

of rights of belligerency exercised by Egypt in conformity with the Armistice Agreement and with the principles of international law."

At the end of its deliberations in July and August the Security Council adopted the following resolution on September 1, 1951, the USSR, India and China abstaining:

"The Security Council

"1. Recalling that in its resolution of 11 August 1949, (S/1376) relating to the conclusion of Armistice Agreements between Israel and the neighbouring Arab States it drew attention to the pledges in these Agreements 'against any further acts of hostility between the Parties';

"2. Recalling further that in its resolution of 17 November 1950 (S/1907) it reminded the States concerned that the Armistice Agreements to which they were parties contemplated 'the return of permanent peace in Palestine', and therefore urged them and the other States in the area to take all such steps as would lead to the settlement of the issues between them;

"3. Noting the report of the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization to the Security Council of 12 June 1951 (S/2194);

"4. Further noting that the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization recalled the statement of the senior Egyptian delegate in Rhodes on 13 January 1949, to the effect that his delegation was 'inspired with every spirit of co-operation, conciliation and a sincere desire to restore peace in Palestine', and that the Egyptian Government has not complied with the earnest plea of the Chief of Staff made to the Egyptian delegate on 12 June 1951, that it desist from the present practice of interfering with the passage through the Suez Canal of goods destined for Israel;

"5. Considering that since the Armistice regime, which has been in existence for nearly two and a half years, is of a permanent character, neither party can reasonably assert that it is actively a belligerent or requires to exercise the right of visit, search, and seizure for any legitimate purpose of self-defence;

"6. Finds that the maintenance of the practice mentioned in paragraph 4 above is inconsistent with the objectives of a peaceful settlement between the parties and the establishment of a permanent peace in Palestine set forth in the Armistice Agreement;

"7. Finds further that such practice is an abuse of the exercise of the right of visit, search and seizure;

"8. Further finds that the practice cannot in the prevailing circumstances be justified on the ground that it is necessary for self-defence;

"9. And further noting that the restrictions on the passage of goods through the Suez Canal to Israel ports are denying to nations at no time connected with the conflict in Palestine valuable supplies required for their economic reconstruction, and that these restrictions together with sanctions applied by Egypt to certain ships which have visited Israel ports represent unjustified interference with the rights of nations to navigate the seas and to trade freely with one another, including the Arab States and Israel;

"10. Calls upon Egypt to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound and to cease all interference with such shipping beyond that essential to the safety of shipping in the Canal itself and to the observance of the international conventions in force." (The latter have to do with such things as the protection of the Canal, the observance of sanitary regulations and control of the slave traffic and the traffic in drugs.)

Egypt continued to apply the restrictions in varying forms and degrees. On January 28, 1954 Israel appealed once more to the Security Council. It argued that Egypt's interference with shipping in the Suez Canal constituted hostile action and that it violated the Constantinople Convention of 1888 and international law, the purposes of the Charter and the spirit and letter of the armistice agreement, as well as the Security Council's resolution of September 1, 1951. Israel asked the Security Council to establish machinery and procedures which would enable it to follow up the course of its resolutions and receive reports on their fulfilment or non-fulfilment. A draft resolution introduced by New Zealand's representative called on Egypt to comply with the Security Council's resolution of September 1, 1951. On March 29, 1954 this was vetoed, however, by the U.S.S.R. for two reasons. It was impossible Mr. Vishinsky said, to settle international problems by imposing on one of the parties a decision which from the outset it had declared to be absolutely unacceptable. The parties should be asked instead to settle their differences by direct negotiation. In the second place, he said, the principle of free navigation in the Suez Canal must be respected. The task of supervising the observance of the Constantinople Convention providing for freedom of navigation had not been assigned, however, to a body like the Security Council, in which non-signatories of the Constantinople Convention constituted a majority. It had been assigned, under Article 8 of the Convention, to the agents in Egypt of the signatories themselves. Only four of the signatories and the successor