

U.S. WELCOMES PROMISE TO WITHDRAW President Emphasises Need to Clear Canal Quickly

FROM MAX FREEDMAN

WASHINGTON, DECEMBER 4.

The State Department said yesterday in a formal statement welcoming the Anglo-French decision to withdraw their forces from Egypt that it was "imperative" that the Suez Canal be cleared without further delay. It was explained that the department believes that salvage operations should begin at once without waiting for the complete withdrawal of the troops.

The State Department has thus supported the Anglo-French position and rejected the arguments advanced by the Egyptian Government, which has insisted that the invading forces must all be removed before the clearance of the canal can begin.

This American decision should not be interpreted as a sign that the American temper is hardening against Egypt. On the contrary, the State Department is merely returning to its earlier policy based upon the recognition that the early use of the canal is vital not only to Britain and France but to India and other members of the Afro-Asian block with whom it has been co-operating at the United Nations. More significant is the State Department's clear indication that it is giving priority to the Suez settlement. The Arab-Israeli quarrel, while receiving urgent study, is for the moment less important.

Strengthening U.N.

Yesterday's statement, issued soon after Mr Dulles returned to duty at the State Department, declared:

"The British and French Governments have now declared their purpose to comply with the United Nations resolution regarding withdrawal of their forces from Egypt. They have stated that they will work out with General Burns, Commander of the United Nations forces, a definite and early schedule for complete withdrawal. The United States welcomes this decision. Its putting into practice will strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to deal with the other aspects of the Middle Eastern problems which are still unfinished business. It will now more than ever become incumbent upon all members of the United Nations to ensure that the remaining issues are dealt with justly and promptly."

"The United States has repeatedly said during this crisis in the Middle East that the United Nations cannot rightfully or prudently stop merely with maintaining peace. Under its Charter it is under an obligation to deal with the basic sources of international friction and conflicts of interest. Only in this way can it attain the Charter goal of peace with justice. In keeping with this obligation, the United States will continue fully to support the measures required to make the United Nations force adequate and effective for its mission. In carrying out his plans for this purpose the Secretary-General can count on the unstinting co-operation of the United States."

"As the United Nations force replaces those of the United Kingdom and France, the clearance of the canal becomes imperative. Every day of delay in restoring the canal to normal use is a breach of the 1888 Treaty and a wrong to the large

number of nations throughout the world whose economies depend so heavily on its reliable operation."

The United Nations and the interested States should, we believe, promptly direct their attention to the underlying Middle East problems. The United States Government considers it essential that arrangements be worked out without delay to ensure the operation of the canal in conformity with the six principles approved by the resolution of the Security Council on October 13, 1956.

"The United States is equally determined, through the United Nations and in other useful ways, to assist in bringing about a permanent settlement of other persistent conflicts which have plagued the Middle East over recent years. Repeatedly we have made clear our willingness to contribute for the purpose of bringing stability and just peace to this area. The present crisis is a challenge to all nations to work to this end."

"Face-Saving Rhetoric"

Britain and France, the "Washington Post" declares to-day, have gone about as far as can reasonably be expected in promising to withdraw their troops promptly from Egypt. It says by speech in the House of Commons by Mr Selwyn Lloyd contained "a considerable amount of face-saving rhetoric directed at the rebellious Tories," and goes on:

"The extravagant claims about what the ill-fated intervention accomplished can be forgiven, however, as the sort of political gesture which is by no means unknown in the United States. What is important is not so much what is said as what is done; and withdrawal is a necessary prerequisite for more constructive efforts. Let there now be an end to recriminations on both sides of the Atlantic."

MR NEHRU WELCOMES WITHDRAWAL But 18-Power Plan Not Basis for Solution

From our Correspondent

Mr Nehru to-day welcomed Mr Selwyn Lloyd's statement of yesterday only insofar as it announced the Anglo-French decision to withdraw troops from Egypt. He noted that no date for withdrawal had been given and proceeded to make a detailed and very critical analysis of Mr Lloyd's statement.

He could understand Mr Lloyd's trying to justify what had been done in the past, but Mr Lloyd "still sought to make out that the Anglo-French action conferred enormous benefits on humanity, prevented a world war and much worse happening, and all kinds of things. I regret that the wrong conceptions are still held in their (the British Government's) minds."

Mr Nehru mentioned that only the day before night he had seen photographs of Port Said taken after bombardment by the Anglo-French forces. "It is clear from these that a good part of Port Said is now in ruins and that damage to the city and human beings is very great," Mr Nehru said. "It was not correct to suggest, as Mr Selwyn Lloyd has done, that the situation in the Middle East was deteriorating and demanded action." Mr Nehru pointed out that the situation was actually well under control and that Britain launched an attack just at the moment when negotiations with Egypt over the Suez Canal were due to be resumed.

Dealing with the rôle of the United Nations Emergency Force, Mr Nehru made it clear that the Indian troops did not go to Egypt as "a kind of continuation of the Anglo-French forces." He reminded Mr Lloyd that the 18-Power proposals for the Suez Canal were as dead as "mutton" and it is quite amazing that any reference could be made towards them now. The entire situation in the Middle East has changed during the last few weeks, and it was not easy to go back upon it. "It is not clear whether Mr Nehru meant the old basis for negotiation on the canal issue could no longer hold good after the Anglo-French attack on Egypt."

He emphasised that the first requirement was the complete withdrawal of the Anglo-French and Israeli forces, and after that one could talk about other

questions. India, along with other countries, was certainly anxious that the canal should be cleared and normal functioning resumed. But this could not be done until the aggressors withdrew from Egypt.

Analysing the international situation, Mr Nehru drew two conclusions: that any attempt at a return to colonialism is doomed to failure, and that communism or socialism can not ultimately be imposed by force. Developments in Hungary revealed that nationalism was still a very powerful feeling. It may be that in Soviet Union and China the feelings of socialism and nationalism are combined. But where nationalism and socialism are separated it would not be easy to suppress nationalism. He did not think that the Hungarian movement was anti-Socialist though there may have been anti-Socialist elements in it. It was essentially a mass upsurge against external domination.

Mr Nehru regretted the Hungarian Government's refusal to permit United Nations observers to visit their country. He said that India has received solemn assurances from the Soviet and Hungarian Governments that there had been no deportations from Hungary. He did not know what value to attach to these assurances when solemn assurances given by the Hungarian Government about Mr Nagy had not been fulfilled.

He could not understand how the treatment accorded to Imre Nagy could be explained away. Assurances were given and then broken and the Hungarian Government was unable to give the protection it had promised. He hoped that Mr Nagy would soon return to Hungary.

Mr Nehru paid tribute to the part played by the United States and more especially by President Eisenhower in the last few months in international affairs. To Pakistan Mr Nehru made the unilateral declaration that India would never go to war against Pakistan unless attacked. The offer of a "no war" declaration was made five years ago and still remained. Although Pakistan had not accepted it he was prepared to make a unilateral declaration to allay apprehensions, if any were entertained in any quarter.