

Durham E-Theses

The Suez crisis: a study in press performance

Evans, Harold

How to cite:

Evans, Harold (1965) *The Suez crisis: a study in press performance*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/9520/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.



Durham E-Theses

The Suez crisis: a study in press performance

Evans, Harold

How to cite:

Evans, Harold (1940) *The Suez crisis: a study in press performance*, Durham theses, Durham University.
Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/9259/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

THE SUEZ CRISIS:

A study in press performance

by Harold Evans

WORK SHEETS

Seven work sheets are included to illustrate the method and present the most important final figures of the study.

Master Sheet 1 and 2

These assemble the results of the daily check lists in the most important categories. For each day, each paper, and each category, there is a possible score of facts - and the result the individual newspaper achieved. These scores are totalled at the end and set alongside are the total number of non-factual units in that category for that newspaper. This enables the newspaper's daily and total reporting of the facts to be compared at a glance with the space given to non-factual material in the news columns.

November 2nd Check List

These three sheets are the factual check list prepared and marked for November 2nd. There were similar check lists for the twenty days of the study. The facts are set out on the left and the newspapers which reported them are credited with a tick. (See Chapter 4 and Appendix II)

Theme List

These two sheets are the theme list prepared and marked for the third period of the study, November 8th and beyond. The themes generally prevalent throughout the crisis are on the left. The figures in the columns represent the occasions the newspapers conveyed this theme, without attribution, in the news columns (i.e. non-factually). (See Chapter 4 and Appendix II)

MASTER SHEET 1

Total scores for each paper in the major categories, compared with possible scores and total of non-factual units.

OCTOBER
30 31

NOVEMBER
1st 2nd 3rd

NOVEMBER
11th 12th 13th 14th 15th 16th 17th 18th

POSSIBLE
TOTAL
SCORE
(FACTS)

SCORE
OF
NON-
FACTUAL
UNITS

NOTES

Possible score:

1. OBJECTIVES: Official

San Francisco Chronicle
San Francisco Examiner
San Francisco News
Denver Post
Philadelphia Inquirer
Wall Street Journal
Quincy Herald Whig
Chicago Tribune
Time magazine
Newsweek
U.S. News & World Report

NIL	13	16	11	4	13	4	6	9	9	2	6	NIL	3	5	7	2	2	NIL	5	117
	5	3	2	1	9		1	2	2						3	1			29	8
	8	2	2		9		2	2	2		4				4			2	37	5
	3				3		1								3				10	4
	4		2	1	8		1		2						3			2	23	14
	4		3	1	9		2	2	1						3			2	27	10
	3							1	1										5	3
	6	1			7		1		1					1	1			3	21	5
	10	2	4	1	8		3	2	1					1	4			4	40	14
	5	3			3				2							1	1		15	0
	1		2		4		1	1	1					2	1	1			14	4
	8	2	2		1									4					17	8

ACTUAL
SCORE

2. OBJECTIVES: Unofficial

San Francisco Chronicle
San Francisco Examiner
San Francisco News
Denver Post
Philadelphia Inquirer
Wall Street Journal
Quincy Herald Whig
Chicago Tribune
Time magazine
Newsweek
U.S. News & World Report

Possible:

NIL	3	4	5	NIL	3	6	7	5	2	3	3	2	NIL	5	2	1	1	NIL	1	72
						2	1					1						1	5	33
	1					2		1						2				1	7	12
	1													1				1	3	24
		1																1	2	43
		2				2	1											1	6	31
			1															1	1	15
	2				1	1	1							1				1	2	30
			1			1	2											1	7	17
																		1	5	32
																			0	10
																		1	1	42

POSSIBLE

ACTUAL

3. CONSPIRACY

San Francisco Chronicle
San Francisco Examiner
San Francisco News
Denver Post
Philadelphia Inquirer
Wall Street Journal
Quincy Herald Whig
Chicago Tribune
Time magazine
Newsweek
U.S. News & World Report

Possible:

NIL	4	9	13	7	5	2	3	NIL	2	1	3	NIL	NIL	2	2	NIL	NIL	2	1	56
	2	5	1	1				1								1				11
	2	5				1		1										1	10	28
	1	3	2	1															8	8
	1	3	1	1															8	25
	1	5				1												1	7	55
															1				9	21
	1	2																	0	4
	2	4	5	1							1							1	4	22
		1	1	1	1													1	14	41
																			5	29
																			0	32
																			7	45

ACTUAL

4. COUNTER CONSPIRACY

San Francisco Chronicle
San Francisco Examiner
San Francisco News
Denver Post
Philadelphia Inquirer
Wall Street Journal
Quincy Herald Whig
Chicago Tribune
Time magazine
Newsweek
U.S. News & World Report

Possible:

NIL	10	13	7	3	4	2	5	2	4	2	1	NIL	1	NIL	NIL	2	2	2	2	63
	2	1		2	1		2	1												9
	4	3		1	1	1		1											12	31
	1																		5	7
		1	1	2															4	1
	2	5	1	3	1	1	2	2											19	4
																			2	5
	1	1	1	1				1											4	4
	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1											9	28
	2	1																	3	53
																			1	35
	3	4	2																9	116

ACTUAL

5. FAVOURABLE TO BRITAIN, FRANCE, ISRAEL

San Francisco Chronicle
San Francisco Examiner
San Francisco News
Denver Post
Philadelphia Inquirer
Wall Street Journal
Quincy Herald Whig
Chicago Tribune
Time magazine
Newsweek
U.S. News & World Report

Possible:

10	24	23	32	19	27	17	21	22	24	32	32	22	22	26	31	20	17	15	18	462
6	3	4	8	1	3	3	5 ⁺	4	6	8	6	6	6	1	7 ⁺	3	4	2 ⁺	8 ⁺	94
5	9	4	6	2 ⁺	9		8 ⁺	6	2 ⁺	9	10	10	7 ⁺	3	3	5	5	3 ⁺	8	42
3	2 ⁺	10 ⁺	2 ⁺	3	1	2 ⁺	8	3	1	4	4	1	8	1	6	4	6 ⁺	1 ⁺	1	71
3	3	8	3	6	4 ⁺	2	3 ⁺	3	2	7	5	6	5 ⁺	2 ⁺	4	2	3	2	3	76
5	4 ⁺	5	5	4 ⁺	8 ⁺	1	9 ⁺	5	6	9	9	8	10	4 ⁺	6	5	5	2	6	116
4	1	1	4				5	1	2	3			4	1	3	1				30
3	2	5	2	5	1	1	5	2	2	4	5	5 ⁺	1	1	2	2	2	3	4	57
9 ⁺	10 ⁺	11 ⁺	9 ⁺	6 ⁺	6	4 ⁺	6 ⁺	6	5 ⁺	13	8	5	9	4	4 ⁺	4 ⁺	6 ⁺	6 ⁺	6 ⁺	131
4	3	2	2	2	2	2 ⁺	2	4	5	6 ⁺	4	2	2	4	3 ⁺	1	2		2	54
	1 ⁺		2	1			1	2	1 ⁺	4	3	6	2	1	5 ⁺		2	4		35
5	7	6	4	1		1	2	1	4	1	2	6		5 ⁺	2	2	1			18
																				116

ACTUAL

6. UNFAVOURABLE TO BRITAIN, FRANCE, ISRAEL

San Francisco Chronicle
San Francisco Examiner
San Francisco News
Denver Post
Philadelphia Inquirer
Wall Street Journal
Quincy Herald Whig
Chicago Tribune
Time magazine
Newsweek
U.S. News & World Report

Possible:

3	28	38	40	32	31	26	29	21	28	26	13	16	17	26	13	9	21	14	12	443
1	11	12	17	13	10	11	6 ⁺	5 ⁺	7	5	2 ⁺	5	5	8	4	5	9	3 ⁺	3	141
1	10	12	13 ⁺	6	12	6	9	9	5 ⁺	4 ⁺		10 ⁺	5 ⁺	8	5	5	7	2	5	134
	8 ⁺	9 ⁺	6 ⁺	5	2	9	5 ⁺	5 ⁺	6 ⁺	5		2	1	4	1	2	5 ⁺		1	76
1	6	13	9 ⁺	11	5	5	5 ⁺	8 ⁺	7	7	3 ⁺	7	5	5	3	2	4 ⁺	1	3	109
1	11	13 ⁺	14	15	9 ⁺	6	8	10	6	6	1	7	8	6	4	5	7	6	2	147
	5	7	4 ⁺			3	2	1	2	3			3	2	2	3	3			40
1	4 ⁺	9	11 ⁺	6	6	4	5	4	3	2	2	7	3 ⁺	4	3	1	6		3	94
1 ⁺	14 ⁺	13 ⁺	18 ⁺	15 ⁺	10 ⁺	5	7 ⁺	4 ⁺	5 ⁺	6	4	6	6 ⁺	5 ⁺	3	5	10 ⁺	6 ⁺		143
	9	12	7	4	3	6	5	4		5	2 ⁺	2	1	3	1	1	3	1		69
	2	7	8	2 ⁺	4	6	7 ⁺	3	5	2	1	2	2	4	1	2	6	2	2	70
	3	11	11 ⁺	1	1	1	2	1	3	4	1	2	3	1	2 ⁺	3				50

ACTUAL

30 31

OCTOBER

1st 2nd 3rd

NOVEMBER

4th 5th 6th 7th 8th 9th 10th 11th 12th 13th 14th 15th 16th 17th 18th

NOVEMBER

1st ... The
small footnote
figure refers to
other fact reported
but not on the
check lists - local
speeches, etc. See
page 275 of the
study, Appendix II

MASTER SHEET (2)

OCTOBER
 30th 31st
 NOVEMBER
 1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th 9th 10th 11th 12th 13th 14th 15th 16th 17th 18th
 NOVEMBER
 POSSIBLE TOTAL SCORE (FACTS)
 SCORE NON FACTUAL UNITS

Possible:		1	1	2	7	1	NIL	3	2	1	NIL	2	2	NIL	NIL	2	2	1	2	3	1	33	
Actuals:																							
7. APPROVAL U.S. POLICY																							
San Francisco Chronicle		/	/	1	3	1	/	/	/	1	/	/	2	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	9
San Francisco Examiner		/	/	1	4	1	/	/	/	/	/	1	2	/	/	/	1	1	/	/	1	13	
San Francisco News		/	/	1	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	4	
Denver Post		/	/	1	1	1	/	/	/	/	/	1	2	/	/	/	1	/	1	1	/	9	
Philadelphia Inquirer		1	1	/	4	1	/	/	2	1	/	2	/	/	/	1	1	1	2	2	/	19	
Wall street Journal		1	/	/	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	4	
Quincy Herald Whig		/	/	/	1	1	/	/	1	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	5	
Chicago Tribune		1	1	1	3	1	/	1	/	/	/	1	1	/	/	2	1	1	1	/	1	16	
Time magazine		/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	2	
Newsweek		NIL																			0		
U.S. News and World Report		/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	2	

Possible:

8. CRITICAL U.S. POLICY	2	6	11	17	10	12	2	10	NIL	NIL	2	NIL	NIL	NIL	5	3	2	1	1	83	
San Francisco Chronicle	1	4	3	11	3	1	/	4	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	28	NIL
San Francisco Examiner	1	1	5	4	4	2	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	19	4
San Francisco News	1	1	7	7	1	/	/	3	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	21	2
Denver Post	/	3	4	10	5	2	/	3	NIL	NIL	/	NIL	NIL	NIL	2	/	1	NIL	NIL	26	11
Philadelphia Inquirer	2	2	2	3	3	4	2	3	/	/	1	/	/	/	2	/	1	NIL	NIL	25	NIL
Wall street Journal	1	2	1	1	/	/	/	2	/	/	1	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	9	NIL
Quincy Herald Whig	1	1	/	3	3	3	/	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	13	NIL
Chicago Tribune	2	3	5	10	7	5	1	4	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	1	/	/	/	39	1
Time magazine	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	0	3
Newsweek	/	/	/	1	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	2	3
U.S. News & World Report	/	/	/	9	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	9	NIL

Possible

9. <u>MILITARY ACTION HUMANE</u>	/	/	11	9	8	9	4	7	8	5	6	4	7	2	NIL	1	NIL	NIL	3	1	85	
San Francisco Chronicle	/	/	6	1	/	/	2	/	2	1	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	14	6
San Francisco Examiner	/	/	3	5	/	/	1	/	1	1	1	1	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	14	NIL
San Francisco News	/	/	4	2	/	2	1	1	/	/	2	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	14	2
Denver Post	/	/	/	1	/	/	1	/	1	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	3	3
Philadelphia Inquirer	/	/	5	3	1	/	1	/	1	1	/	2	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	15	1
Wall Street Journal	/	/	3	1	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	5	NIL
Quincy Herald Whig	/	/	1	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	4	1
Chicago Tribune	/	/	5	4	1	1	2	/	2	2	1	2	3	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	24	9
Time magazine	/	/	2	5	1	2	1	/	1	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	14	2
Newsweek	/	/	1	/	/	2	/	/	3	1	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	8	7
U.S. News & World Report	/	/	1	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	2	NIL

10	MILITARY ACTION INHUMANE	Possible:	NIL	NIL	4	8	6	6	5	4	4	3	1	1	8	NIL	NIL	2	NIL	NIL	1	3	56			
	San Francisco Chronicle				2	1	4	/	1	2	1	2	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	2	16				
	San Francisco Examiner				2	2	1	5	/	1	/	2	/	/	6	/	/	/	/	/	3	22				
	San Francisco News				2	1	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	5				
	Denver Post				1	2	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	4	/	/	1	/	/	/	10				
	Philadelphia Inquirer		NIL		1	4	2	1	2	2	1	1	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	3	18					
	Wall Street Journal				2	1	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	4				
	Quincy Herald Whig				1	3	1	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	3	/	1	/	/	/	/	10				
	Chicago Tribune				3	2	2	2	4	2	1	2	/	/	3	/	/	/	/	2	23					
	Time magazine														NIL											0
	Newsweek				/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	1				
	U.S. News and World Report				/	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	2				

		Possible: NIL NIL NIL 4 1 NIL 2 NIL NIL 1 NIL NIL NIL 1 NIL NIL NIL NIL 1 NIL 10																				
11. CANAL: BLOCKAGE: BRITAIN TO BLAME																						ACTUAL:
San Francisco Chronicle	/	/	/	1	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	2		
San Francisco Examiner	/	/	2	1	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	5		
San Francisco News	/	/	2	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	4		
Denver Post	/	/	1	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	2		
Philadelphia Inquirer	/	/	1	1	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	4		
Wall street Journal	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1		
Quincy Herald Whig	/	/	2	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	4		
Chicago Tribune	/	/	3	1	/	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	6		
Time magazine	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1		
Newsweek	/	/	1													NIL					1	
U.S. News & World Report	/	/	1													NIL					1	

Possible:		NIL	NIL	2	4	3	1	2	1	2	NIL	3	2	3	1	4	3	1	2	NIL	34
12. CANAL BLOCKAGE: EGYPT TO BLAME																					ACTUAL:
San Francisco Chronicle		/	/	1	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	2	/	8
San Francisco Examiner		/	/	1	2	1	1	/	/	/	/	/	2	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	8
San Francisco News		/	/	1	1	/	/	1	2	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	2	/	/	8
Denver Post		/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	2
Philadelphia Inquirer		/	/	2	1	/	/	1	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	1	/	1	/	7
Wall street Journal		/	/	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	2
Quincy Herald Whig		/	/	/	1	1	1	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	2	/	7
Chicago Tribune		/	/	2	2	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	2	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	9
Time magazine		/	/	/	/	1	/	1	1	/	/	1	2	1	1	/	/	/	/	/	8
Newsweek		/	/	1	2	/	/	1	1	2	/	1	/	2	/	2	1	/	/	/	13
U.S. News and World Report		/	/	1	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	2

30th 31st
 OCTOBER NOVEMBER
 NOVEMBER

OTHER DILEMMA

1

November 2nd: CHECK LIST OF ATTRIBUTED STATEMENTS

SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER SAN FRANCISCO NEWS DENVER POST PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER WALL STREET JOURNAL QUINCY HERALD WHIG CHICAGO TRIBUNE TIME NEWSWEEK U.S. NEWS + WORLD REPORT

1. OBJECTIVES: Official

- a) Eden, Commons: Not seeking impose by force solution to Egypt/Israeli dispute or dispute over Suez canal
- b) Eden, Commons: Our aim to stop hostilities, prevent resumption, safeguard canal traffic - essentially police action
- c) Eden: War would have spread but for intervention
- d) Eden: Lesson of Munich, avoid great wars by acting to prevent small wars
- e) Lord Chancellor, Lords: Aim to protect British nationals, ships, canal installations
- f) Lord Chancellor, Lords: US wrong to think "colonialism": It is anti-Communist
- g) Menzies, Australia: Intervention to prevent conflagration, police canal
- h) Dixon for Britain, UN: Intervention to prevent E/I war leading to conflagration
- i) Dixon, UN: U.S. motion would not achieve twin objectives - separating combatants, at once and safeguarding passage for ships
- j) War Office, London: Our aim limited to reoccupying old British bases
- k) Dixon, UN: Only want to stay at Suez long enough protect canal from war

2. OBJECTIVES: Hostile

- a) Nasser, Cairo: Britain, as always, conspiring to dominate Egypt
- b) Pakistan, President Muslim League: Suez reoccupation is British aim
- c) Nehru, India: Britain not defending canal because first result of invasion is stoppage of traffic
- d) China, statement: Invasion by Israel being used as pretext to seize Suez again
- e) Russian delegate, UN: Britain & France aim to reestablish colonial domination

3. CONSPIRACY THEMES

- a) Egypt, UN: B.F. & Israel agreed in advance fight Egypt
- b) Nasser, Cairo radio: British trying destroy Egyptian plane to help Israel
- c) Nasser, Cairo radio: Britain and France have "ally" in Israelis
- d) Nasser: British, French, Israel air forces co-operating against E. air force
- e) Nasser & Egypt communique: F. squadrons helping Israelis in Sinai attacks
- f) Senator George, U.S.: Israelis have been encouraged by Britain & France
- g) King of Jordan: B. and F. "supported & incited" Israel
- h) Soviet delegate, UN: B.F. and I. aggression according to previous B.F. plans
- i) Libya Premier: Israel's treacherous aggression "with imperialist conspiracy"
- l) New Zealand Premier: We were not consulted before intervention
- m) Egypt, UN: B.F. planes operating from Israeli airfields
- n) Yates, Cons M.P.: Been in France & conclude Gogt. in "international conspiracy"
- o) Ceylon Prime Minister: "Strange coincidence" of Israeli & B and F. attacks

4. COUNTER CONSPIRACY

- a) British delegate, UN: "Absurd & completely false talk of B-F-I plot"
- b) British delegate, UN: Israeli attack 'violation of armistice'
- c) Menzies: "No time" to consult Commonwealth beforehand
- d) Eden, Commons: B.F. would welcome UN take over after E-I separated
- e) Eden, Commons: Would welcome participation other nations in settlement
- f) Foreign Office spokesman: Suggestions concerning mil. action with I. false
- g) Foreign Office spokesman: Mil. aims B and F. entirely distinct from Israel's

5. FAVOURABLE TO BRITAIN, FRANCE (or ISRAEL)

- (F) Eden, Commons: Do not intend to stay one moment longer than necessary
- a) War Minister, Commons: Original offer to Egypt remains open at any time
- b) UN, British delegate: US motion would leave Mid-East in dangerous pre-crisis situation
- c) UN, "": Situation nearly out of control - what use a Security Council injunction?
- d) UN, Britain: Suggested conference to solve Middle-East problems
- e) UN, Britain: Willing hand over physical tasks of keeping peace to U.N.
- f) UN, Britain: U.S. would have fought in Korea in 1950 even if blocked by veto
- g) UN, Britain: Soviet veto would have prevented UN from agreement - hence police action
- h) UN, Britain: This is not aggression, but purely temporary police action
- i) Eden, Commons: Not at war with Egypt - "state of armed conflict". Compare Korea
- j) Eden: Complied with Hague convention of 1907 by ultimatum before attack
- k) Eden: Would should remember fate of Britons in Cairo massacre at time of Abadan
- l) Eden: Britain vetoed UN censure of Israel because unjustified. Egypt provocative.
- m) Eden: Colonialism? Charge fails in light of Suez-Sudan evacuations
- n) Eden: UN not equal to legal system - B. and F. had the forces available
- o) Eden: Need for economic aid for Middle East
- p) Britain: Government won majorities 69, 68, 67 for policy; 82:30 in Lords
- q) R.A. Butler, Commons: Once US fully understands motives, will take more benient view
- r) Menzies, Australia: Nasser has been hostile to Israel's existence
- s) Menzies: U.S. should try and understand the pressures on Britain and France
- t) Menzies: UN failed secure Suez passage for Israeli ships: show UN can be useless
- u) New Zealand Premier: Situation "disturbing" but full confidence in B's intentions
- v) Nehru: Recalled liberal gestures of Britain in past (which made sorrow more now)
- w) Eisenhower: Despite differences, alliance would grow to new and greater strength
- x) UN, Israeli delegate: Aggression for 8 years - against Israel by Egypt
- y) UN, Israel: Would not do to go back to outdated crumbling armistice
- z) Lord Chancellor: Disagreed with US at moment but keen on co-operation
- A) Dulles: UN Assembly can only recommend action
- B) Eden: In our responsibility and with full information, intervention "only action"
- C) Foreign Office: Denied that before fighting any progress on Suez canal dispute
- D) British delegate, UN: US acted before UN taking in Korea and always called it police action.
- E) British delegate: Procedure to recall Assembly improperly invoked

6. UNFAVOURABLE TO BRITAIN, FRANCE, ISRAEL

- a) Nehru sent sympathy message to Nasser:
- b) Nehru: Letter to Eisenhower: B. and F. actions worse than Israel's
- c) Nehru: B. gone back to predatory methods. Clear and naked aggression
- d) Capetown (Reuter, AP): All newspapers, English & Afrikaans, critical of Britain
- e) Syria Government announced support of Egypt
- f) Moscow: Need for new Bandung conference to discuss British aggression
- g) Commons, Britain: Opposition censure motion said intervention affronted UN, US alliance, Commonwealth and many British people.....

6. UNFAVOURABLE TO BRITAIN, FRANCE, ISRAEL (Continued)

- h) Bevan, Commons: No semblance legal justification: For God's sake, get out.
- i) Bevan: Argument of lynchers to say because UN weak we take law into own hands
- j) Bevan: Intervention has stained Britain's reputation
- k) Australian Opposition in Parliament: B. F. violating United Nations
- l) Australian Opposition: Will oppose any Australian aid in Suez fighting
- m) Egypt breaks off diplomatic relations with Britain- London & Nasser announcement
- n) Adlai Stevenson, U.S.: Would not condone use of force even by our friends
- o) Eisenhower: Cannot condone armed aggression no matter who the attacker or victim
- p) Archbishop of Canterbury: Christian opinion uneasy. Should ask Israel withdraw
- q) National Council of Labour said British people shocked by intervention
- r) Liberal Party: Intervention wrong even if succeeds: Blow to UN & Commonwealth
- s) Jordan announces cutting relations with France
- t) Jordan announces: Relations with Britain 'being considered'
- u) Jordan: Use of bases barred by Govt. for attacks against Arabs
- v) UN decided that crisis should be discussed in Assembly: 62-2,7 abstentions
- w) Egypt in UN: 1888 Convention gives Egypt alone right to defend the canal
- x) Egypt, UN: If Britain wants peace, why veto mere cease fire resolution?
- y) Egypt, UN: Temporary action? Britain said 1882 occupation was temporary
- z) Egypt, UN: Public opinion in UK far from approves Eden policy
- A) US, in UN: Policy appraised in highest quarters but despite ties with Britain, France and Israel U.S. could not accept the use of force
- B) US, in UN: US motion proposes cease fire for all parties; Israeli withdrawal; prohibition on military goods; end of raids; free navigation of Suez canal
- C) Dulles: "violent" armed attack by BFI "grave error" inconsistent with UN principle
- D) Dulles (UN): Provocations serious but force not justified
- E) Nasser, Cairo: Israel accepted cease fire - it left her, the aggressor, within ten miles of the canal
- F) France: Pro-regime newspaper questioned the policy of intervention (Reuter, AP):
- G) Labour Opposition in Britain angry - Speaker suspends Commons sitting
- H) Senator George, U.S.: Britain & F. virtually withdrawn from NATO: "mean"
- I) Canada, Premier: No decision yet whether to support Britain and France
- J) Shepilov for Russia: War should end first, then troops withdrawn. Britain & France "gangsterism".
- K) Dulles: Unless stop what started in Mid-east might spread - other nations using as a pretext
- L) Dulles: Before fighting progress British-French-Egypt agreement on Suez canal
- M) Ceylon, Premier: Britain & France no justification. Ceylon bases barred
- N) Pakistan, Premier: Deprecated use of force in solving differences
- Other hostile attributed statements or events:

7. APPROVAL U.S. POLICY

- a) Menzies, Australian Premier: Profound respect for Eisenhower and Dulles' attempts to keep the peace in Suez crisis
- b) Eisenhower: Despite strident voices of those seeking to turn world events to political profit, proud of his stand in middle east
- c) Dewey: Situation shows need of Eisenhower "foremost leader in world for peace and justice"
- d) Nixon: Eisenhower's stand on Suez represents U.S. at its best: No double standard
- e) Eisenhower (Philadelphia): "U.S. policy receiving proud, spirited, bipartisan support in the crisis."
- f) Nixon: Shocking of Adlai Stevenson to criticise US policy without being constructive
- g) Yugoslav envoy, Brilej: U.S. prestige will soar..action "unforgettable" for peace

7. CRITICISM U.S. POLICY

- a) Kefauver (Rhode Island): Eisenhower policy to blame for split with B & F.
- b) Adlai Stevenson: Crisis direct outcome of Eisenhower policy provoking and appeasing Egypt. Policy at a dead end.
- c) Stevenson: Should have helped Israel with arms and territorial guarantees, and put in UN force.
- d) Stevenson: Blunders climax finds U.S. with Russia and a dictator, against the democracies of Britain, France and Israel
- e) Stevenson: U.S. built up Nasser and pressured Britain to leave Suez base
- f) Stevenson: Dulles behind Baghdad pact which caused trouble & offended Nasser
- g) Stevenson: When at last became clear Nasser was enemy of peace, Dulles withdrew aid for Aswan Dam
- h) Kefauver: Admin. had contributed directly to rise of Nasser
- i) Kefauver: Admin. allowed Russia to gain foothold in middle east & divide US from allies
- j) Kefauver: Administration thought oil more important than middle east people
- k) Canada in UN: US motion inadequate to achieve purpose - needed UN peace force
- l) Lord Astor: U.S. ambassador in Cairo anti-British
- m) Evans, MP. Britain: U.S. oil rivalry is reason for not getting fair play from US
- n) Governor Harriman, New York: "lack of confidence" shown in U.S. by allies
- o) Adlai Stevenson (new speech): Mistake after mistake in U.S. policy
- p) Stevenson: Have given Soviet 2 victories in Mideast, broken Western alliance
- q) "No one going back to pre-crisis situation when event threatened strangulation of all major lines"

8. MILITARY ACTION HUMANE

- a) British communique: Military airfields bombed
- b) British communique: Much care taken to avoid civilian casualties in bombing
- c) British communique: Delayed action bombs used to help personnel escape
- d) C in C, Cyprus: Aim to achieve only military objectives with minimum of casualties, to save life and property, both civilian and military

San Francisco Chronicle	San Francisco Examiner	San Francisco News	Denver Post	Philadelphia Inquirer	Wall Street Journal	Queeny Herald Whig	Chicago Tribune	TIME	Newsweek	U.S. News + World Report
						✓5/4		✓		
				✓				✓18	✓13	✓
✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓			
✓			✓			✓	✓			✓
✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓3	✓		✓
✓5								✓2/28		
✓6			✓6			✓	✓		✓	
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
✓	✓									
✓	✓			✓		✓			✓	
		✓		✓						
							✓			
			✓				✓			
✓	✓			✓						
✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓			✓4
✓	✓						✓			
✓	✓			✓			✓			
										✓
									✓	
✓	✓		✓	✓		✓4	✓	✓		✓
		✓8/11	✓			✓				✓
✓				✓						
✓	✓						✓			
							✓2		✓17	✓12
							✓			
	✓4/6	✓6/7	✓7		✓3	✓1	✓9/5/7			✓14

MILITARY ACTION HUMANE (Continued)

- [illegible]

[illegible]

	✓	✓ ✓ ₁₄		✓ ³ — ✓	✓	✓ ✓		✓ ¹⁸	✓
✓ ₈	✓		✓		✓	✓			

[illegible]

	✓			✓ ⁴		✓	
✓	✓	✓	✓ ²		✓	✓	
✓ ²	✓ ²		✓ ⁵	✓ ⁶	✓	✓	

✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
---	---	---	---	---	---

✓ means fact appeared in newspaper issue of preceding day (usually evening newspaper)

✓² Small letter is footnote cross reference to notebook where details of some entries kept - i.e. to preserve the original passage or qualify the credit mark in some way relevant for writing up the figure.

NON-FACTUAL THEME LIST (1)

Nov 8th and beyond (after cease fire)

	SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE	SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER	SAN FRANCISCO NEWS	DENVER POST	PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER	WALL ST JOURNAL	QUINCY HERALD with 6	CHICAGO TRIBUNE	MAGAZINES TIME MAGAZINE	NEWSWEEK	U.S. NEWS with 2 REPORT	(6)
1. OBJECTIVES (Accepting official British view)												
a) Taking of Port Said, Suez, Ismailia, to protect waterway while fighting				1								
b) Separating combatants and ending the Egypt-Israeli war								1				
c) Protect British nationals and property												
d) To stop the fighting from spreading further in the Middle East												
e) Prepare way for durable peace equally between Arabs and Israel	3 ¹³		1			1						
f) Uncover, forestall Russian plot to take over Middle East		1 ⁵		7 ¹¹				5 ^b		1.1	1	
g) To save West's position in Middle East												
h) "occupy the Suez canal zone"												
2. OBJECTIVES (Hostile assertions)												
a) To prevent Nasser uniting Arabs			1					2		1.1		
b) Weaken or destroy Nasser as enemy of Britain and France	2		1		2.1.1.1.1 ¹⁵	1 ²	2.1.1.1	1 ²		1	15.1 ¹¹	
d) Reoccupy Canal Zone by force and impose international Canal settlement	2.2.2.13	9.2 ¹⁸	1 ⁶	1	1.5	1.1.1 ²	2.1 ⁷			1	1	
d) Denationalise the canal once occupied and make it Anglo-French		1 ¹⁰		1 ²⁵	1	4	2	1				
e) Restore British colonial rule over Egypt												
f) Re-establish an Egyptian government dependent on Britain and France									1 ⁷			
g) Preserve Israel as an independent state											1 ¹¹	
h) Preserve Iraq, Jordan, as independent vis a vis Egypt												
i) Restore Britain's position as a big power, independent of U.S.											1	
j) Impose peace at expense of Arabs											1	
k) Preserve British-French own interests, unspecified (oil/prestige, etc)	1					1	1	1 ³	1 ²		1	
l) "Seize the Suez canal"	1	1			1	1	1				1	
m) "temporary" occupation of Canal, i.e. repeat of official statement of objective but using quotes on temporary as sign of doubt				14.1.1			1.1					
3. CONSPIRACY CHARGES												
a) U.S. was/is being deliberately deceived by B. & France	2.1 ⁷			1 ²⁰		1.1 ⁵	1 ⁶			15.3 ⁵		
b) U.S. deliberately deceived by Britain, France & Israel jointly												
g) Britain/France planned the assault with I. as pretext for action							1	4 ⁰		12		
d) Britain & France knew of and encouraged I. assault as pretext			1.1 ¹⁸				1					
e) B/F knew of the impending Israeli attack & were ready to act		1 ¹⁰						1 ^d			1 ²	
f) B/F hoped for Israeli attack and planned in anticipation												
g) France planned the assault, but Britain knew nothing of this												
h) France knew of and encouraged Israeli assault, but B. did not												
i) France knew of I. plan and was ready with assault plan for Britain												
j) Suggestions that Britain, France, Israeli were allies		1	1 ⁵	1		1 ⁵		1.1.1.1.1 ²⁰	1 ¹	1.1.2.1	1.2	
k) Britain and France welcomed the Israeli invasion												
l) Britain and France deliberately defied the U.S.	2			1								
m) Plain statement that B/F did not consult or inform the U.S.	2	1		1.1.1.1.1				1.1.2.1			1	
4. ALLIANCE (Anglo-U.S.)												
a) Disagreement confined to crisis, alliance will stay & U.S. Administration wishes it to stay	1.2.2		1.1	8	8.1.1.1	1.1		3.1				
b) France keen to see alliance preserved								1.2	1.1	1		
c) Britain keen to see alliance preserved	1		1.1		4.1	3.4		4	1.1			
d) Disagreement such that alliance in doubt in U.S.			1									
e) " " " in doubt in France, Britain												
f) Disagreement such that alliance is wrecked in U.S. eyes												
g) " " alliance wrecked (for good) in B/F eyes												
h) Plain statement: Disagreement anger extreme in U.S.				2.1			1	1				
i) Disagreement was violent but subsiding												
j) U.S. not really very angry at any time												
5. WHY DID BRITAIN & FRANCE ACCEPT CEASE-FIRE? UNFAVOURABLE THEMES.												
a) Because B. had said it would do when E/I accepted cease fire												
b) Because objectives achieved, combatants separated												
d) NOT because of Russian threat of rocket attack on England											1	
d) NOT because of pressure at home or from U.S.				2								
e) NOT because of threat of Russian volunteers							1					
6. WHY STOPPED: UNFAVOURABLE REASONS (i.e. not given by Britain/France)												
a) Because of U.S. pressure	3				1		2.1	1.1 ¹⁵			3 ⁷	
b) Because of UN pressure, in whole or part	3			1			1	1.1		1.1	1 ⁷	
c) Commonwealth pressure											1 ⁷	
d) Domestic pressure in Britain and France	2			1				1.3.2.1			1 ⁷	
e) Because B/F suffered military setback from Egyptian forces												
f) Frightened by Russian rocket threat in whole or part	5				4.1.1.1	1 ²	2.3 ³	2	2		2 ⁷	
g) Frightened by Russian volunteer threat, chance of World war	3 ³	1 ¹⁰	1 ¹²	2	1 ⁹	3 ³	1	1.1		2		
h) British economy could not stand the cost any longer												
7. JUDGMENTS ON INTERVENTION: FAVOURABLE												
a) IS a genuine police action												
b) Canal is in danger from Egyptian/Israeli fighting												
c) Could lead to peace in Middle East now												
d) Russian has been plotting in the Middle East					1.3.1.1.8 ²	1.8	1		1		9.1 ³	
e) Anti-Nasser themes (i.e. Nasser a "dictator", etc)	1 ¹⁴	2.8.1	1.1.1.1		1.1 ²²	4			3.1	1	1.1.1.1 ¹¹	2.3.9.1.4 ¹²
f) Did not risk a major war												
g) Britain and France genuinely impartial	1.6 ³		1				1					
h) Pro-Eden themes (personality, i.e. lover of peace)								1				
i) More people support Eden than oppose. Also Mollet					1 ¹⁹	1					1.1.8.1	3
j) Egypt friendly with Russia & other themes hostile to Egypt	1.1				2.3.1			1			1	

NON-FARTUM THEME LIST (2) NOV. 8TH and beyond, continued

	SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE	SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER	SAN FRANCISCO NEWS	DENVER POST	PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER	WALL ST. JOURNAL	QUINCY HERALD WITH	CHICAGO TRIBUNE	MARTINE TIME	MARTINE NEWSWEEK	US NEWS WORLDWIDE
7. JUDGMENTS (FAVOURABLE)											
k) Britain a reliable strong ally still			1.								
l) Intervention has not ruined Commonwealth											
m) U.S. policy failures forced Britain/France to go-it-alone											
n) US came to see intervention for common good											
o) Support for Britain from other countries suggested (i.e.no attribution)		4 ¹²		1 ¹³	1.						
p) Egypt not co-operating with the United Nations	1.3.2.3.1	1.1.1	1.1.1.1	1.	1.2.1		3	2.1.2.2.1.3		1.1	
q) Britain co-operating with the UN and the UN Expeditionary Force	1.4 ¹³	1.	1.	1.				1.			
r) " " " " UN Expeditionary Force	1.1.1.1	1.	1.	1.1.2.1.1.1	1.1	1.	1.1	2.1.1.1.			4
s) Evidence of Egyptian provocations of Britain/France	2.	2.8 ¹³	1	1.1.1.1	1		1.	1.1			13.2
t) Russian return to Hungary was due to Hungarian causes, not Suez											
u) Intervention did expose Russian penetration of Middle East		1.11		1.2	1.7			2.5.3.1		1.10	2.3 1.10
v) Intervention did stop war from spreading & separated combatants											
w) Did weaken Nasser as a dangerous force in Middle East		8 ³		1.2.3			7.3				
x) Did bring a settlement of the Canal dispute nearer				1							
y) Laid groundwork for permanent Middle East peace											
2) US shared help Britain because <i>because we allies</i>				8.2.4							
8. UNFAVOURABLE JUDGMENTS <i>Israel provocations caused trouble</i>				2.1.8							
A) Intervention failed (unspecified)	1.			7.10.4.2	3.4	1.7	3.1.1.7	4.8.1.3	1.3	1.1.1.2.1.2	1.1
b) Is aggression, war (i.e. not police action)	1.		1.1.1	1.1	1.7			1.2	1		
c) Is to blame for Russia being freed from world censure over Hungary				1.		1.		1.	1	2.	
d) Is to blame for Russian suppression of the revolt in Hungary	5.2.9		4.2								
e) Britain not co-operating with the United Nations	1.1.1.2.1.3	1.2	1.3	1.1.1	1.2	1.1.6		1.5	1.8.1.1	1	
f) Has shown Britain to be weak, 2nd class power who cannot be trusted	8.1.7				1.1.3	9.4			1.9.1.0		2.9.1.1.3
g) Has made Nasser stronger to disadvantage Middle East stability				2.1.1	2.	2.	1.1.1	2.		2.	1.2.1
h) Has helped Russian in the Middle East				3.2.2.1.1.2.1.1	3.6	2.	2.	9.1.1.	1.2	1.1	1.1.2.1
i) Anti-Eden themes				1.1.1.3	1.2.3			4		1.7	
j) Pro-Nasser or pro Egypt themes		4.3.1.7		1.1.8			1.	2.	2.	1.1.3	
k) Britain and France lost prestige in the world & among Arabs	1.1.2.1.6	2.1.6.3		1.1.1.1.1.1	5.2		1.1	2	1.6	1	1.1.1.1.1
l) "Arms plot by Russia" was an excuse devised later	1.1.4			2.6.1.9	1.1.2		1		1.4		
m) Intervention hurt the British Commonwealth				1.1		1.5	1.				1.
n) US not keen to associate with B/F yet which makes them weaker		1.9.5		3.		1.		2.		1.	1.1
o) World condemned intervention	2.1		1.	1.	1		1	1.		1.	
p) Needlessly risked world war		1.		1.6.1						4.	
q) Helped isolationists in U.S. and enemies of UN	3.7						1.				
r) U.S. rescue theme (i.e. US had to "bail out" Britain and France)	2.3.7			1.1.5	2.6	2.6.1.1.1.0	1.2	3.3.1.1.4		1.4.1.7	1.1.1.1.2.1.3
s) British public opinion against intervention	2.		2.								
t) Intervention not impartial vis a vis Egypt	1.1		2.1	1.1.1	1	1.2	1	1.1.3.2.0.1.1	1.10	1.	
u) Simple themes that intervention hurt NATO and the Western alliance				1.1							
v) Hurt the United Nations				1.1.1	2.		1.7		1.		2.2.1
w) To blame for the blockage of the canal & postponement of settlement											2.1
x) Peace in Middle East put in peril											
y) Strained British economy				5.2.4.1.3	4.9.5.2.6.3	12.	3	1.7.1	1.1	3.2.1.2.4	2.1.1.8.1
z) Failed to protect British investments & citizens					1.2.1.1.1			1.1.7		1.9.1.3	
9. INTERVENTION WAS HUMANELY CARRIED OUT <i>1.1) Colonialism involved</i>	1.5										
a) Bombing was carried out to avoid civilian casualties											
b) Few casualties altogether											
c) Port Said soon back to normal								4.8			
d) Population friendly to invading forces	3.4.3.11				1.		1.			3.5	
e) Britain, France doing everything at all possible restore conditions			1.	1.2				2.1.1		2	
10. INTERVENTION WAS INHUMANELY EXECUTED	1.	3.4.3.5.3.1	1.1.4	3.4.1.4.2.1			1.4	1.1.1		1.	
a) Indiscriminate bombing & shelling by Britain, France											
b) Heavy casualties among Egyptians	3.4.3.8.1.7		1.1	1.1				1.1.3.1.1	1		
c) Much destruction		3.	1.	1.1			1.	1.1.1.1.1			
d) Population suffering from lack of services or order	3.8.1.1.1		1.7	1.2.1.1				3			
e) Suffering of population (unspecified)	2.2.1.8		1.1.1.4	3.6.1.1				2.1.1			
f) Atrocities			1.7	1				1.9.1.1.1			
g) Britain and France impeding the true story of Egyptian suffering		3.1.1.6		1							
11. CANAL: BRITAIN CULPABLE FOR BLOCKAGE	2.1	1		1	4.1						
12. CANAL: EGYPT CULPABLE FOR BLOCKAGE	1.		1	3.1	4	1	3	1.1.1.5			
13. U.S. POLICY: CRITICAL											
a) U.S. policy bad and misleading in Middle East	1.1.3		1.2	2.2.4.1.9.1.2.1						1.1.3	
b) US policy not winning friends											
14. US POLICY: FAVOURABLE											
a) US doing everything possible for world peace	1.	4		1.2	1.1		1	3	2		
b) US policy winning friends		4							1		

BLACK: indicates stated as fact
 RED: indicates home statement
 probability (see p.280 of study)
 GREEN: Possibility
 FOOTNOTES, 12. 1.3 - small letter cross refers to notes separately compiled generally to quote the example from which the home count was made.