U. S. MOVE BACKED
By THOMAS J. HAMILTON Special to The New York Times.
New York Times (1857-Current file); Nov 2, 1956; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 1

U. S. MOVE BACKED

Dulles Proposal Asks Israel to Withdraw to Armistice Line

By THOMAS J. HAMILTON
Special to The New York Times.

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., Friday, Nov. 2—A United States proposal for a cease-fire in the Egyptian fighting was approved this morning at an emergency session of the General Assembly.

The vote was 64 to 5. Aside from Britain, France and Israel, the only countries which voted against were Australia and New Zealand.

The United States resolution was approved after foes of the British-French and Israeli attacks beat down attempts to obtain an adjournment. The resolution calls also for the withdrawal of Israeli forces behind the armistice line. The result was announced at 2:30 A. M.

Six members abstained in the vote and one member, Luxembourg, was absent. Those abstaining were Belgium, Canada, Laos, the Netherlands, Portugal and South Africa.

Adjournment at 4:20 A. M.

The Assembly, which had convened at 5:35 P. M. yesterday, adjourned at 4:20 A. M. after hearing explanations of the vote. It will remain available to meet again to hear reports on compliance with its resolution.

Shortly before midnight it was decided by a vote of 57 to 2, with 10 abstentions, to limit debate and to take a vote before adjournment.

The United States resolution was presented by Secretary of State Dulles last night at the opening.

The United States resolution urged that the emergency session be continued pending compliance with the terms of the cease-fire by all nations concerned.

Mr. Dulles said that the United States position had been reappraised "in the highest quarters." He said the United States, despite its ties with Britain, France and Israel, could not agree to the use of force except in self-defense or with United Nations authorization.

Not one of the other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization voted against the United States resolution, but some abstained. The Asian-African and Latin-American blocs

Continued on Page 7, Column 5

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

DULLES IN APPEAL FOR A CEASE-FIRE

Continued From Page 1

were solidly in favor. Except for New Zealand and Australia, all the members of the British Commonwealth voted in favor or abstained.

The vote was as follows:

For: (64) Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussia, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Phillipines, Poland, Rumania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, Soviet Union, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: (5) Australia, Britain, France, Israel, New Zealand.

Abstentions: (6) Belgium, Canada, Laos, the Netherlands, Portugal, South Africa.

Absent: (1) Luxembourg.

Resolutions by the General Assembly are not legally binding on governments. In recent years, United Nations members have tended to comply only with the resolutions for which they had voted. However, General Assembly resolutions are intended to carry moral weight.

While the Assembly took a recess, Mr. Dulles had dinner with Arthur Lall, the permanent representative of India. It was understood that Mr. Lall had told him that the Asian-African bloc of twenty-four countries was highly pleased with the United States resolution.

Therefore, it was believed that efforts would be made to adopt the United States resolution speedily. A majority of two-thirds is required. There is no veto power.

Arkady A. Sobolev, representative of the Soviet Union, spoke after the recess and urged the Assembly to agree on the following:

¶To condemn Britain, France and Israel for acts of aggression.

¶To urge a cease-fire and withdrawal of forces.

¶To establish a United Nations commission to supervise compliance.

However, Mr. Sobolev did not introduce a motion to this effect, presumably as a result of praise given to the United States proposal by Asian and African speakers, including some from Arab countries.

Abba Eban, the Israeli representative, was one of the last speakers. He renewed his contention that Israel's attack was merely to eliminate the bases from which Egyptian commandos were making forays into Israeli territory. He said that the United Nations should see to it that if the frontier was to keep Israeli forces out of Egypt, it should also keep Egyptian forces out of Israel.

Latin-American delegates, who had lined up solidly behind the United States resolution, took a much harsher view of the British and French attack than that by Israel.

The two basic terms of the resolution are the same as those contained in a United States resolution vetoed in the Security Council Tuesday by Britain and France. The only difference is that the new terms would apply to the British-French attacks, as well as to those by the Israelis. However, the new resolution contained concessions to Britain, France and Israel.

First, whereas the vetoed United States resolution put the entire responsibility in the attack on Israel, the new one spoke of the frequent disregard to the armistice agreements "by the parties." This would include Egypt as well as Jordan, Syria and Lebanon. Also, it urged all the "parties" to refrain from raids across the armistice lines and to observe the agreements.

Second, the new proposal omitted the previous recommendation that all members of the United Nations deny "any military, economic or financial assistance" to Israel until she accepted a cease-fire and withdrew from Egypt.

Third, it urged that after the cease-fire went into effect, "effective steps be taken to reopen the Suez Canal and restore secure freedom of navigation."

Sir Pierson Dixon, the British representative, suggested that the Assembly call a "suitably constituted" conference to try to reach a general settlement in the Near East. He did not, however, offer a resolution.

He declared that "if the United Nations were willing to take over the physical task of maintaining peace in the area," no one would be "better pleased" than the British Government.

Sir Pierson had already sought to justify what he called the British-French "emergency police action" on the ground that Soviet use of the veto had prevented the Security Council from creating collective security.

Mr. Dulles, whose plane from Washington had been delayed by bad weather, entered the assembly hall just as Sir Pierson was drawing an analogy between the British-French action and the intervention of the United States in 1950 to defend South Korea.

Reversion to Chaos Seen

Sir Pierson declared that if the Assembly merely called for a cease-fire and the withdrawal of forces, the situation would "only revert to the condition of chaos which we have had to endure" in the eight years since the Palestine armistice agreements.

Omar Loutfi of Egypt was the first speaker when the session, scheduled to convene at 5 P. M., opened thirty-five minutes late. Mr. Loutfi repeated Soviet and Yugoslav charges that Britain, France and Israel had "agreed in advance to perpetuate this act of war," but concentrated his attack on Britain and France.

He accused them of violating both the United Nations charter and the Constantinople Convention of 1888, which assured unrestricted use of the canal by all nations, in peace or war. He told the council that an Egyptian warship had been sunk in the canal and said Britain and France had bombed nonmilitary targets.

Mr. Loutfi said that the assembly should "condemn the aggressors and put an end to the aggression," but he did not offer a resolution.

Under the agreement to limit debate, Ecuador, Yugoslavia, India and Saudi Arabia spoke for the United States proposal, and it was opposed by Israel, Australia, France and New Zealand.

All seventy-six members of the United Nations were represented when the session began. Rudecindo Ortega of Chile presided. Two foreign ministers were present—Prince Wan Waityanakon of Thailand, here early for the regular session of the Assembly, starting Nov. 12, and Lester B. Pearson of Canada.

The decision for the Assembly ruling was taken on the initiative of Yugoslavia, with United States and Soviet support. However, the legal basis was challenged at the start of the meeting by Louis de Guiringaud, the acting French representative.

Agreement to call the session had been made at a meeting at which the only item on the agenda had been the Egyptian complaint against the British-French attack. No resolution had been presented and the British and French had argued that since the "uniting for peace" procedure could be invoked only after a veto, the Yugoslav proposal was out of order.

Despite M. de Guiranguad's thesis, the Assembly overruled Britain and France and adopted the agenda, as prepared by the Secretariat, by a vote of 62 to 2.

Abstentions included several British Commonwealth countries.

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