

7. A further meeting with the representative of Israel was held, on the invitation of the Secretary-General, on 10 February. Following the meeting, the representative of Israel sent the Secretary-General an additional letter, received on 11 February. This letter is likewise annexed to the report (Annex IV).⁽¹⁾

8. This latest communication received from the representative of Israel does not add any new information. Thus it is still an open question whether Israel, under any circumstances, accepts full implementation of resolution I, which, as pointed out above, requires withdrawal from the Gaza strip of Israel's civil administration and police as well as of its armed forces. Further, it is still an open question whether Israel accepts the stationing of units of the United Nations Emergency Force on its side of the armistice demarcation line under resolution II, concerning which, in a similar respect, Israel has raised a question which requires clarification of the Egyptian stand. In case Israel were to receive the assurance from Egypt, which it has requested the Secretary-General to ask for as an action in implementation of resolution II, the representative of Israel in his latest communication has stated only that his Government "would formulate its position on all outstanding questions in the light of Egypt's response".

9. The fact that the Government of Israel has not found it possible to clarify elements decisive for the consideration of their requests, has complicated the efforts to achieve implementation of the resolutions of the General Assembly. If this development has "adversely effected the time-schedule for the withdrawal" of Israel forces, about which the Secretary-General had not been informed, an ultimate reason is that Israel's request for an assurance from Egypt concerning the cessation of all belligerent acts has been put forward while Israel itself, by continued occupation, maintains a state of belligerency which, in the case of Gaza, it has not indicated its intention fully to liquidate.

10. The Secretary-General shares the view of the Government of Israel that the office of the Secretary-General may serve as a means for an interchange between Member states of "proposals and ideas", but wishes to draw attention to the fact that the action which the Government of Israel has requested cannot be regarded as properly described in such terms, as it would be an action within the scope of resolution II and in implementation of this resolution which, although closely related to resolution I, has, at least, full and unconditional acceptance of the demand in resolution I as its prerequisite. . . .

21. In the situation now facing the United Nations the General Assembly, as a matter of priority, may wish to indicate how it desires the Secretary-General to proceed with further steps to carry out the relevant decisions of the General Assembly.

Paragraph 8 of the above report was of particular significance, since it cast doubt on what had been, to some delegations at least, a working hypothesis that Israel accepted the principle of withdrawal and questioned only the circumstances in which it could be implemented.

Results of the conversations in Washington were not immediately apparent; and the continued delay in withdrawal led to the tabling of a draft resolution⁽²⁾, dated February 22 (A/3557), calling in effect for sanctions against Israel.

The General Assembly

Recalling its resolutions 997 (ES-I) of 2 November 1956, 998 (ES-I) and 999 (ES-I) of 4 November 1956, 1002 (ES-I) of 7 November 1956, A/RES/410 of 24 November 1956, A/RES/453 of 19 January 1957 and A/RES/460 of 2 February 1957,

Noting the report of the Secretary-General dated 11 February 1957 (A/3527),

Viewing with grave concern the failure of Israel to comply with the terms of the above-mentioned resolutions,

1. *Condemns* Israel for its non-compliance with the said resolutions;

⁽¹⁾Not reproduced here.

⁽²⁾The sponsors were Afghanistan, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan and Sudan.