should put the General Assembly on its guard. It is not difficult to see that these States are trying to draw the United Nations into an unseemly game. The United Kingdom, France and Israel attacked Egypt. They reduced Port Said to ruins; they inflicted severe damage on several other towns and many villages; they killed and wrought havoc among the peaceful population of Egypt. And now these aggressor States, which have trampled underfoot the elementary rules of relations between sovereign States and have themselves brazenly violated human rights and the principles of international law, are bringing a charge of violation of human rights against the young Egyptian State, whose only aims are to strengthen its national statehood, free its people from the painful consequences of a lengthy colonial oppression, and secure their right to independent development.

116. This odd complaint by the United Kingdom, France and Israel can be construed only as an obvious attempt to cover up their own crimes against Egypt and the Egyptian people and against all mankind. If, indeed, we entertained for one moment the idea that such a complaint was admissible, we should have to acknowledge that in our world violence is above the law—which is doubtless what the aggressors seek to achieve. At the same time we should be setting a dangerous precedent whereby, at some future date, an aggressor would be enabled to pose as the defender of law and humanity and to accuse his victim of his own crimes.

117. This is no new stratagem. All those who have coveted their neighbours' goods have acted so. Those circles in the United Kingdom, France and Israel which unleashed the aggression against Egypt and suffered defeat as the result of the courageous resistance of the Egyptians and the efforts of the forces of peace, which categorically condemned that aggression, are now seeking to evade their direct responsibility for their misdeeds. With this aim in view the instigators of the attack on Egypt are attempting to justify their acts by accusing Egypt of the very crimes for which they themselves bear the full responsibility.

118. The aggressors gave no thought to the defence of human rights in the days when, by fire and the sword, they robbed Egypt of its national independence. They were not concerned with human rights when, through violence, they enslaved the hard-working Egyptian people and turned Egypt into a colony. But when the Egyptian people cast off the colonial yoke and drove the colonizers out of their country, they began to speak of the protection of human rights.

119. This is an old and favourite stratagem of colonizers and imperialists. Wherever the colonizers find themselves in difficulties, wherever they seek to prolong their dominion by force of arms, wherever they seek to restore the old dispensation, they cry that human rights have been violated.

120. But we are no longer in the nineteenth century, when it was still possible to put up some justification for colonial banditry and robbery and to force one's own ways on other peoples with the aid of this one too subtle device. It is not possible nowadays to treat the peoples of Asia and Africa as the founders of the colonial empires treated them in the past. Anyone who cleaves to the old methods in our era—an era of the peoples' struggle for liberation from any form of colonialist and imperialist oppression—merely proves that he has understood and learned nothing from the past. And aggressive circles in the United Kingdom, France and Israel, which have violated the Charter and the principles of international law, should be the last to appear as champions of human rights and humanitarian principles. The case can be aptly described in the words of an Arabian proverb: "He beat me, and it was he who wept."

121. On what grounds do the sponsors base their thoroughly hypocritical complaint? As we see from the statements made by the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and Israel, the Egyptian Government is being accused of arbitrarily arresting and expelling from the country French and British nationals and Jews, and confiscating their property. The representative of Egypt and the representatives of other countries who have spoken here have shown that the Egyptian Government has not committed and is not committing any violation of human rights, and that the complaint by France, the United Kingdom and Israel is completely unfounded.

122. Egypt is conducting itself as a sovereign State in compliance with the rules of international law. Any sovereign State, especially when it has been the victim of aggression, is both wholly entitled and in duty bound to take all necessary measures to safeguard its internal and external security. Such measures lie within the competence of a sovereign State and are not open to discussion by the General Assembly. In the present instance, such discussion would be all the more unjustifiable in that no violence is being employed against British and French nationals or Jews.

123. The question arises why the United Kingdom, France and Israel, which committed aggression against Egypt, have found it necessary to raise this trumped-up charge before the General Assembly. This is easily answered. The uproar about alleged violations of human rights by Egypt has been raised primarily in order to mislead public opinion and distract attention from the barbarous destruction and crimes which have been and are being perpetrated by British, French and Israel troops in Egypt.

124. It is no accident that the aggressors have been forced to resort to this diversionary manoeuvre at the very time when the evil picture of their crimes against the people of Egypt is becoming increasingly plain to the whole world. Many instances of the brutalities of the British, French and Israel troops in Egypt have already been cited here. I wish to mention only a few new facts which have recently emerged.

125. As the Egyptian Government stated on 28 November, British helicopters on 19 November raided a small island five miles west of Port Said and landed troops which attacked the defenceless civilian population of the island. Anglo-French forces subjected Port Said and its peaceable civilian population to a brutal sea and air bombardment. Once they had captured Port Said, they surrounded several city blocks with barbed wire and fired on the peaceful inhabitants, killing women and children. In the words of Shubdas Banerjee, the correspondent of the newspaper *Anurita Bazar Patrika*, who was in Egypt, a terrible drama which recalls the worst acts of the Nazis is unfolding behind the military censorship curtain in Port Said. Heaps of ruins, the corpses of thousands of women and children—these are the results of the so-called "police action" of the British and French aggressors who are now attempting to pose as the defenders of humanitarianism and human rights.

126. What is this but a typical example of the crimes committed by the colonizers against a people who had risen against their former oppressors?

127. These senseless, monstrous crimes are still continuing. *The New York Times*, a newspaper which can in no wise be numbered among the foes of the United Kingdom, reported on 17 December that the British forces had recently undertaken a new, bloody butchery of the peaceable inhabitants of Port Said. Tanks and artillery were used. Scores of Egyptians were killed or wounded.

128. The Israel forces which treacherously attacked Egypt have been conducting themselves no less savagely towards Egypt's non-combatant population than those who incited them to fall upon Egypt.

129. In the Egyptian territory occupied by the Israel army, the Arab population has been subjected to unheard-of acts of oppression and persecution. Thousands of completely innocent people have been thrown into prisons and concentration camps by the Israel authorities.

130. It is further reported in the Press that increasingly ruthless repressive measures have been used of late by the Israel authorities against the Arab population in the Sinai peninsula. At the orders of the Israel authorities, roads, communications, storage depots and inhabited localities are being destroyed. An idea of what the Israel troops are doing to Egypt's roads can be gleaned from the photograph published in *The New York Times* on 20 December. The property of Egyptian nationals is being carried off. All this destruction is being inflicted for the alleged purpose of weakening Egypt's military potential. Actions of this kind are nothing but outright banditry.

131. Even the Israel Government itself cannot keep silence over its savage policy of annihilating non-combatant Egyptians—men, women and children. The Prime Minister of Israel was obliged to admit officially in Parliament that forty-eight Arab peasants who had committed no crime had been killed by the Israel police at Kafr Qasim on 20 October. In the Prime Minister's

own words, these civilians were killed while returning home from the fields.

132. According to information from the committee for Arab refugees from Palestine, the Arab population in Israel's own territory is being subjected to persecution. Arabs in Israel are treated as second-class citizens and deprived of their civil and religious freedoms; their land is expropriated, punitive expeditions are organized, etc. According to a report in the Israel newspaper *El Rabita*, the Israel authorities have declared a whole region populated by Arabs a closed area and made it impossible for the Arab inhabitants to carry on agriculture there. The Arab population in Israel lives under a constant threat of armed raids by punitive detachments of the Israel army, which in many cases have destroyed whole inhabited localities. For example, the Arab village of Tira, near Haifa, the Maronite settlement of Kappa Terim and others have been completely destroyed in this way.

133. Other facts could be quoted as evidence that the aggressors are guilty of glaring violations of the rules of international law and of the provisions of the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Convention of 1949 in their treatment of the Arab population. These deeds call for a condemnation of the utmost severity. And after all this, the representatives of the United Kingdom, France and Israel have the audacity to pose as defenders of human rights and international law!

134. No, for us to agree with them would be tantamount to licensing banditry, encouraging the aggressors in that pursuit, and doing away with the elementary rules of international law.

135. In making this approach to the United Nations, the United Kingdom, France and Israel have yet another nefarious aim in view. As we all know, the United Nations has condemned the aggression they committed and called for the withdrawal of their forces from Egypt. Yet the forces of these Powers have still not been entirely withdrawn from Egyptian soil and the aggressors are seeking various pretexts for prolonging their presence in Egypt, in flagrant violation of the decisions adopted unanimously by the General Assembly on 2, 5, 7 and 24 November.

136. We cannot fail to note the attempt which the United Kingdom and France are making to leave part of their armed forces in the Suez Canal zone on the pretext that they are to take part in clearing the Canal; this is clear from the letters which the United Kingdom and French Governments addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 3 December 1956 [A/3415].

137. It is reported in the Press that the Israel Government intends to delay by every possible means the evacuation of its forces from Egyptian territory, and has no intention at all of withdrawing them from Gaza.

138. The only explanation of the attempts to force the United Nations to consider this complaint is that the United Kingdom, France and Israel have still not renounced their aggressive designs on Egypt.

139. The General Assembly cannot ignore this alarming situation. So long as all the British, French and Israel forces have not been withdrawn from Egyptian territory, it cannot be said that the aggression of these States against Egypt is at an end. It is the General Assembly's duty at this juncture to put an immediate and complete stop to the aggression against Egypt and to take prompt steps to wipe out the consequences of

that aggression. We must not allow the aggressors, who are assuming the role of accusers of their own victim, to distract the General Assembly's attention from this essential duty.

140. The need for the United Nations to halt the campaign of slander which is now being launched against Egypt is the more pressing in that the originators of this campaign are violating human rights in several countries whose peoples are engaged in a selfless struggle for their freedom and independence against Anglo-French domination.

141. It must, unfortunately, be noted that the General Assembly has of late allowed itself to be diverted from its immediate task of strengthening the peace and security of nations, and has been led by the nose by those who have no interest in the adoption of effective measures to put an end to acts of aggression against nations and, first and foremost, against the oppression of the Eastern peoples.

142. If the representatives of the United Kingdom are so concerned about the defence of human rights, why does not the United Kingdom cease its oppression of the Cypriots and grant self-determination to the population of Cyprus, which it has subjugated? Why does not the United Kingdom, in the interests of ensuring human rights, renounce its outworn colonial practices in Cyprus? The population of Cyprus has been fighting for self-determination these many years, and all attempts to suppress its claims in this direction, on any pretext whatsoever, violate the elementary rights of the brave Cypriots.

143. The United Kingdom has made of Cyprus its own military base, which it used in common with France in the military aggression against Egypt and which it retains as a means of exerting military pressure on the Arab countries, daily and hourly violating the human rights of the Cypriots, hanging and shooting them solely because they aspire to liberation from the British yoke.

144. Could not the United Kingdom demonstrate its desire to respect human rights by giving up its oppression of the peaceable population of Malaya, Kenya and its other very considerable colonial possessions?

145. Let the United Kingdom show us its attitude to human rights by deeds, not words, and let it begin with Egypt, to which the aggressors have done great damage, and on which they have inflicted great losses by their attack.

146. Again, consider the bloody colonial war of the French imperialist circles against the unarmed people of Algeria, at present being waged under the banner of the French Socialists; is not this too a glaring violation of human rights? The extent of the losses suffered by the Algerian people in their struggle for independence can be gauged even from a statement by Edouard Depreux, a French public figure, who has admitted that by the beginning of April 1956 the French forces had killed 48,000 Algerian patriots and taken 24,000 prisoner. The Press carries almost daily reports of scores and hundreds of Algerian killed or wounded. The blood of Algerian patriots, whose only crime is to love their country and fight for freedom, is flowing in rivers in Algeria.

147. If the representatives of France wish to prove that they stand for the observance of human rights, they and their partners in the attack on Egypt must immediately withdraw their forces from Egypt and pay it for the damages they have caused. They should also

put an immediate end to the war of extermination against the Algerian people, who are struggling for the right to build their own life, free of foreign oppressors.

148. Furthermore, we have no assurance that the uproar over the so-called violation of human rights by Egypt does not mask the preparation of further acts of aggression against the Arab countries.

149. The General Assembly should categorically reject the unfounded complaint of France, the United Kingdom and Israel, which is a fresh attempt to intervene in Egypt's domestic affairs.

150. We must demand the immediate withdrawal of all the forces of the aggressors from Egypt and the termination of the misdeeds against the peaceful inhabitants. The United Nations should take steps to ensure that the damage inflicted on Egypt is made good at the aggressors' expense. The instigators of the aggression must not be allowed to transform themselves into accusers, or the victims of the aggression to be transformed into the accused. Justice must triumph. To ensure this is the General Assembly's primary duty and responsibility.

151. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): We should actually be grateful to the French and United Kingdom delegations for having brought the question of the treatment of their nationals in Egypt before the Assembly. If unilateral and exaggerated news reports, or reports which had been distorted and analysed in an uncritical way, had been allowed to accumulate in people's minds, they might in time have created the impression in world opinion that something disturbing was going on in Egypt as far as respect for human rights and fundamental freedom was concerned.

152. Such an impression would have been extremely unfortunate, not only because it would have been false, but above all because it would have been likely to maintain and increase the dangerous tension created by the three-Power invasion of Egypt, a tension we would all like to see reduced or eliminated. It was high time to put an end to this dangerous flood of irresponsible reports and to let the light of truth shine with full force, once and for all, on the important question raised by the French and United Kingdom delegations.

153. I am reluctant to reply to the allegations made this morning by the representative of Israel, because, like all Israel allegations in general, and as the representative of Jordan has clearly shown before me, these allegations are the product of a boundless capacity for invention, distortion and mendacity, and they ring particularly false when they come from people whose very existence is based on the inhuman tragedy of the million Arab refugees in Palestine.

154. For that reason I am going to confine myself to discussing the question raised by the representatives of France and the United Kingdom.

155. What is the truth concerning this question? The representative of Egypt has explained it to us here in a way which is simple, factual and sincere. Egypt, without any provocation on its part, suddenly found itself invaded by three armies, two of which were the forces of two great Powers, France and the United Kingdom. With its security thus threatened, it took certain measures with respect to nationals of those two countries. The representative of Egypt has given us all the necessary information: first, the measures were

taken against a limited number of these nationals, and he has given us the relevant facts and figures; secondly, they were dictated solely by considerations of national security; thirdly, they were accompanied by all the necessary administrative and legal safeguards; fourthly, they are perfectly in accord with international law, the Geneva Convention and those United Nations instruments which govern the conduct of nations and the protection of human rights.

156. In these circumstances, we cannot help but ask why France and the United Kingdom are protesting against these measures. Were they not already perfectly aware of what the representative of Egypt has just told us here? Personally, I am convinced that France and the United Kingdom have no lack of lawyers capable of recognizing the validity of the measures taken by Egypt. But why, then, do they protest? Would it be because—as would appear from the statements made by their representatives on that occasion—the measures taken by Egypt were no longer justified after the two countries had accepted the cease-fire and had even begun to withdraw their troops, and—to borrow the very words of the representative of France—because a state of law had been created and a legal boundary drawn?

157. However, in order to judge this explanation at its true value, we should first recall that the cease-fire was not a spontaneous act on the part of the invading countries, but a position into which they were forced by the magnificent resistance of the Egyptian people, by outside pressure of all kinds and by the courageous resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, not to mention the general indignation reflected in world opinion. In other words, in obeying the cease-fire order issued by the United Nations, the invading countries were by no means abandoning the objectives which they had in mind and which they wished to attain as a result of the hostilities which they had launched. In the circumstances, therefore, it was only reasonable to fear that there might at any time be a resumption of hostilities by these countries. As for the evacuation of their troops from Egyptian territory, this was also due to factors beyond their control. They arbitrarily attached vague and unsatisfactory conditions to this evacuation which were later more or less definitely withdrawn or abandoned; but, worse still—and this is perhaps the most important point now—that evacuation has not yet been completed.

158. All these factors show that as long as the troops of the invading countries continue to remain on Egyptian soil, no one in the world can give the Egyptians any guarantee that hostilities will not be resumed against them and no one, therefore, can blame them for proceeding with measures which they still consider necessary for their national security. This is especially true because the Egyptian people, the peoples of the Middle East in general, and probably many other peoples throughout the world, have had their faith in the strength and stability of the principles of reason, law and justice in the world profoundly shaken by what I shall call, to put it mildly, the unfortunate Egyptian adventure.

159. It would appear from all this that the new state of law which the French representative invoked to prove that the security measures taken by Egypt were unjustified has, in point of fact, not yet been completely established, and that consequently the legal boundary of which he spoke has not, up to now, been clearly and definitively drawn. If only the French and United

Kingdom Governments had realized this, I think that their concern about the treatment of their nationals in Egypt would have been dispelled.

160. However, in my opinion, the real explanation of their protests against the security measures taken against their nationals by Egypt is to be found in the unfortunate fact that there is still a certain tendency in both of those countries, as well as in certain other Western countries, to adopt a fundamentally biased attitude towards the countries of Asia and Africa in general.

161. Although we used to think that this tendency was gradually disappearing, it is nevertheless true that, under the influence of certain factors, it sometimes shows an alarming vitality, and prevents these Western countries from behaving fairly towards the countries of Asia and Africa. This mentality, about which I should like to say a few words, arose in the past from the relationship which then existed between colonizers and the peoples they colonized, between superiors and inferiors, between independent countries and dependent countries. Unfortunately, those possessing this mentality have as yet been unable to adapt themselves fully to the new relationship of perfect equality which ought now to prevail between independent and sovereign peoples, whether they are Europeans, Asians or Africans, and whether they are technically advanced or under-developed countries.

162. It is persons of this mentality, this state of mind who are surprised, who fail to understand, who refuse to admit that a country which they have been accustomed, until recently, to treat as an inferior may now react and conduct itself as an equal and may exercise, like all other independent and sovereign countries, all the privileges of independence and sovereignty. I am convinced that it is this state of mind which largely explains the extremely violent reaction of certain European countries to the nationalization of the Suez Canal. It is this state of mind which is basically responsible for the unfortunate Egyptian adventure and, finally, it is this state of mind that explains why France and the United Kingdom are today protesting against the legitimate security measures taken by Egypt against their nationals, measures which these two countries themselves would have taken in a similar situation against the citizens of any other country residing within their territory.

163. What are we to conclude from all this, with respect to the question now before the General Assembly? First, we may conclude that the satisfactory assurances requested by France and the United Kingdom concerning the revocation of the security measures taken by Egypt against their nationals are implicit in the very nature and character of those measures themselves. Since they are security measures, measures taken because Egyptian security is still threatened, one cannot, in reason and justice, expect to see them revoked until that security is no longer endangered.

164. It rests with the two Powers which invaded Egypt to behave towards that country in such a way as to dispel any legitimate fear on its part concerning its security. We are convinced that if the two Powers fulfil this obligation in good faith, the security measures in question will be automatically terminated and that French and British residents in Egypt will resume the normal, quiet and happy life which they have led there for many years. Moreover, the representative of the United Kingdom has admitted in this hall that the Egyptian Government has proceeded with more moderation in this matter during the last few days. In our opinion, this is only the natural consequence of the withdrawal of most of the French and British forces from Egypt.

165. The second conclusion that we would draw from the foregoing facts is that the Western nations should make a special moral effort—perhaps a tremendous effort—to eradicate, wherever it may still be found among them, the last vestiges of the colonial mentality which, born in other times and for other conditions, can only prevent a clear understanding of present-day realities and the new obligations which they impose.

166. This effort is necessary, not only to set people's minds at rest concerning the subject now under discussion, but also to provide the basic conditions which are the prerequisite for any sincere and fruitful co-operation between those countries and the countries of Asia and Africa. If this effort is not made, the present tension, which is embittering relations between France and the United Kingdom on the one hand and Egypt and most of the Arab States on the other, will become more and more acute. This will operate against the interests of all concerned and will endanger peace in that important part of the world.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.