Excerpts From the Speeches by Eden and Gaitskell on Egyptian Crisis
New York Times 1857; Nov 1, 1956; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 20

Excerpts From the Speeches by Eden and Gaitskell on Egyptian Crisis

LONDON, Oct. 31 (Reuters)—Following are extracts from the texts of addresses in the House of Commons today by Prime Minister Eden and Hugh Gaitskell, Opposition leader:

By Prime Minister Eden

I will begin by saying this about the United Nations session. Yesterday morning the United States representative tabled at the United Nations organization a resolution which was in effect a condemnation of Israel as the aggressor in the events of the last few days.

We felt that we could not associate ourselves with this and we said so through diplomatic channels both in London and in New York. Her Majesty's Government did not feel, and do not feel, that it is possible to pronounce in this way against one of the parties in the dispute for the action which they have taken regardless of the cumulative effects that went before.

Throughout recent months, and in particular since the seizure of the [Suez] canal, the Egyptian Government have kept up a violent campaign against Israel, against this country and against the West.

The Egyptian Government have made clear over and over again, with increased emphasis since the seizure of the canal, their intention to destroy Israel, just as they have made plain that they would drive the Western powers out of the Middle East.

That is what has been happening and that is the background to understand what is happening. It is from these Egyptian policies that much of the present crisis has sprung and to ignore them is to shun reality.

Challenges Cairo's Innocence

In these circumstances, is there any member of this House who can consider Egypt as an innocent country whom it is right to exonerate at the Security Council by condemning Israel as an aggressor?

In the light of all these facts, can anyone say that we and the French Government should have waited for a satisfactory resolution by the Security Council authorizing definite action to stop the fighting?

I must remind the House that we have recently been to the United Nations and we went with proposals for the future of the canal approved by eighteen powers representing more than 90 per cent of the traffic users of the canal.

Admittedly, we received strong support for our proposals, but they were vetoed by the Soviet Government. Can we be expected to await the development of similar procedures in the situation of much greater urgency that confronts us now in and about the canal?

We have no desire whatever, nor have the French Government, that the military action that we shall have to take should be more than temporary in its duration, but it is our intention that our action in a settlement will prevent such a situation arising in the future. If we can do that, we shall have performed a service not only to this country but to the users of the canal.

In the actions we have now taken, we are not concerned to stop Egypt but to stop war. None the less, it is a fact that there is no Middle Eastern problem at present which could not have been settled or bettered but for the hostile and irresponsible policies of Egypt in recent years, and there is no hope of a general settlement of the many outstanding problems in that area so long as Egyptian propaganda and policy continues its present line of violence.

To Avert Greater Betrayal

What would the future of the Middle East have been if, while denouncing Israel, we had done nothing to check these Egyptian actions? The only result would be warfare spreading through the whole area and a great increase in the strength and influence of a dictator's power.

In these circumstances, to have no action would have been to betray, not our interests alone, but those of the free world and, above all of the Middle East itself. To have taken ineffective action would have been a greater betrayal than to have taken no action at all.

In entering the Suez Canal area, we are only protecting a vital international waterway. We are also holding—and this is a point I would ask the House to bear in mind—the only line of division possible between the combatants which is practicable for us because, even if it had been fair, it would not have been possible to have attempted to establish ourselves upon the armistice line itself.

It is an irregular line with no facilities and no possibility of any limited forces doing anything effective to control it, and, of course, would have been no assistance at all in respect of shipping in the canal.

Now I wish to say something about our relations with the United States in the matter. The decisions which we and the French Government took were, as I said yesterday, taken on our own account and on our own responsibility. The Governments remain convinced that we could have done no other and discharge our national duty.

Now, it is, of course, an obvious truth that the safety of transit through the canal, though clearly of concern to the United States, is for them not a matter of survival as it is to us and, indeed, to all Europe and many other lands.

Cites Dulles

Indeed, Mr. Dulles himself made this clear on the 28th of August when he said the United States' economy is not dependent upon the canal. Of course that is true. We must all accept it, and we should not complain about it, but it is equally true that throughout all these months this fact has inevitably influenced the attitude of the United States to these problems, as compared to that of ourselves and France.

If any one says that on that account we should have held up action until agreement could be reached with the United States as to what to do, I can only say that this would have been to ignore what every one knows here and in the United States to have been different approaches to some of these vital Middle Eastern questions.

They know it. We know it. Of course, we deplore it, but I do not think that it can carry with it this corollary that we must in all circumstances secure agreement from our American ally before we can act ourselves in what we know to be our own vital interests.

There have been a number of conversations between the United States and ourselves upon this situation, and we have expressed our preoccupations and our reasons, dating right back to the Suez Canal seizure, why the matter seemed to us of such overwhelming importance. We have done that at all stages.

(Philip Noel-Baker (Labor) interrupted to ask: "Did not those conversations take place after and as a result of the Israeli mobilization about which the United States had issued a very serious warning?" Sir Anthony proceeded:)

I was going to say there was conversation only yesterday morning between the Foreign Secretary and the United States Ambassador in respect of the action to be taken at the Security Council, with which I have already dealt.

I have said quite clearly to the House, and I repeat, that the decisions taken by us yesterday afternoon—the French Government and ourselves—were our decisions which we thought it right to take at once in the interests of our own nationals and our shipping.

Cites Message to U. S.

The moment the French Government and ourselves had reached conclusions as to what we should do, I authorized the dispatch of a full message to the United States explaining our action before even coming to the House.

Earlier yesterday I also informed the United States Government of our reasons for concern and our anxieties as to whether the Security Council was the method to deal with the increasing dangers that faced us, but I do not think that on either of these I have anything to repent, because it is sometimes a government's duty to take decisions for its own security.

I am glad to see that Mr. Cabot Lodge, the distinguished American representative on the Security Council, said yesterday that it took "more than one question, important though it is, to upset relations between the United States, Britain and France."

This is true. Throughout this period, and longer still in the communications we have had with the United States Government, we have done our best to make it clear why we thought that decisive action would have to be taken.

While we agreed to the Security Council, we also explained, as I said just now, that experience showed that this procedure was unlikely to be either rapid or effective.

I conclude by repeating that our request to the Government of Egypt is still open. We are still convinced that this offer is the best opportunity there is of bringing hostilities rapidly to an end, and of preventing the conflagration from spreading widely. That was the purpose of our two Governments in the action we took yesterday. We stand by it.

By Mr. Gaitskell

There was at least one extraordinary omission from the Prime Minister's statement. Last night, we begged the Government to give us an undertaking that they would refrain from using armed force until the Security Council had completed its deliberations or we had had another chance of discussing the matter here.

I had hoped, even after the refusal of the Government to give us that undertaking, that wiser counsels might well have prevailed. We are still left to some extent in the dark as to what the Government have done.

This is really a fantastic situation. It is not only the honorable members on these benches, it is the whole House, and indeed the whole country which is waiting for an answer to this question.

I ask the Prime Minister once again—I do not ask him to disclose troop movements—I ask him simply to tell the House and the country, and indeed the whole world this: whether the decision has been finally taken that British and French troops shall invade the canal zone and Egypt?

I am at a loss to understand why the Prime Minister should be so reluctant to give this essential item of information frankly and fully to the House.

'A Tragic Situation'

I can only assume, however, from what you have said that this decision has been taken and therefore British and French troops are at any rate at the moment on the move. If this is not so, the Prime Minister owes it to the country to say it is not so, so that we can then conclude that there is still time to prevent fighting. He is evidently reluctant to do that and I think my friends must draw their conclusions.

All I can say is that in taking this decision, in the view of the Opposition, the Government have committed an act of disastrous folly, whose tragic consequences we shall regret for years.

All of us will regret it because it will have done irreparable harm to the prestige and reputation of our country. This action involved not only the abandonment but a positive assault upon the free principles which have governed British foreign policy for at any rate the last ten years—solidarity with the Commonwealth, the Anglo-American alliance, and adherence to the Charter of the United Nations.

This is a tragic situation and I cannot but feel that members of Parliament who are sincerely concerned with the maintenance of this unique institution, the British Commonwealth, must in their hearts feel the deepest anxiety at what has happened.

From time to time, there have been disagreements between America and Britain but, in the light of what has happened in the last twenty-four hours, I am bound to conclude,with the American press, that a far greater strain is now being placed upon the Anglo-American alliance than ever before.

We are told that we have been in close connection with the United States. Yet even yesterday evening, the State Department put out a notice to the effect that they had no prior intimation of what was going to be done. It is perfectly clear that no opportunity whatever for discussion with the United States was allowed or permitted.

I can only say that those of us who feel as I do—and I thought some members opposite—that the Anglo-American alliance was the basis for the maintenance of peace, ought to be a little disturbed by the reports now coming in.

Sabotage of U.N. Charged

Even worse is the third pillar of our foreign policy which has now been so wantonly attacked by the Government—our support for the United Nations. It is our attack on the principles and the letter of the Charter which is the reason why our action has been so cooly, indeed hostilely, received by both the commonwealth and the United States.

Who was responsible for the veto this time? Only the British and French Governments. If it had not been for their action, there would have been a unanimous resolution of the Security Council. I can only describe that as a major act of sabotage against the United Nations.

Even more serious is our own armed intervention in this matter. I can only say that any impartial observer must recognize that this is a clear breach of the Charter of the United Nations.

Whatever doubts there may be about the degree of aggression in the Israeli invasion of Egypt and the extent of the provocation she suffered, there can unfortunately be no doubt about the nature of the British and French aggression. It is clear beyond all peradventure.

There will, therefore, be a further debate in the Security Council. No doubt the British and French will be able once again, unaided, to veto any decision of the Security Council. The next stage will be without doubt the reference of this whole matter to the Assembly of the United Nations. It is, I am afraid, only too obvious that if this matter is pressed, as it will be, in the United Nations Assembly, there will almost certainly be a two-thirds majority against us. That is a terribly serious situation.

Israel's True Interests

The Chinese Government could perfectly well intervene in Singapore and say it was bound to do so and entitled to do so under international law to protect the lives and property of its own nationals. It has been set a wonderful example by the British Government.

The terrible thing about what the Government has done is that it set such an example to every potential aggressor in the world. There can be no doubt at all what the view of the world as a whole is on this decision of the British Government. They look upon it as a transparent excuse to seize the canal, to carry out the policy of force from which they were deterred by public opinion here and in the world in August and September.

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

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

But there are even graver possibilities. The Arab states have indicated their solidarity with Egypt. What kind of action they may take about oil supplies I do not know. It is possible that the intervention of the United States against us may be of some assistance there, and thank goodness for it.

There are wider implications than this, for this reckless and foolish decision has been taken just at the moment when events in Poland and Hungary had given the free world its greatest hope and encouragement for ten years. This act of the Government has done untold damage to the democratic cause throughout the world, and, above all in those vital, uncommitted areas of the world where special concentration should be made.

I must now tell the Government and the country that we cannot support the action they have taken, and that we shall feel bound by every constitutional means at our disposal to oppose it. We shall do this because we consider it our duty in the present crisis both to do everything in our power to save the country from the disasters which, we believe, will follow the course set by the Government, and to proclaim to the world loudly and clearly, that there are millions and millions of British people—as we believe a majority of the nation—who are deeply shocked by the aggressive policy of the Government and who still believe that it is both wise and right that we should stand by the United Nations, the Commonwealth and the United States alliance.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.