MOLLET SAYS U.S. SUPPORTS FRANCE
Special to The New York Times.
New York Times (1857-Current file); Nov 8, 1956; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2003)
pg. 12

MOLLET SAYS U. S. SUPPORTS FRANCE

Differences Over Suez Gone After Soviet's Attempted Threat, Premier States

Special to The New York Times.

PARIS, Nov. 7—Premier Guy Mollet told the National Assembly tonight that the differences between France and the United States over the Suez invasion had been removed.

After recalling that the British-French ultimatum of Oct. 30 to Egypt had "not always been understood by the United States Government," M. Molet said: "But when the Soviet Union thought it saw a crack in the free world and wanted to threaten, we at once found the United States at our side."

This was an allusion to President Eisenhower's statement warning against Soviet intervention in Suez, issued shortly after Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin's sharply worded mesages to Fremier Mollet and Prime Minister Eden Monday night.

"President Eisenhower informed Sir Anthony Eden and me last night that our friendship and mutual confidence emerged reinforced from these events," said M. Mollet.

Common Principles

"I am convinced our American friends understand that, although we have acted independently in a realm of vital interest for our countries, we are none the less deeply agreed about objectives and common ideals. I am sure I speak for the great majority of Frenchmen in expressing to you my determination to do everything to maintain and strengthen our bonds of alliance."

The Premier said the occupation of the Suez zone, by making plain the situation in the Middle East and Soviet ambitions there, underlined the "absolute necessity that the three great Western powers unify their policies in that region."

M. Mollet contended that the Suez cease-fire order had been given by Britain and France because their objectives had been satisfactorily attained.

He said this had been done with small losses; not a single allied ship had been hit and all allied aircraft with the exception of a naval Corsair had returned.

The premier said the British and French forces had neutralized the Egyptian Air Force by destroying its most modern aircraft on the ground and rendering military airfields useless. He said much Egyptian armored equipment had been destroyed in depots or on the roads while the best ships of the Egyptian Navy had been put out of action.

M. Mollet told the Assembly that in less than a week Israeli forces had defeated three Egyptian divisions, capturing intact 100 tanks and 500 guns with a loss to themselves of about 100 men.

He interpreted these data as showing that the Egyptian forces had "refused to fight for President Nasser and his regime."

The Premier said the Arab League had not even met in the Suez crisis and that the absence of solidarity among the Arab nations had been evident. He said Pan-Arabism had appeared to be a cover for Egyptian ambitions.

The Premier addressed the assembly in the middle of a debate, not on Suez, but on the Soviet invasion of Hungary. He read to the Assembly the text of the reply he had sent to the note from Moscow on Suez intervention.

REPLY TO BULGANIN

Addressed to Marshal Bulganin as President of the Soviet Council of Ministers, M. Mollet's reply read:

Mr. President:

I have read the letter you addressed to me Nov. 5. I reply with the same frankness. I am as conscious as you are of the grave risks involved in resort to force in the world of today. I desire that the world shall find the peace to which it aspires. But I doubt, Mr. President, that the present situation can be clarified by the use of threats and reminders of the possibilities of long-range weapons.

Let me add that if the Soviet Union really intended to support the authority of the United Nations, it could easily have brought to an end—in conformity with the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations—the operation it is carrying out in Hungary in violation of the principles of humanity and the rules of justice and law.

I doubt, moreover, that the Soviet Government has quite the authority to bewail the spilling of "innocent blood" while, because of the same Government, that blood is spilt in streams in Hungary.

Like you, Mr. President, I want hostilities to stop and all responsible governments to abandon finally the use of force.

The operations we have been obliged to undertake, of which you appear not to appreciate exactly the deliberately limited character, are not war operations against Egypt. They are operations designed only to remedy certain aspects of a state of permanent insecurity in the Near East, notably because of encouragement given by certain governments, including yours, to the Egyptain Government.

It is clear that the Egyptian Government for months has done everything to maintain a reign of insecurity in that region, and, in spite of long negotiations in which we have sought to reach a solution of the Suez problem satisfactory to everyone, that Government refused every acceptable proposal.

It seems to me certain that if the Soviet Union had used a moderating influence in Cairo in conformity with the policy of relaxing tension which it proclaims, events would have taken a different turn.

Regarding the Near East, the position of France is as follows: We are ready to accept a final cease-fire as soon as a similar desire is expressed by Israel and Egypt and the international force, which the United Nations has decided to create, is able to fulfill the tasks assigned to it under Paragraphs 1, 3 and 4 of the resolution of Nov. 2 of the General Assembly.

We desire also that the Security Council meet at the ministerial level to define the conditions of a final cease-fire and of a settlement of the problems of the Near East.

I hope, Mr. President, that the Government of the Soviet Union will take an attitude in conformity with the importance of its responsibilities.

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