



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

1745th MEETING: 11 OCTOBER 1973

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1745)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 7 October 1973 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11010)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 11 October 1973, at 6.45 p.m.

President: Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, China, France, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1745)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 7 October 1973 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11010).

The meeting was called to order at 7 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 7 October 1973 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11010)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 1743rd meeting, I propose now, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Egypt, Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic to take their places at the Council table in order to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Zayyat (Egypt), Mr. A. Eban (Israel) and Mr. M. Z. Ismail (Syrian Arab Republic) took places at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that, in addition, I have received a letter from the representative of Nigeria containing the request that Nigeria be invited to participate without the right to vote in the Council's discussion of the item inscribed on the agenda, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. The letter states that Nigeria will be represented by Mr. Arikpo, the Commissioner for External Affairs. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to invite him to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, and I shall ask him to take the place reserved for him at the side of the

Council chamber, on the understanding that he will be called upon to take a place at the Council table when it is his turn to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. O. Arikpo (Nigeria) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Secretary-General, who has asked to make a brief statement.

4. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Mr. President, this afternoon I asked you to circulate a statement by me relating to the Middle East conflict. I made that request on the basis of information that there would be no meeting of the Council today. Now, since the Council has been convened at the request of a member Government, I should like simply to draw the attention of the members of the Security Council to that statement [see S/11021]. I wish only to repeat the conclusion of this statement.

5. I have no illusions about how difficult it is for countries in conflict to turn from war to peace. I have no wish to deflect any Government from what it believes to be its legitimate sovereign aims. I do, however, question whether the continuation of the war can possibly achieve those aims permanently for any of the parties. I am also deeply concerned at the wider threat to international peace and security which this situation may create.

6. I therefore earnestly appeal to the conflicting Governments to consider alternative courses, before it is too late, so that fighting and bloodshed may cease. I also hope that the members of the Security Council, as well as other Member States, will redouble their efforts to seek an end to the fighting and an immediate and determined resumption of the quest for a just and lasting settlement in the Middle East.

7. The PRESIDENT: The first name inscribed on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Egypt, on whom I now call.

8. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): I wish to make a very short statement. First, however, having just heard the Secretary-General, I should like to assure him that we are going to study his statement, which I am sure he made as the Secretary-General within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations and United Nations resolutions.

9. I have asked to speak because I have a message to give the Security Council from my Government. Before doing so, however, I would like to say that during the last meeting

of the Council, I received a telegram which mentioned air attacks on Cairo. This was a flash which was followed later on by a full telegram saying that these attacks had been on airports near Cairo. I wished to make this correction—and I wish it were a correction that changed the situation. Unfortunately it does not. For, since the receipt of that telegram and since these attacks on airports near Cairo, the Israeli Air Force has carried out other attacks on Delta towns and villages. The Nile Delta, as everyone knows, is one of the most densely populated areas of the world.

10. The toll from those attacks has been increasing. In the morning there were 113 civilians killed and 307 wounded. By about 2 o'clock New York time, the number had risen to a total of 500. In addition, 67 inhabited houses have been completely destroyed by these air attacks. Perhaps we shall be given the following explanation: that these attacks were against military targets—as has been said in the case of Damascus; that these innocent people were killed as a result of these attacks on military targets; and that the responsibility lies with Egypt because it has decided to liberate Egypt from the occupation of Israeli forces, who have never said that the part they are occupying is part of Israel, but still go on repeating that we are attacking Israel. If that is going to be the explanation, then I should like to have an additional explanation of the fact that many of those killed, maimed or wounded were killed, maimed or wounded by picking up a transistor radio, a pen, a watch, a box, and so on, booby traps thrown from Israeli planes and picked up—not by soldiers; soldiers are trained not to pick up these things in time of war—but by innocent people in villages of the Nile Delta.

11. I conclude my statement by repeating two lines from my statement at the last meeting. I wish I could say that those lines had been premature or useless, since they were based on the flash that the attacks had been carried out against Cairo and the report has now been corrected to "attacks against airports in Cairo". But now, with 500 Egyptians killed—the houses are not really as important as human lives—I must solemnly say again that if these air raids on civilian targets and people in our countries continue, the Government and Command will do their best and make every effort to dissuade the military leaders of Israel from continuing these raids.

12. That is the message my Government wishes to convey to you, Mr. President, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to every person sitting at this table—whether a permanent member, a member or a representative invited to sit at the table.

13. The PRESIDENT: I call next on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

14. Mr. ISMAIL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): I have already read out in this Council chamber, on instructions from my Government, a communication on the bombing in Damascus of civilian populations and targets by Israeli aircraft. These raids were carried out on 9 October.

15. On the same day, after the raids, the International Red Cross, after having noted the terrible damage caused by

those raids, appealed for a halt to these bombings of civilian targets and the civilian populations. On 10 October—that is to say, yesterday—the Israeli Air Force resumed its raids on civilian targets and the civilian population in the very heart of Syria, ignoring the appeal made by the International Red Cross one day earlier. The civilian targets attacked this time include: the city of Tartus, the city of Latakia, the workers' city in the suburb of Homs, the sugar refinery in Homs, the power stations in Damascus and Homs, and other civilian targets. Civilian loss of life as a result of those raids totalled several hundred. I do not have the exact numbers, but the list of the dead is growing longer with every passing hour. Most of the victims were workers, women and children.

16. These acts of barbarism by the Israeli Air Force prove that, having lost hope of a quick victory on the battlefield, Israel chooses to take its revenge against civilian installations and against innocent civilians, which is a brutal violation of the Geneva Conventions on the protection of civilians in time of war and cynically defies world public opinion.

17. I must offer my apologies for taking up the time of the Council once again to draw to its attention the barbaric acts of the Israeli leaders. I do so on the instructions of my Government because these cowardly and irresponsible acts have been repeated and are being repeated in Syria and in Egypt and everything indicates that the Israelis are determined to continue with them. I am also drawing this to the attention of the Council because a new element appears in Israeli savagery. Now the Israelis are using napalm bombs. That does not surprise us because many Syrian children died during past attacks against our urban agglomerations as a result of these terrible bombs. Let the Israelis not try to deny this revolting aspect of their crimes. The fact is reported by United Nations observers. Allow me to read the text of a telegram from United Press International dated today:

"The United Nations Truce Supervision Organization reported today that Israeli planes had carried out at least three air attacks with napalm in the Israeli-Syrian sector of the Middle East fighting front."¹

18. The list of victims among the civilian population grows longer. I have just learned that the number of victims exceeds 100. If Israel believes that by this barbarism it can break our determination to continue the battle, it is seriously mistaken. General Yariv, who has pledged to fight, to bomb, to punish, can rest assured that his inhuman rancour, when it is unleashed against Syria and Egypt, will not and cannot have any effect other than to make us firmer in our determination and more resolute to wage our fight for liberation to the end. Freedom is too precious for it not to be protected and acquired with great sacrifices. This we know, this we recognize.

19. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

20. Mr. EBAN (Israel): My Government will study with interest the statement by the Secretary-General concerning

¹ Quoted in English by the speaker.

the terrible war which, as he points out, started more than five days ago. In the meantime I offer some observations on the statements that have just been made on behalf of the two Governments which started that war, the Government of Egypt and the Government of Syria.

21. We have just lived one of the most extraordinary half hours in international history. On 6 October the Governments of Egypt and Syria wantonly, unnecessarily, without provocation, decided to end the cease-fire and to wage all-out war against Israelis, soldiers and civilians, wherever they could find them and wherever they could reach them. They chose the moment of maximal peace and serenity in Israel in order to add blasphemy and sacrilege to the crime of unprovoked aggression and thus they have changed a position of cease-fire, with concrete and early prospects of negotiation, into an inferno of war and affliction and suffering, for Israelis, for Egyptians and for Syrians.

22. Now the extraordinary thing about the statements by the representatives of Egypt and Syria is their conviction that they have the right to attack Israelis and yet to seek international protection against any Israeli response. They not only want to make war but they want it to be unilateral. They would like Israel to have its hands tied behind its back so that they can shoot it accurately in the head, just like the 11 Israeli sportsmen under the protection of the Olympic flag at Munich, whose brutal murder in just that fashion was so fervently applauded by the official spokesmen of Egypt and of Syria. Is it not obvious that those who take the responsibility for launching a war assume the terrible responsibility for its consequences? Anybody who watched television in this country today was able to see the Israeli ambulance destroyed by Syrian shellfire.

23. We must say in all frankness to both neighbouring Governments: "You started a war on 6 October and you are responsible for all its tragic victims, its Israeli victims, who are tragically numerous"—perhaps in proportion to our population more tragically numerous than any other casualties described here today—"and you are also responsible for the death and the disaster suffered by Egyptians and Syrians and by all those who are caught up in the fearful alternation of war". But the doctrine of unilateral war, a right unprovokedly to kill Israelis and to be immune from all response, that is what makes these two utterances unusual, even in the history of war.

24. Every few days the representatives of Egypt and Syria come here with fictions which later turn out to have no foundation: the fiction about the invisible naval battle at Sukhna and Zaafarana which, I must say, in our contacts with foreign Governments nobody seems to take seriously. And now, a few days ago, a statement by the Foreign Minister of Egypt about an air raid on Cairo to which his own Government responded that it was nonsense to say that there had been an air penetration of Cairo. And then deeply distressing reports about alleged casualties at an embassy, followed by Syrian statements that there were no such casualties in any such embassy or and that no such embassy was either the target or the victim of any air action. With this record behind us we have no reason to believe anything that we are told from these sources, unless there is independent evidence.

25. But of course once the war began at the most drastic rhythm and at the moment of Israel's minimal preparedness it was obvious that the war would have its victims. Israel's policy is to direct its air action to military targets, such as those attacked on 9 October, namely, the military headquarters of the Syrian army and the air force headquarters and military airports, and in the south the Sukhoy 20 air bases from which assaults have been launched across the cease-fire line. But let everybody understand in full and lucid humility that there is no way of selecting military targets with complete assurance that non-military personnel will not be the victims.

26. And thus we must come back to the problem of original responsibility. If you want to know why people are being killed, ask yourselves who started the war on 6 October, and those who started the war have the deadly responsibility for all its consequences.

27. Since, however, instead of discussing how to bring an end to the war by restoring the cease-fire structure that was violated on 6 October, the representatives of Egypt and Syria have chosen to speak about episodes of war. I will not ask them for I know the answer. But I ask any man of enlightened spirit and of equitable mind why it is heinous to bomb, for example, the air bases in Syria, but, in the opinion of the representatives of Egypt and Syria, it is perfectly all right to direct ground missiles with warheads of 500 kilos, namely, Frog missiles, on Israeli towns and villages? It is all right to send missiles of this kind into Migdal-Haemek, it is all right to bombard Gevat, it is legitimate to rain destruction on Kfar Baruch, it is all right to bombard Nahalal, it is all right to send missiles into the villages of the Hula valley, it is all right to bomb and to murder in the Druse villages at Buk'ata and Masada, it is all right to send missiles into Majdal Shams killing villagers, including women and children, and causing additional casualties. It is all right to send a Kelt missile in the direction of the most populated area of Tel Aviv, as on 6 October, and only by an act of aerial virtuosity was an air pilot able to divert it from its course. This is all right. This requires no protest and no indignation.

28. It is to this that I refer in calling attention to the extraordinary character of these pronouncements. Now surely what the Governments of Egypt and of Syria should be considering is how to stop the whole of this sequence by the only just and rational method, which is to think back to the relative serenity of 5 October, to restore that serenity, to restore the cease-fire, to restore the cease-fire in its full structure, and from that starting-point to proceed to the negotiation of a peace treaty. Surely that is not only the logical but almost the universal response to war. First of all, to stop it, to honour the framework accepted for the arrest of the war, namely, the Security Council cease-fire resolution, and also the Egyptian-Israeli cease-fire accord negotiated in August, and thereafter to find ways and means and, above all, attitudes whereby all future wars can be avoided and all the States and peoples of the Middle East can enter their inheritance of peace.

29. We do not know what it is that Egypt and Syria want if they continue to refuse this normal course—the restoration of the cease-fire structure in all its elements, and

thereafter at an appropriate time the negotiation of an appropriate peace.

30. Mrs. Jeanne Martin CISSE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, may I be allowed, before I address my remarks to the item on our agenda, to address to you the congratulations of my delegation on your accession to the presidency of the Council for the month of October. I am happy with the high quality of the relationships of frank co-operation which link us, and I want also to pay a tribute to your qualities as an experienced diplomat. Your wisdom, which is so familiar to the Council, augurs well for the good conduct of our work during this month of October, so burdened and so replete with events of the most painful character.

31. To your predecessor, Ambassador Mojsov of Yugoslavia, we want to pay a tribute and to tell him how much we valued his competence, his tact and his good will during his presidency in the month of September. He is an eminent jurist and a skilled diplomat, and we have appreciated his talents and his long experience with international problems. The sensitivity which he demonstrated during the month of September was certainly equal to the expectations of the Security Council.

32. The repetition of the tragic violence of June 1967, which we had wanted to prevent directly after the hostilities ended occurred on 6 October 1973. The Security Council is meeting under the pressure of events to attempt to extinguish a conflagration of which none can foresee the consequences today.

33. If efforts made by the Security Council over the period of a quarter of a century have not been able to pave the way to real peace in the Middle East, we believe that this is due largely to the fact that the solutions offered were mainly make-shift accommodations, and the international community was not in a position to shoulder its full responsibilities. Resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 appeared for the moment to be most appropriate in the sense that its effective implementation would have been a decisive step towards the progressive settlement of the conflict. But as in the case of many other resolutions related to conflicts, it became a dead letter.

34. Europe and the United States had offered alternatives which did not prove conclusive. Africa, realizing that peace and security are indivisible, affected in the northern part by this conflict, adopted, at the end of the tenth session of the Organization of African Unity, a special resolution and gave the mandate to seven of its Ministers for Foreign Affairs to indicate most clearly before this Council, at its meetings in June last, that any search for peace in the Middle East necessarily involves the establishment of the rights of the Palestinian people and the restitution to the Arab countries, parties to this conflict, of their occupied territories. A clear solidarity was demonstrated with our brothers the people of Egypt, but, above all, it was a message of truth, a message of peace, a message that a continent, Africa, addressed to Israel. But our disappointment was great when this appeal to peace met with the United States veto. The rejection of the draft resolution of 24 July 1973 [S/10974] submitted by eight member States of the Security Council, and

supported by five other members, was nothing less than an encouragement given to the aggressor.

35. Quite recently, at Algiers, the non-aligned countries reaffirmed their unconditional support of the just struggle of the Palestinian and Arab peoples, after having recalled that the end of the hostilities in the Middle East meant the recognition of the fundamental rights of the Palestinians and the restitution of the ravished Arab lands.

36. Today, guns are thundering over Sinai, over the Golan Heights. Bombardments continue, and they are being intensified against Syria. They are directed against civilian objectives, economic units; they strike women and children. The enemy ignores international conventions applicable in war-time. In Damascus diplomats and international civil servants became victims of Israeli raids. Workers' settlements, which are the most peaceful social units, have been attacked by surprise. My delegation condemns these attacks against civilian objectives and populations, and renews the expressions of condolences of the Government of the Republic of Guinea to the people of Syria, and we want to assure our brothers, the peoples of Egypt and Syria, of our unconditional support for the struggle they are waging to liberate their usurped territories.

37. If the situation has become explosive now, it is not so much because of the legitimate response of the Arab peoples, but it is rather because those who for a long time have been the victims of the Zionist occupation, and always to the benefit of the aggressor, have realized that no other alternative exists to reconquer their rights other than the use of force; that is, the use of the very means which made it possible for their lands to be usurped.

38. It must be admitted that any attempt to recuperate from the usurper what belongs to you is a source of legitimate action. In view of this reality, can one, out of respect for human values and logic, recommend as a pre-condition to a just settlement of the conflict a return of the belligerents to the lines of June 1967 which were the result of the usurpation of Arab territories? In so doing, victims and aggressors would be treated on a footing of complete equality.

39. During these many debates on the Middle East, my delegation has always stated that any peaceful solution in the Middle East must impose the evacuation by Israel of the occupied territories. To preserve peace and security in that critically sensitive part of the world, the Security Council in general, and the permanent members in particular, must make this view prevail.

40. Indeed, we are concerned. We read this morning, in the news disseminated by Agence France Presse, that, according to a Cyprus government newspaper, 57 American Phantoms landed at the Akrotiri base on Saturday, and that 25 of them then left the island of Cyprus, it is said, for Turkey; that much traffic is observed in the air on the British base in Cyprus. That is why my delegation wonders and asks the Security Council—whose essential vocation is the preservation of peace and international security—to face up to its responsibilities, because otherwise it runs the risk of seeing our world carried away towards a third world war.

41. Thousands of innocent people, including women and children, are falling under the bombs, victims of the blindness and of the arrogance of Israel. The responsibility of the United States acquires, in our view, considerable significance in the present phase of this struggle.
42. The PRESIDENT: In view of special considerations that have arisen, and with the agreement of the next speaker on my list, the representative of Peru—for which I am grateful—I now call on the Foreign Minister of Egypt in exercise of his right of reply.
43. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): Mr. President, I thank you very much for your courtesy and I thank my colleague the representative of Peru for allowing me to speak now. I am taking the floor for one minute because I have to leave the representative of Egypt in my place for a few minutes.
44. I wanted to reply to Mr. Eban. He has asked this question: What does Egypt want? It wants and it intends to get the foreign soldier of occupation off its territory, all its territory. Mr. Eban knows, or should know from his stay in Egypt during the Second World War, that Egypt has always wanted to get the foreign soldier of occupation off its territory, all its territory and has always succeeded in doing so. I did not think that he really needs to know this.
45. That is the first point. The second point is this: The theory that the cease-fire was in effect this October really needs some queries.
46. I do not want to go into a detailed discussion; I have done that before. I think he knows very well that the August 1970 United States-initiated cease-fire was for 90 days. I think he knows very well that it was extended several times and then ended and that there is no United States-initiated cease-fire.
47. Regarding the Security Council cease-fire in June 1967, it is closely linked with withdrawal from occupied territories. The strange theory that this or any cease-fire is for an unlimited time obviously means that the occupation is unlimited. Should we accept that the cease-fire must be observed until both parties—the occupier and the occupied—agree to put an end to it, then we would accept that the occupying Power can be evacuated only by its own consent. Such a thesis makes resistance a virtue, revolution a duty and a national struggle for liberation both a national obligation and an international obligation.
48. To conclude, I wish also to remind Mr. Eban or anyone around this table that the war started on 5 June 1967. I am sure the Secretary-General did not say in his letter that the war started in October. If he did, I would certainly ask him to correct that. The war started in June 1967, and an end to the war is an end to the war which started in June 1967.
49. Lastly, and I take no pleasure in saying this, I wish to announce here to everyone—because this may be a tragic mistake—that Egypt finds no serenity in military occupation. There was no serenity before our struggle for liberation and there is never going to be serenity for Egypt or the Egyptians, for Syria or the Syrians, or for anyone around this table if their land is occupied. That is not serenity. It is humiliation; it is domination.
50. Mr. PEREZ de CUELLAR (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, may I start my statement by expressing to you my congratulations for the skill and wisdom with which, since the beginning of this month, you have conducted the always complex business of this Council.
51. I also wish to express my high esteem to Ambassador Mojsov for the skill, effectiveness and complete impartiality with which he presided over the Council during the month of September.
52. First of all, I should like to state that Peru deplors the resumption of hostilities in the Near East and that we are profoundly concerned over the rate at which the conflict has already spread, as it appears to be leading to an uncontrollable escalation.
53. Our concern is all the greater when we recall that the Council, in June and July last, had an opportunity to set in motion once again the diplomatic channels open to it to seek a just and lasting peace in the region. The meetings of June and July are now filed away in the melancholy archives of lost opportunities. How can we not think that if the machinery of the Council had not then been paralysed, we might perhaps have prevented the conflict which now causes us to meet in an atmosphere of tension and anguish?
54. But at this stage we believe that it would be unproductive for the Council to be carried away by a torrent of recriminations or if it were to devote itself to apportioning blame and responsibility. But it can be affirmed, on the other hand, that just as the prevailing situation until a few days ago was legally untenable, it was also politically untenable from the point of view of the security of the States of the region. In the specific case of the occupied territories of Egypt, Jordan and Syria, the presence of Israel is in itself a source of insecurity rendered more serious by the measures which it adopts to make its occupation permanent.
55. It is therefore necessary for the Council now to discharge the functions which are incumbent upon it under the Charter, in conformity with the commitment it undertook when it unanimously adopted resolution 242 (1967). For six years this resolution has provided a framework for a solution, and it is unfair to try to divert responsibility towards the Council or the United Nations and make them the scapegoats of those who obstructed the implementation of the resolution.
56. In the present situation, it is therefore up to the Council to make an appeal for the fighting to end. But this appeal must be couched in terms which will facilitate and, if possible, give an advance indication of the complete and long-term solution of the problem.
57. Peru was present at the summit meeting of the non-aligned countries in Algiers, where we affirmed full and effective support to Egypt, Jordan and Syria in their struggle to recover by every means the occupied territories. Thus, it is inconceivable to equate the struggle for recovery of Egypt and Syria with the determination of Israel to maintain its presence on Egyptian and Syrian soil.

58. Consequently, and in conclusion, Peru considers that the Council should not adopt a proposal which involves approval by the Council, however tacit, of the occupation of territories by force, because this would be counter to the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, which is the basic premise of any negotiation seriously directed towards a just and lasting peace.

59. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Saudi Arabia containing a request that Saudi Arabia be invited to participate in the Council's discussion of the item inscribed on the agenda without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

60. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

61. Since I have no more names inscribed on my list except for those of representatives who have asked to exercise the right of reply, and as I understand that the representative of Saudi Arabia would wish to speak at this meeting, I shall invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took a place at the Council table.

62. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Council, for granting me permission to speak on the item before you. I wish Mr. Eban were in the room, but, of course, Mr. Tekoah is our colleague, and I am sure he will convey every word I have to say, not only to the Zionists but to those who support them.

63. It is immaterial to ascertain which party started the present conflict. In replying to Mr. Eban in the General Assembly I mentioned that certain Syrian towns in the north of Syria, far from the cease-fire line, had been bombed and that there were many casualties. Israel cannot pretend that the bombing of those cities in the north was necessary to maintain peace and serenity on the cease-fire line. That took place on 12 or 13 September.

64. We have an Arabic proverb which says: "He who starts the evil bears the greatest responsibility". But now suffice it to say that the present situation is only the latest link in a long chain of events; and here I would like to address myself to every one of you members of the Council and, if the mass media of information allow my voice to carry beyond this chamber, to the people of the United States—because I am not talking only to you; you receive instructions from your Governments, and many of you are in the strait-jackets of instructions; and as if sometimes the strait-jackets of instructions were not enough, many of you put on the tight pants of procedure and we engage in a lot of talk without any action.

65. How do I know this? I participated "umpteen" times in the Assembly and in this Council, where resolutions were

passed which Israel did not heed. When it suited it, or rather its representatives, they wantonly said: "The Arab States can always muster votes". Muster votes? I must remind Mr. Tekoah—who, I believe, was in Shanghai at the time, in 1947—I do not know where he was, but I was present in Lake Success. We, muster votes? What did the Zionists do at Lake Success? It is better to ask it in reverse: what did they not do to bring pressure to bear on the United Nations, which counted only 51 or 52 Members then?

66. What I have quoted from the records of historians need not be repeated here, but suffice it to say that they even marshalled a prelate—a cardinal—to go and visit Latin America to ask certain Governments to vote for the partition of Palestine. And only the other day, I read excerpts from Colonel Edde's record of what happened in Washington, and I succinctly draw your attention to what Mr. Truman said—and I am paraphrasing: "Tell me: how many Arabs do I have in my constituency? The Zionists are more important to me." It was a question of votes. I quoted this at that time; it was a matter of democracy by subscription and contribution. He who pays the piper calls the tune.

67. It is high time that we were candid and frank and went to the genesis of the case, and did not beguile ourselves by treating the question as if tomorrow, were peace to be established, the whole situation would be cleared up. Let us not fool ourselves: it is my humble duty to take the floor and tell you that this last link is not the final link in the chain of events.

68. If all those who are parties to the conflict were to stop fighting today, there is not the least assurance or guarantee that the Arab people, from Morocco to the confines of Iran, and from the north—from Syria and Iraq—down to the Sudan, will not take issue—not with Syria or Egypt, but with their Governments—to see to it that the Arab world will not be made the laughing stock of the Zionists and those who support them.

69. The Zionist movement, as I have mentioned time and again, is not native to the Middle East: it is a political movement started in Central and Eastern Europe by people descended mostly from the Khazars, who came originally from the northern tier of Asia on the outskirts of the Caspian Sea, and who settled, in the first century, in what today is southern Russia.

70. There was a confrontation in the eighth century between Christianity and Islam, Byzantium—Islam had spread in the area. There was a gentleman's agreement that those tribes which came from the northern tier of Syria and settled in what is today southern Russia would not be converted either to Christianity or Islam. There were certain rabbis around and it was agreeable to the Christian and the Muslim States of those days to have those pagan tribes converted to Judaism.

71. It was in Eastern and Central Europe that the idea of a State for the ingathering of the Jews from all over the world grew and flourished. One of the things that helped it at that time was the Dreyfus affair in France, whence Herzl

completed his Zionist manifesto and put the last touches in the Rue Cambon behind the Ritz, in a small hotel. I walked there last summer to see if the plaque was still there. I think they are reconstructing the hotel; there will be a larger plaque to commemorate the Zionist Manifesto of Herzl.

72. There is nothing wrong with a dream. But, as I have mentioned and I now repeat, that dream turned into a nightmare. They thought it would have become a Utopia. But Jews and Gentiles are being sacrificed because that dream has turned into a nightmare.

73. And now, my good friend from the United Kingdom, I did some research in the City of London about the Balfour Declaration. I must mention it—2 November is not too far. After the Zionists found out that Kaiser Wilhelm II, who made a trip to Istanbul in 1898, could not persuade Sultan Abdul Hamid, on the request of his Jewish friends, to give an enclave in Jerusalem to the Zionists, and when the Kaiser told the Zionists that he had not succeeded—of course the Kaiser went, not as an emissary for the Zionists; he went to negotiate the Berlin-Baghdad railroad and the British Empire was in jeopardy, our British friends thought: “Good Lord, how will those Germans skirt through the Gulf, the Suez Canal, and send their goods to India and other regions of the British Empire?”

74. And when the Jews who sat at the Kaiser’s table started to conspire against Germany they turned all their efforts to England. How do I know that they sat at the Kaiser’s table? May God rest the soul of Sharaf al-Din Effendi—which means prince; they did not call themselves prince—the nephew of Abdul Hamid, who told me.

75. Then the entente cordiale came in 1903. And the entente cordiale—thanks to, *inter alia*, Edward VII, who brought it into being—which Tsarist Russia joined—my good friend Ambassador Malik knows that—in a sense indirectly, through the so-called friendship—really interests—that existed between the French and the Russians of those days. I think that the friendship with Russia is now being revived. Nothing has changed in the world—balance of power.

76. I must set the record straight here. The present events are not the only link. They began to seize an opportunity. Who? Those Zionists. They began to conspire with the United Kingdom against Germany and in 1917 they pushed the United States of America into the war when both the Democratic Party of Woodrow Wilson and the Republican Party were isolationists; they did not want to get involved in a European war. But how did they get them involved? There is a romantic story about Woodrow Wilson but I do not want to go into that here. In 1917 the Allies, meaning France and the United Kingdom, were losing heavily and the United States was brought into the war to help them out against the Kaiser. They did help them out, they did beat Germany, and the price was the Balfour Declaration.

77. But the Rothschilds were afraid that they might be told that they would have to negotiate. I found that out through my research. They did not want the word “State” to appear, so they used “national home”, lest they say: Now that you Jews have a State get out of here. There was

discrimination against the Jews in Europe; let us say so. Therefore they said “national home” and tried things out to see how they would succeed, or fail.

78. Then the war started and in Versailles—I was a young man then—there was a big argument about Woodrow Wilson’s 14 points and whether the principle of self-determination should be respected. Mark you, at that time there were only 6 per cent of the Jewish faith in Palestine and 94 per cent were Muslims and Christians—but they were all Semites. They were our Jews, mostly Sephardim. Some from Europe had settled there because the Rothschilds gave money in the eighties in order to have certain vineyards. They liked wine; they had wine from Palestine but I cannot remember the name.

79. And, then, what happened? The United States did not join the League of Nations, and amongst those who prevailed on them not to do so was the father of one of our erstwhile colleagues, Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge—he used to sit here during the Korean war, my good friend Malik will remember.

80. I shall not go into the politics between certain European States and what happened to certain international arrangements that were made. But Hitler came on the scene and I still believe that, inadvertently, they paved the way for the emergence of Hitler—two of them: Lloyd George and Clemenceau. But lest we digress, I will come back to the point. They were also instrumental in turning the tide of the Second World War. Mr. Roosevelt sent Sumner Welles on a trip in 1937 to ascertain the intentions of Germany vis-à-vis the United States. I was in London in the thirties. I was tipped off by an Englishman to get out of London, because I was for peace. He said “You have no place here. You leave.” And I came to this country in 1939.

81. I remember the communiqué of Sumner Welles, and I stand to be corrected, Hitler assured him that he had no ambitions here. But still the Zionists played a part in railroading the United States into the Second World War. I leave aside Pearl Harbour. I am not going to digress into that.

82. I am glad to see that my good friend Mr. Scali is back here, because I have a great deal of respect for his sincerity—although sometimes he has to use words to express the policy of his Government. We are all servants of our Governments. But I am adducing the facts of history, and I am sure my good friend Mr. Bennett and Mr. Scali’s other colleagues will convey what I have said, about how the United States was railroaded into the First World War by the Zionists, and to a large extent also into the Second—not wholly, because there was Pearl Harbour and there were other things. But, as I said, I am not digressing into history here, though there is an interconnexion.

83. But why did the British, and now our American friends, want to maintain Israel in the midst of the Arab world? Is it necessary for them? I think the most prosperous segment of the population in the United States are Jews, and they do not want to leave for Israel—except, probably, for a few of them upon whose sentiments political Zionism has played.

84. One has only to read *Fortune* and *Business Week* and other statistics to see that the Jews here are among the most prosperous, if not the most prosperous, in relation to their numbers, and that is why they do not want to go to Israel. But they bring pressure to bear on your Government, my good friend Mr. Scali.

85. How do I know? What about those 78 senators who decided that the President should beware of giving to Russia—or call it the Soviet Union; I call it Russia still—the “most favoured nation” clause because it does not allow the Jews who happen to be Soviet citizens to leave?

86. What are you, the United States? The torch-bearers of people who want to leave or do not want to leave? There are Christians who might want to leave any country. Why do you not sometimes help them? You do not help them because 3 per cent of the population is Jewish. There are 6 million, I believe. I do not like round figures, unlike Mr. Tekoah, who talks about those who lost their lives—but 6 million more or less. What do they do? Their own most of the mass media of information. I wish I had the list with me; I have looked but unfortunately I have not. I would have named those at the head of the television and radio companies. The Jews—more power to them. They are Americans. First and foremost they should be Americans. But should they use the mass media of information to brainwash the American people saying, “Here is a poor Jewish people. We should help them.”?

87. And they disseminate all kinds of falsehoods under the guise of freedom of information. I want to tell you what kind of falsehood they disseminate in synagogues. I have Jewish friends who go to synagogues, and they tell me these things. I want to show you how the propaganda goes.

88. This is from a sermon about “Faucet Judaism”, in 1964. I took this from my files this morning. It is from a sermon in 1964 by Rabbi Alexander Alan Steinbach, senior Rabbi of Temple Ahavath Sholom, the largest reformed congregation in Brooklyn: Chapter 6, the sermon for Kol Nidrei—Yom Kippur:

“To those whose memory goes back to World War I the Day of Atonement of Arabia will strike a familiar chord. He was a spectacular, adventurous British soldier-archaeologist and writer who helped organize the Arab revolt against Turkey. Passionately devoted to the Arab cause, he brought five uncouth Arabs to New York for propaganda purposes and put them up at the Waldorf Astoria.”

I believe he meant Lawrence, the so-called Lawrence of Arabia. He was not for Arabia any more than I am for people living on the moon.

“When the time arrived for the return journey he noticed a suspicious bulkiness in the Arabs’ luggage. He ordered them to open their suitcases and, to his amazement and chagrin, he discovered they were filled with faucets taken from the hotel rooms.”

Now we know you have to bring in plumbers to take out faucets.

“‘We will soon be back home’, one of the Arabs volunteered, ‘where water is scarce. When we are in the desert and our throats are parched we will turn on the faucets and get all the water we need.’”

How idiotic. He wants to picture the Arabs as idiotic. They turn on the faucet and get water from them like that.

89. That is from the sermon of Rabbi Alexander Alan Steinbach. Do not think it is a fabrication. Baroody does not fabricate. The mass information media fabricate here.

“Lawrence upbraided them: ‘Those faucets, unless they are attached to pipes, and pipes are worthless until they are connected with a reservoir. Nothing will come out if there is not a well spring to supply the water’.”

That is Professor Lawrence of Arabia.

“This amusing anecdote”—I am continuing from the sermon—“bears a special relevance for our Kol Nidrei contemplation.

“Some Jews seem to believe that all one has to do as an adherent of Judaism is to wait until some pressing, desperate need arises, turn on the faucet and find water of salvation spurting out. With a flick of the wrist, open the spigot and, presto, there will be nothing to worry about. Need I point out that such thinking stems from a tragic fallacy? It represents a preposterous juvenile religious attitude. When we find ourselves trapped in the desert in which life periodically enwebs us, ‘faucet Judaism’ is pathetically inadequate. Faucets are utterly useless without reservoirs.”

And so on and so on. If I read from that sermon of a distinguished rabbi, it was to show you how the Arabs are pictured, as if they are so simple-minded that they take a faucet and hang it in the air, and they drink water. This is part of the propaganda, brainwashing the Jews who are not necessarily Zionists.

90. I warn this Council: any makeshift arrangements in this Council that may be brought about by the pressure of major Powers to pave the way for a *status quo ante*—and I mean by the *status quo ante* the so-called cease-fire—will not work out. Believe me, I am not talking off the top of my head. I have seen the Arab youth. I have talked to them. I have counselled patience. They are inflamed. And by the youth, I mean those between the ages of 18 and 25. And do not think they are Palestinians. They are Arabs of many nationalities. They are all inflamed against this artificial State that was created by two major Powers in the First World War, and later by none other than the late Harry Truman, the President of this great country. You only have to read volume II of the paperback edition of his memoirs to see what pressure the Zionists brought to bear on Truman in order that they would be given Palestine.

91. What I have said about the idea of Palestine being given to the Zionists by God may become hackneyed, but it bears repetition. The Zionists used to say time and again in the early years—not since they have consolidated themselves—“God gave us Palestine”. I spoke with them about

this in the thirties in London, and later in New York; the last time I appeared was on a platform in Town Hall in 1944. I had private talks with Zionists. One could not go to the Middle East in those war years. I do not know how the American friends brought them here to Town Hall. I was asked to address an audience in Town Hall in 1944. Do you know where it is? It is off Sixth Avenue, the Avenue of the Americas. I think they still have meetings there. There were 1,500 people present, and when they found out I was an Arab, they booed me. And then someone who happened to be a Jew from Aleppo, and who spoke Arabic, said "Give the man a break, let him speak". That was the first time I found out that "a break" means "a chance".

92. There were 14 Zionists brought over here to brainwash the American people. And now they do not have to do it again. They contribute to the campaign of Senators—I am not interfering in your domestic affairs. It seems the Kennedys have not learned anything from the past. The late Robert Kennedy during the six-day war, and your Governor, Mr. Rockefeller, coming from Geneva to this Council on the 11th—one was a Democrat and one is a Republican, the Governor—said, according to *The New York Times*, that the best thing has happened by the victory of the Jews over the Arabs; they will bring civilization to the Arabs. Civilization to the Arabs! Who is that Kennedy? And now his brother takes off, as if they have not had enough tragedy. He is egging on the American people to bring pressure on the President to help. To help whom? The Arabs? To help Israel. And who is this Rockefeller? I knew his father. He was a good man. I knew him in the forties. Read the author Tarbell to find out how he made his fortune. When they made money they became respectable. And they want to bring civilization to the Arab world through establishment of a Zionist State amongst us, and its consolidation in the Arab world.

93. For 25 years, and even before, I warned the Council and I warned the United Nations that there will be no peace as long as this foreign element is amongst us, a festering wound that has caused the abscess and the high fever. And there will be no peace unless the pus is drained from the body politic and the body social of the Arab world.

94. Sir, the Council has a responsibility not to treat the question piecemeal but to take it as a whole. That is why I have gone into the genesis again and again. And I beg you, Sir, to bear with me. Of course you all have engagements, but a war is going on here. And if tomorrow it stops, there will be another war. As I said in the Assembly, this is only a round. Do not think I am not sorry about the loss of lives, whether of Jews or of gentiles. After all, I always say that the Jews are human beings like everybody else—although now power has made the Zionists arrogant. I stand for their human rights as individuals, but not at the expense of the Arab people. Arab Governments are expendable, but the Arab people are one. I know what I am talking about. This is not an oratorical speech I am making. Do you want to make the Middle East a checkerboard for the great Powers to play their chess game—not with wooden pieces but with the destiny of nations, including the Jewish people? Because the Jewish people will be sacrificed. By us? No; they will be sacrificed, when the tide turns, by the great Powers if they pursue their policy of power politics and

balance of power. Let us not fool ourselves. I feel sorry for every innocent Jew who might suffer; my heart would bleed for them as it would bleed for any Arab, or for that matter, any human being, regardless of his nationality.

95. If Baroody has spoken, it is not to talk about this latest link; it is to take into account the whole chain of events, to take the historical background. And beware, United States of America, you will be only 200 years old in 1976. I hope I will be alive to celebrate with you your independence from the erstwhile colonial Power, although you are friends now and you are members of NATO together. My good colleague from the United Kingdom understands when I quote the Arabic proverb: "Praise be to God who changes other people but He never changes." We have been there in the area for 6,000 years. Forget that we are Arabs; we are the Semites of the area and the Sephardim Jews are our brothers. They are Semites, and we would accept the Khazar Jews to be our brothers, but not as our lords. Far be it from us that we should accept them as our lords. We will fight and fight and fight, not to hurt others but to preserve our freedom, our dignity.

96. So do not talk about the *status quo ante*. With all due respect to the Secretary-General, I am talking to him about that report of his. Please, Mr. Urquhart, I want to address myself to the Secretary-General. I love what he wrote in his report; who cannot praise what he wrote? But, my dear Sir—and I am talking to you not only in your official capacity but as a human being like all of us here, let us cast aside our titles—I know in what a critical position you are. I remember how Mr. Hammarskjöld got himself into trouble in the Congo affair, and I advise you not to take steps that may involve you with Jew or Gentile. I am addressing myself to you, and I do not want to embarrass you and ask you to comment—because I could if I wanted to. Then you might say, "No comment", and then you would become Americanized. This is no laughing matter, although it is sometimes good to break the tension with some laughter.

97. Even if the war ends tomorrow, it will be recommended at a future date, either by Israel or by the Arab States, by the Arab people. Or we may have anarchy, and our interests and those of the United States and of any other country will go with the wind. Now, do not say that Baroody did not warn you: they will go with the wind. Who can assure us that there will not be a world conflict? Why should the Zionists be the cause of this world conflict? Because God gave them Palestine? As I said, God does not parcel out land.

98. We will protect even our enemies, in our tradition. We will not do as you did, Western Powers, in Nuremberg—I do not know. Von Paulus you kept in a villa, you the Soviet Union. Once our enemies stretch out their hands to live as human beings without a flag, we will accept them in our midst, but not under a flag.

99. This is my message tonight, and I am not through, but knowing that it is almost 9 o'clock I shall respect your human rights—you have been working hard and the human rights of others who should perhaps go and rest after an arduous day but on how many occasions on other subjects, not necessarily on Palestine, have we stayed till after

midnight, till 3 a.m.? I am not sure whether there will be enough courage on the part of the major Powers to set their petty interests aside, and those who help Israel, not to play with fire, because the fire might spread and then miscalculations may throw us all into a world conflict.

100. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the Vice Foreign Minister of the Syrian Arab Republic in exercise of his right of reply.

101. Mr. ISMAIL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): I have listened attentively to the statement made by the Foreign Minister of the other side. That statement calls for the following comments.

102. First of all, he has omitted giving the Council any explanation as to why the air force of his country uses napalm bombs. Why? He has not replied. This omission should be considered as an admission of the facts reported by the United Press International—and that is to say that he admits that the Israeli Air Force is using napalm bombs.

103. Second, as regards the denial of the other side that civilian targets and the civilian population in my country were subjected to attacks by the Israeli Air Force, I would simply wish to say that at present in Syria there are still United Nations observers who can report the facts. The late Norwegian captain who was a member of the United Nations observation team, who met death tragically with his wife and his daughter, was killed in his home, in his own apartment. Now could I ask, are apartments of United Nations staff military targets for Israel? So it would seem.

104. The International Red Cross did not make its appeal of 9 October without having observed on the spot the gravity of the situation. Furthermore, the history of Israel, when it comes to bombing civilian targets and civilian populations, has a wealth of precedents. It is very rich in precedents. Were I to read from United Nations documents all the resolutions which have condemned Israel because of these bombings of civilian targets and civilian populations, I would keep you here until after midnight. But it is a little too late to do that and I shall content myself with referring to two Security Council resolutions.

105. The first is resolution 265 (1969) of 1 April 1969. I shall read paragraph 3, that is to say, the last paragraph of the resolution:

"The Security Council,

"...

"Condemns the recent premeditated air attacks launched by Israel on Jordanian villages and populated areas in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions, and warns once again that if such attacks were to be repeated the Security Council would have to meet to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such attacks."

106. But there is another resolution—resolution 270 (1969) of 26 August 1969. That time it was the

privilege of Lebanon to be the target of Israeli bombing. I shall read paragraph 1:

"The Security Council,

"...

"Condemns the premeditated air attack by Israel on villages in southern Lebanon in violation of its obligations under the Charter and Security Council resolutions;"

107. I believe that those resolutions are irrefutable.

108. Thirdly, the other party insists on accusing us of violations of the cease-fire. I have made a lengthy statement before the Council on this subject. In that statement I said, to summarize, that when the 1967 war broke out the Security Council adopted resolution 235 (1967) of 9 June 1967. I shall now read out that resolution:

"The Security Council,

"Recalling its resolutions 233 (1967) of 6 June and 234 (1967) of 7 June 1967,

"Noting that the Governments of Israel and Syria have announced their mutual acceptance of the Council's demand for a cease-fire,

"Noting the statements made by the representatives of Syria and Israel,

"1. Confirms its previous resolutions about immediate cease-fire and cessation of military action;

"2. Demands that hostilities should cease forthwith..."

Israel did not wish to comply with that resolution.

109. The Security Council adopted another resolution, 236 (1967) of 11 June 1967, in which, *inter alia*, it called for "the prompt return to the cease-fire positions of any troops which may have moved forward subsequent to 1630 hours GMT on 10 June 1967".

110. Israel started its attack against Syria on 9 June, that is to say, after having declared and notified the Security Council that it accepted resolution 235 (1967) about the cease-fire and the cessation of military operations. It also ignored resolution 236 (1967), in which the Security Council called upon Israel to return to the cease-fire positions at 1630 hours on 10 June. It continued its attack, stopping only on 12 June. These facts are confirmed by General David Elazar who is at present the Chief of Staff of Israel and who at the time of the 1967 war was the Commander of the Israeli forces which attacked my country. Had Israel complied with the Security Council resolutions on the cease-fire, had Israel not violated the cease-fire, no part of the territory of my country would be occupied by Israel today. When the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel was here, he did not dare reply. I challenge the representative of Israel to reply to me.

111. Fourthly, as for Israel's respect for our Organization, its organs and its resolutions, I shall give one single example: the representative of Israel on 30 November 1972 before the Special Political Committee² openly and candidly declared that his country did not accept the application of the Fourth Geneva Convention. I should like to know—and I ask the representative of Israel to say—whether Israel agrees to observe and comply with the Geneva Conventions. I am anxiously awaiting a reply.

112. Fifthly, the other party accuses us of bombing populated urban areas. Where? In the Golan Heights—that is to say, in our territory, Syrian territory—Masadu, Bukata, Majdal Shams. Those are typically Hebrew names I suppose! They are Syrian names. But what we bombed were not these cities—no, not at all; it was the settlements which the Israelis have built.

113. The representative of Syria drew the attention of the Security Council to the building of these settlements and to the political significance of their construction, which could mean only one thing—the violation of the cease-fire line since to violate the cease-fire is not only to open fire; it is also to distort and to alter the physical nature and change the demographic structure of the occupied territory—this, too, was a serious violation of the cease-fire. These are serious violations of the Geneva Conventions, and this, of course, is passed over in silence. But there is more. When the representative of Syria addressed an official letter to the President of the Security Council [*S/8550 of 18 April 1968*] in which he drew attention to the fact that Israel was colonizing the occupied Syrian territory, the representative of Israel—Mr. Tekoah, himself—replied in his letter of 24 April 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council. I read from his letter:

“The pursuance by Syria of active belligerency against Israel creates grave security problems. The *Nahal* corps, to which the letter of the representative of Syria refers, are military units of the Israel Defence Forces...”
[*S/8558.*]

114. When we say that they colonized our occupied territory and built settlements they tell us: but these are military units; then it is not colonization. It is for self-protection. But, when now, during this war we bomb these colonics, these military units, the representative of Israel says that these are civilian-populated areas and that we are violating the Geneva Conventions. Well, the other party should make up its mind. Are these military units—as Mr. Tekoah himself said in his official letter addressed to the President of the Security Council—or not?

115. When this accusation was levelled against us, immediately an official spokesman at Damascus denied it. He affirmed that we only bombed military targets. The *Nahala* of these settlements are actually military units. And this is confirmed in an official letter addressed by the permanent representative of Israel to the President of the Security Council from which I have just read.

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Special Political Committee, 849th meeting.*

116. I should like to point out that Israel has been condemned twice by the Commission on Human Rights, at its twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth sessions; Israel was condemned for having committed war crimes. There were no actual military operations, but the misdeeds in the occupied Syrian territory were so serious that the Commission on Human Rights considered that Israel had to be condemned for war crimes. What Israel is doing now by bombing our urban centres and killing our civilian population I really can find no words to describe. “War crimes” is not enough. “Genocide”, possibly.

117. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

118. Sir Donald MAITLAND (United Kingdom): In her intervention the representative of Guinea mentioned a news agency report that Phantom aircraft had staged at a Royal Air Force station in Cyprus on their way to Israel. I wish to tell the Council, with the authority of my Government, that that report is totally without foundation.

119. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

120. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Israel's Minister for Foreign Affairs has said all that we intended to say at this meeting. However, the two additional interventions by the representatives of Egypt and of Syria and their kinsman from Saudi Arabia, compel me to exercise my right of reply.

121. Even as Israel is locked in a struggle to defend the Jewish people's right to life and independence it is fully aware of and will not forget the treachery and mendacity accompanying the renewal of Arab aggression. These reached a climax at the Council's previous meeting, on 9 October. The orgy of falsehood and abuse, the outbursts of primitive anti-Semitism at that meeting have shocked the civilized world, further damaged the stature of the Security Council, and tarnished the name of the United Nations. Yet, this has continued today as well.

122. By charging a non-existent raid on the Soviet Embassy in Damascus, and a non-existent air attack on Cairo, by alleging non-existent casualties among the diplomatic personnel of the Soviet Embassy, the Egyptian and Syrian Foreign Ministers and their supporters created in this Security Council an atmosphere that has been described by eye witnesses, including representatives of international information media, as pogromist.

123. The Syrian authorities have denied that any Soviet nationals were killed at the Soviet Embassy or at the Soviet cultural centre. The Egyptian Government has called the talk of a raid on Cairo “downright nonsense”. Yet, under pretext of this nonsense and these falsehoods certain members of the Security Council joined in a demonstration of blind hatred and inveterate one-sidedness. The known inability of United Nations organs to address themselves to the Middle East situation in an equitable and responsible manner has never been more evident.

124. Those who unleash aggression know that they expose their people, including the civilian population, to danger.

They know that war, as my Foreign Minister stressed, cannot be one-sided. Which is the war that has not resulted in civilian casualties? Even if the vile calumnies regarding civilian casualties in Damascus and Cairo were true, by what right would the aggressors—Syria and Egypt—complain about the inevitable consequences of their own sanguinary initiative of 6 October?

125. What right would their supporters have to make of this a reason for the vulgar spectacle which we witnessed here the day before yesterday, and which is being pursued today? Have they expressed any sorrow, any grief, over the bombardment of Israeli civilian localities mentioned by me at the previous meeting, repeated again by the Foreign Minister at this meeting? Have they extended their condolences to the bereaved Israeli families? Have they ever voted a resolution condemning the murder of innocent Jewish men, women and children by Arab terrorists? Have they ever requested the President of the Security Council to convey sympathy to the fathers and mothers, to the wives, to the children, of the Israeli athletes killed at the Olympic Games in Munich, or the Jews and Christian pilgrims massacred at Lod Airport?

126. How much more odious the conduct of the Arab representatives and their supporters has been in view of the falsehoods on which they based these outbursts. Today, we have witnessed a similar travesty of logic, law and morality. Not only have Egypt and Syria initiated the present hostilities; they are complaining that Israel is fighting back. To describe today's military actions against military airfields—or a civilian air field closed since 6 October by the Syrian authorities and used only by military aircraft—power stations, refineries and other oil installations, radar posts, naval headquarters, whether they be in Homs, Latakia, Damascus or the Nile Delta mentioned here today, as civilian targets is as justified as calling the initiators of the aggression of last Saturday the victims of aggression.

127. I have in front of me an official statement from Cairo, issued today, and I read:

“Earlier today fighters shot down four Israeli planes which attacked Egyptian air fields in the northern Nile Delta area, Port Said and the Canal areas, an official communiqué said.”

And from Damascus I quote another statement from the Syrian Government: “Syrian defences and fighters shot down 66 Israeli planes today.” Apparently the mendacity regarding losses continues even in official communiqués. “The spokesman said Israeli planes continued to attack Syrian land positions, ground defences and airports today.” Yet, the representatives of Egypt and Syria come before the Security Council in the apparent belief that we are on the moon and unable to follow these official statements, and repeat the odious spectacle of the last meeting.

128. Behind all this, of course, looms the big lie regarding the origin of the attack on 6 October. I have taken note of the fact that the Foreign Minister of Egypt no longer claims that Israel started that attack. Now it is a new theory that he puts forth. There was no cease-fire, we heard him say today, and therefore Egypt was apparently free to set the

Middle East aflame once more. Security Council resolutions establishing the cease-fire are, according to him, not valid. This is a strange theory for one who has tried for years to appear, again and again, as the defender of United Nations resolutions, even those which have only a recommendatory character, even those which reflect only partisan positions and not the unanimous view of the members of the Security Council, after consultations with the parties concerned, as the cease-fire resolutions of 1967 did.

129. The Deputy Foreign Minister of Syria treated us to another variant of such duplicity. Syria has torn to pieces the principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations in its relations with Israel, ever since its attack against the nascent Jewish State in 1948. Syria refuses to recognize Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which has been for the past six years the very foundation of the United Nations peace efforts in the area. Syria is not ready to admit into its territory representatives of the United Nations trying to work for harmony, understanding and peace between Israel and its Arab neighbours.

130. Yet, the representative of that Government comes here and preaches to us respect for the United Nations and its resolutions, and at length quotes out of them, selectively of course, in the manner to which he is so accustomed. His respect for truth and law has been demonstrated in particular by the announcement he has just made that only localities in the Golan Heights have been bombed by the Syrian armed forces, only civilian villages in the Golan Heights have been attacked by Syrian artillery and Syrian missiles.

131. Now at two successive meetings we have given a list of names of those villages. Does he expect us really to believe that he can move Migdal-Haemek Gvat, Nahalal, Nazareth, into the Golan Heights, from deep in Galilee?

132. But I do take note of the fact that the Deputy Foreign Minister of Syria has formally, before the Security Council of the United Nations, admitted that the Frog missiles which have been bombarding Israeli territory since 6 October were directed not against any military targets, but against civilian localities, and let the map answer the question as to where those localities are situated. Indeed, Arab leaders no longer insist on one falsehood, and that is that Israel initiated the hostilities of 6 October. They are now trying, as the representatives of Egypt and Syria have done today, to justify their aggression by claiming that these countries are liberating Arab territory.

133. This is exactly the same pretext they used when they invaded Israel in 1948 in defiance of the United Nations. At that time the onslaught on Israel's emergence as an independent State, at that time the openly proclaimed aim to massacre all the Jews of Palestine was also alleged to have been an effort at liberating Arab land. This was precisely the excuse used by them for the continuous attacks against Israel and its civilian population in the 1950s and in the 1960s by *fedayeen* terrorist squads organized by the Egyptian and Syrian Governments and trained and controlled by the Egyptian and Syrian armies. Now it is again an alleged effort to liberate. Whenever Egyptian and Syrian cohorts have struck to kill Israelis and

to deprive the Jewish people of its right to live in freedom, in peace, in security, the world has been asked to consider the attackers as being on a liberating mission.

134. The civilized world is sick and tired of such liberators. The Hebrew nation has had enough of murderers shedding Jewish blood in the name of slogans such as religious truth, racial superiority, justice and morality.

135. The problem in the Middle East today is not one of occupation or liberation. Egypt and Syria waged war against Israel on the 1947 lines; Egypt and Syria continued war against Israel on the 1949 armistice lines; and now they are attacking Israel along the 1967 cease-fire lines. The problem is not any particular military line at any particular time: the issue is the relentless war of aggression which the Arab States launched against Israel's very existence in 1948 and have carried on since then.

136. It is for that reason—and no other—that we are on the cease-fire lines. It is immaterial along which lines this war is being conducted or resumed: the aggression remains the same; its origin is the same; responsibility for it continues to rest with Egypt and Syria.

137. Egypt and Syria opened war against Israel in 1948 because they did not want peace with the Jewish State and sought Israel's destruction. They refused to terminate this war for 25 years because they did not want peace and continued to strive for Israel's elimination as a sovereign State. They have now resumed the hostilities to escape the need to negotiate peace, including secure and recognized boundaries.

138. How fickle has been Egypt's and Syria's argumentation during the past few days, trying to explain away their aggression. Their proposition in fact is that temporary, pre-1967 military armistice lines, persistently violated and disregarded by them, are more important than Israel's right to peace and security. The sands of Sinai and the rocks of Golan are, according to Egypt and Syria, more sacred than the life of an entire people, the right of the State of Israel to exist. Only a neurotic concept of what law is and should be could support such a view.

139. Much has already been said about Egypt's and Syria's choice of the Day of Atonement for their aggression. The 6th of October, as is known, was the most solemn day of the Jewish calendar—the Day of Atonement, a day of fast and prayer when young and old alike are gathered with their families at worship and at home. This is a time when the entire country is at rest; all work at a standstill; radio and television stations silent; transportation immobile. I should like to mention one other aspect of this blasphemous choice for the perpetration of the treacherous attack. It was this day, the Day of Atonement, that the Nazis used to select for massacres of Jews. It was on this Day of Judgement in 1941 that the Nazi SS squads brought 90,000 Jewish men, women and children to Babi Yar, in the suburbs of Kiev, made them dig mass graves and then mercilessly mowed them down with machine-guns. It was on this day of fast and prayer that they used to surround synagogues and butcher all the worshippers in them. It was on Yom Kippur of 1942 that Nazi military forces attacked

and slaughtered the Jewish men, women and children assembled for prayer in the synagogues of Warsaw and Bialystok. In 1943 it was on the Day of Atonement that they did the same in the ghettos of Vilnius and Lublin.

140. Those who have watched and studied the attitude of the Arab leaders towards the Jewish people and its rights know that it was in a similar spirit of fanatical hatred and bloodlust that Egypt and Syria attacked Israel on the Day of Atonement 1973. Like the Nazis, they too thought we would be caught unaware on such a day, unable to defend ourselves. They were wrong.

141. The affinity with Nazi thought and the Nazi attitude towards the Jewish people is not new for Egypt's President. Thus, in September 1953, several news agencies reported that Hitler was still alive. On the basis of that report, a Cairo daily, *Al-Moussawar*, asked a number of Egyptian personalities the following question: "If you wished to send Hitler a personal letter, what would you write to him?"

142. Anwar Sadat was one of those questioned. His answer, published in Cairo's *Al-Moussawar*, number 1510, of 18 September 1953, reads, *inter alia*:

"My dear Hitler:

"I congratulate you from the bottom of my heart. Even if you appear to have been defeated, in reality you are the victor. You may be proud of having become the immortal leader of Germany. We will not be surprised if you appear again in Germany, or if a new Hitler rises up in your wake."

Well, new Hitlers have risen up: in the Nile Delta and in Damascus.

143. This is the face of the enemy that Israel confronts today. We know that he feels towards us as the Nazis did. We know that if he could, he would complete the Nazi objective of annihilating the Jewish people and would destroy its State. We shall fight him as the nations victims of Nazi aggression fought with all our soul and all our might, until the Jewish people can live like others—in peace and security.

144. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

145. Mr. ISMAIL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): I shall not take long, but at the very outset I should like to stress that I am incapable of using the kind of language used by the representative of Israel. I will gladly accord him that privilege.

146. With regard to massacres and genocide, Israel is a past master. Proof of this is the well-known massacres in the history of Israel, of which I shall mention only a few. Everyone knows of Qibia, Deir Yassim, Kfar Kassem and of the bombing in Egypt of the Bahr el-Bakar primary school, where dozens of little children were massacred. That is my first comment.

147. Secondly, I did not hear the Israeli representative reply to my question about the use of napalm. Perhaps I was deaf when he was replying, but I did not hear anything about it. Nor did he reply to my statement that Israel had not observed Security Council resolutions 235 (1967) or 236 (1967).

148. Thirdly, he did not reply either to my reference to the two 1968 Security Council resolutions on the bombing in Lebanon and Jordan of urban centres and civilian populations.

149. Nor did he reply to my comment on Israel's refusal to comply with the Geneva Conventions. I gave reference numbers and dates; I indicated official documents of this Council. Yet there was no reply.

150. Before concluding, I should like to refresh somewhat the memories of everyone here, including the representative of Israel. There is a Jewish holiday known as the festival of the sabbath, a sacred occasion for the Jewish people. We respect that religious holiday. But it was on that day last year that Israel launched a tremendous attack against Lebanon. What does that mean? It means that when there is a religious holiday it does not necessarily prevent the Israeli forces from going on the attack. They did so last year against Lebanon; they did so this time, too, on 6 October 1973.

151. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the Soviet Union to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

152. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): It has been a long time since the Security Council and its members heard such cynical attempts on the part of two official representatives of an aggressor country to justify its misdeeds, the barbarous murders of peaceful people. These advocates of war crimes were the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel, a country branded as an aggressor in numerous decisions of the United Nations, and the official representative of that country in the Security Council.

153. Indeed, the day before yesterday the members of the Council expressed their indignation and condemned the Israeli aggressors and the Israeli Air Force pilots who, on the orders of the Israeli Command, carried out a raid against Damascus, the capital of Syria; according to press reports, the Israeli Air Force carried out raids against residential areas of the Syrian capital, including the area in which the missions of foreign States are situated. As a result of these raids, buildings on the premises of some diplomatic missions were destroyed and dozens of people were killed, including diplomats and members of their families.

154. The newspapers reported that the Israeli air pirates carried out a strafing attack and shot down women and children in the streets of the Syrian capital. The Israeli representative denied that Soviet citizens had been killed, but that is a Goebbels-like trick—to lie in such a way that those who do not know the facts will believe the lie. The Security Council and its members emotionally and with all the dignity of their perfectly understandable sense of outrage decisively and categorically condemned these bar-

barous acts committed, according to the reports of United Press International and Agence France Presse, by the Israeli Air Force. Fortunately, casualties were fewer than indicated in the reports of those two agencies. But the destruction actually turned out to be greater. A woman named Kurinicheva who taught Russian at the Soviet Cultural Centre in Damascus was killed. A delayed-action bomb fell on the premises of the Centre. The building was reduced to rubble. The living quarters of Soviet personnel were severely damaged by the bombing. Six apartments were destroyed and more than 10 persons were seriously injured. These are concrete facts taken from official reports which we have received from Moscow.

155. How, then, can it be claimed that nothing of that sort happened? I ask the representative of Israel, how can the Security Council and all those present be misled in this way? How do you dare to defend such barbarous raids on residential areas and on the diplomatic quarter? Do you and your Minister call them "military targets"? That was how the Hitlerites justified the destruction of towns and inhabited localities in Western Europe during the Second World War, the "Coventryfication" of Coventry and the destruction of more than 1,700 towns and tens of thousands of inhabited localities in the USSR—then putting forward various pretexts for these barbarous misdeeds. Yet today two official representatives of the aggressor country have spoken in justification of these misdeeds. What is more, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the aggressor country raises the question of "original responsibility": who initiated the hostilities? The whole world knows who started the war against the Arab countries and who has been waging it without interruption since 1967 and earlier. In answer to this question we have the official replies of the United Nations and the decisions of the Security Council. Who is guilty of aggression and who has been repeatedly condemned by the two main organs of the United Nations, the Security Council and the General Assembly? The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the aggressor State, speaking today at an official meeting of the Council, has tried to defend the murders and justify these barbarous raids and the killings of peaceful people. Moreover, he pretends that he does not know who is guilty. But in fact he bears direct responsibility for the aggression of his State. You ask why? There are precedents. There is the international practice applied to war criminals at the Nuremberg trial when Ribbentrop, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Hitler's Reich, was condemned on the ground of his direct responsibility for the aggressive acts of Hitlerite Germany. Today's aggressors should bear this in mind and not forget it.

156. Eban, with his English education, assumes the role of a naive person and tells us here: "We do not know what it is that Egypt and Syria want." This reminds me of the Russian saying, "Are you stupid or are you just pretending to be stupid?" But no one would call the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel stupid. He is a clever and educated man, versed in military matters; he was, I think a lieutenant—my distinguished colleague, the representative of the United Kingdom, will correct me if I am wrong—in the British Navy. He knows what war is, how it is prepared and how it is waged, and he knows the difference between the combatants and the peaceful population; no doubt he is also familiar with the relevant provisions of the Geneva

Conventions on the law of war and the difference between the combatants and the peaceful population. But here he is speaking as though he were an innocent, uninformed person. He does not know what Egypt and Syria want. But, hearing this question from such an educated and experienced politician, a statesman, a diplomat, who has represented Israel for many years here in the United Nations, you cannot help recalling the Russian saying I just mentioned. This is monstrous hypocrisy. He knows very well what Syria wants and what Egypt wants. Our distinguished friend Mr. El-Zayyat, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, told him what they want. They want, as Mr. El-Zayyat said in his statement here in the Council and in the General Assembly,³ to return to the homes taken from them by the Israeli aggressors. That is a straight and clear answer. No one sitting here can have any doubt that both of them—Mr. Eban and Ambassador Tekoah—know perfectly well what the Syrians and the Egyptians want.

157. At previous meetings of the Security Council the Soviet delegation has repeatedly set forth the position of principle of the Soviet Union in connexion with the events in the Middle East. The reason for the present aggravated situation in that area is the unceasing aggression of Israel against the Arab States, the desire of the Israeli ruling circles to expand their territory at the expense of the neighbouring Arab countries, and the refusal, Israel's stubborn refusal, to establish a just peace in the Middle East. Pursuing its expansionist, aggressive policy towards the Arab countries, during the six years since its attack on Egypt, Syria and Jordan in June 1967 and its occupation of part of the territory of those States, Israel has stubbornly refused to carry out the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly concerning a peaceful settlement; it has sabotaged the Jarring mission and flagrantly violated the Charter of the United Nations and the generally accepted standards of international law. But the Minister for Foreign Affairs speaks here and pretends that he does not know why such events are taking place in the Middle East or what Syria and Egypt want.

158. The Soviet people have never doubted and do not doubt that the aggressor will fail in its attempt to impose its will on the Arabs and that it will have to withdraw from the Arab territories which it seized. The longer Israel opposes the establishment of a just peace in the Middle East, the more inglorious will be the end awaiting its aggressive policy. Such an end is inevitable.

159. Consistently supporting the search for a peaceful, political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of the well-known decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, the Soviet Union, in full conformity with the principles of the Charter, has always considered and still considers that, faced with Israel's stubborn refusal to accept a just political settlement in the Middle East, the Arab States are fully entitled to fight for the liberation of their occupied territories. They are so entitled under Article 51 of the Charter, which establishes the inalienable right of States Members of the United Nations to self-defence in the event of aggression.

160. Israel is waging a criminal war against the Arab countries in Arab territory, seeking to establish itself there and appropriate that territory. It is using impermissible means—napalm, shelling and aerial bombardment of the peaceful population—which have already led to the death, as Mr. El-Zayyat, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, has informed us, of more than 500 peaceful inhabitants.

161. The Arab countries are defending their land, their towns and their homes, which they want to liberate from foreign occupation. It is a sacred struggle for every people which has been subjected to aggression.

162. Fortunately, I see at this table few representatives of the countries which experienced attacks by the Hitlerite air force during the Second World War, the destruction of their towns and inhabited localities, the killing of their citizens and the destruction of buildings. We are happy for those whose countries have not experienced this. We have experienced it. I see here the representative of France—France experienced it. I see here the representative of Yugoslavia—Yugoslavia experienced it. I see the representative of Byelorussia, my friend, Comrade Gurinovich, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Byelorussia—Byelorussia experienced it. One in four of the inhabitants of his country perished at the hands of the Hitlerite barbarians.

163. When the representative of the aggressor speaks at an official meeting of the Security Council and tries to defend the murders, the barbarous attacks on peaceful towns, peaceful residential areas and the diplomatic quarter, then I think it is difficult to imagine greater cynicism and, if I may say so, greater insolence.

164. The Soviet people understand the feelings of the Arab peoples very well, for we ourselves experienced Fascist occupation during the Second World War. We are happy that the American people have not experienced this. Perhaps, indeed, that explains why some people in the United States take such distressing events so lightly.

165. We know the feelings of those who are subjected to barbarous attacks by an enemy air force and see the strafing enemy aircraft kill their relatives and loved ones before their very eyes. We understand their feelings and the profound righteous indignation, the tremendous feeling of national hatred and anger towards the annexationists and aggressors, and the sacred aspiration to liberate their own soil from foreign occupation. We experienced these feelings to the full during the Second World War. We know and understand them as do many other peoples in Europe and in other countries, including the peoples of some of the countries whose representatives are sitting at this table and in this chamber, as I have already remarked.

166. The Soviet Union supports the just liberation struggle of the Arab peoples against imperialist aggression and it considers that this struggle is legitimate and sacred, as indeed was the struggle of the Soviet people, the people of France, the people of Yugoslavia and the peoples of many other European countries against foreign aggression during the Second World War.

³ *Ibid.*, Twenty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 2143rd meeting.

167. In their statements during the debate the overwhelming majority of members of the Council have condemned Israel as an aggressor and have noted that the main cause of the present war in the Middle East is Israel's continuing occupation of Arab lands and its policy of obstructionism and disregard of all United Nations efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement on the basis of United Nations decisions. The majority of members of the Council, like many, very many delegations speaking in the general debate in the General Assembly, have firmly insisted and continue to insist on the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories and have expressed themselves in favour of securing the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

168. Some members of the Security Council have called on the Council to consider the question of applying sanctions against Israel in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter if Israel continues its aggression. Thus, the majority of the members of the Council have condemned Israel as an aggressor and have called for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories.

169. The overwhelming majority of the members of the Council have drawn attention to the justness of the struggle waged by the Arab Republic of Egypt and by Syria to liberate the lands occupied by Israel in 1967 and drive the aggressor from territories which have been part of the Arab countries since time immemorial.

170. With equal justification it has been pointed out here during the debate that Israel's occupation of the Arab lands is the main obstacle to a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. That is what Syria and Egypt want. If the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel does not understand that and asks in a meeting of the Security Council "What do they want?", then that is tragic. It is time for the Israeli leaders and one of Israel's most responsible statesmen—its Minister for Foreign Affairs—to understand that Syria and Egypt, on a lawful basis and in accordance with the decisions of the United Nations, want to recover the lands which were taken from them unlawfully and in violation of the numerous and repeated United Nations decisions on the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force or war.

171. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Egypt in exercise of his right of reply.

172. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation would have wished to take up one by one the allegations, lies and deceptions with which the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel and his delegation have flooded the Security Council this afternoon and this evening but, since the hour is late, my delegation will spare the Council and at this stage of the debate will confine itself to a few remarks.

173. Members of the Council are already accustomed to the theatrical rhetoric and tactics of the delegation of Israel whenever the Security Council is seized of the question of the Middle East. The falsifications which the delegation of Israel is skilled at have already been made in the Council.

174. This afternoon you heard the statements of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt on the cease-fire and you have heard how the delegation of Israel has distorted this. Tomorrow you will have the verbatim record of this meeting and you will be able to compare what my Minister for Foreign Affairs has said and the inaccurate and deceitful allegations made by Israel on the subject in order to avoid addressing itself to the specific points raised by the Egyptian Foreign Minister in this regard.

175. Secondly, the delegation of Israel has read out certain communiqués from the Egyptian press on air raids on the Egyptian front. You all know that the Israelis have a monopoly of violence, of destruction, of destroying places where the refugees live. They have the monopoly of expelling the refugees from their territory. But we were unaware that the Israeli delegation or Israel has a monopoly on information from the Egyptian Government. But there are other sources of information; there are other press communiqués which may have been issued. I have with me a communiqué from the International Committee of the Red Cross which, being alarmed by the damage inflicted on the civilian population, has issued an appeal for a cessation of the attacks upon civilians.

176. From time to time the delegation of Israel speaks of anti-Semitism. I do not know what they mean by anti-Semitism. That word does not intimidate us. But it must be emphasized that whenever Israel is isolated diplomatically, it falls back on the use of that extortion.

177. When one hears the delegation of Israel speak here before you whenever the Security Council discusses the Middle East, we have the impression that we are not in the Security Council within the framework of the Charter, but at a banquet or \$1,000-a-plate dinner organized by the Zionists to buy Phantoms and other weapons to kill our women and children and refugees everywhere in the Middle East. We are not at a conference to glorify Zionism and the aggressive nature of Israel. We are at the Security Council where one is to observe and respect the territorial integrity of States, and hear statements about the inadmissibility of occupying territories by force and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States. This is what we should be hearing here. This is the criteria with which we should judge the attitudes of the two parties. Religious fervour belongs in the temples; it belongs at conferences organized by Zionists. But we are here in the Security Council where the Charter must be respected and invoked.

178. To conclude—if the delegation of Israel comes here to complain about war victims, if they ask for condolences, they could have avoided all of that if they had respected the Charter. If they respect the United Nations resolutions and leave Egyptian, Syrian and Jordanian territories, then they would have no cause to come here to complain.

179. The PRESIDENT: I call now on the representative of Israel in exercise of his right of reply.

180. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): To the Egyptian representative, I would make only one remark. After 25 years of waging continuous aggressive warfare against my country,

after 25 years of refusing to recognize its sovereignty, its lines, even its very right to exist as an independent State, what we heard now about the need for respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty really does make strange music. And I must say that the kind of reactions that all of us must have been reading in this morning's press, and yesterday's press, and heard in international information media regarding what transpires at our meetings here at this Security Council, is frequently the result of the kind of duplicity and hypocrisy to which the representative of Egypt resorted a while ago and his colleagues have done for the last two and a half decades.

181. To the representative of the Soviet Union I would like to say, I wish he and his Government contributed just part of the effort to achieve peace in the Middle East as it does to the extent and thickness of the protocols of the Security Council. One thing is clear after his observations, and that is what the Soviet Union wants under the present circumstances. One thing is clear after listening to the representative of the USSR, and that is that his Government supports the renewal of aggression by the Arab States on 6 October. I take note of that fact.

182. Ambassador Malik spoke of responsibility for war now and even before, he said. I have here a list of statements made by him, by his present Foreign Minister, and by other representatives of the Soviet Union in the Security Council and the General Assembly at the time when the conflict in the Middle East first started in 1948. And at that time the representatives of the USSR had no hesitation at all in saying very clearly who the aggressor was and pointing their fingers at the Arab Governments. Now, history and fact is not going to be changed with every statement in the Security Council delivered by representatives of the Soviet Union. The war to which the Middle East has been subjected by the Arab States since 1948 is the same war of aggression initiated by them at that time. There was a period of truce followed by a period of armistice, and now, since 1967, a period of cease-fire. And today we heard the theory that even the cease-fire was non-existent and invalid. But there was never a time of peace. It is the same war; it is the same aggression. Those responsible for its initiation are the same today as in 1948. Those who are defending their right to live in peace and security—in fact, their life; in fact, their right to exist like other nations do—are the same today as in 1948, when Ambassador Malik spoke in this very Security Council of Arab aggression, and was supported by Mr. Gromyko, Mr. Tsarapkin and Mr. Tarasenko. Facts and history cannot change. And when the Nazis were at Stalingrad they were aggressors. And when the Soviet Red Army threw them back to Berlin, they remained the aggressors and the Soviet army was the defender. Can you imagine, Ambassador Malik, someone getting up in those days of 1944 and 1945 and telling your Government you have become aggressors because you have defended yourselves successfully and pushed back those who wanted to turn you and your peoples into slaves?

183. I have listened carefully to your definition of what criminal, barbarian military actions—especially air attacks—are. Well, let me tell you one thing—and I challenge the Soviet press to publish it and Soviet international lawyers

to reply to this: By this definition which you threw at us, all the Soviet marshals and generals and officers and soldiers who defended themselves against the Nazi aggressors in the Second World War should be considered criminals and barbarians—and no one, I think, in his right mind would suggest that. But there is one law, if there is law at all in this world, and it will be the same for the Soviet Union and its military forces and its leaders as it is for Israel and its Government and its armed forces.

184. How can the representative of the Soviet Union repeat again and again—as we used to say in the Soviet Union, like another editorial in *Pravda* or *Izvestia*, and by “we” I mean all those who were in the Soviet Union at the time, Soviet citizens and foreigners alike—the charge that the Israeli air actions were not directed against military targets when I have read here—and he will be able to check with the verbatim record—official communiqués of the Syrian and Egyptian Governments pinpointing the military installations which were attacked? And you should know, Ambassador Malik—you remember those days very well, and my Foreign Minister pointed this out—that war cannot be unilateral and war always brings grief and suffering also to the civilians, especially to those in the proximity of military targets. You had once upon a time in Tsarist Russia a saying: “All except the Jews”. This will not be. If there is a law for you, the same law will apply to us. Do not come to preach to us on the basis of theories which you have adopted from Arab Governments which collaborated with Hitler against you and which are continuing Hitler's designs towards the Jewish people.

185. You spoke today about the alleged attack on Soviet buildings in Damascus in a somewhat different tone as compared with the outburst we all witnessed here only the day before yesterday. Falsehood? Is it enough for something simply to be passed on to you by another Arab representative for you to make a spectacle of blind hatred as you did the other day?

186. I should like to put on record what happened in Damascus regarding the Soviet Embassy and the Cultural Centre, a report by eye-witnesses, a report based on official Syrian communiqués, dated Damascus, 9 October and dispatched by a Syrian representative of the Reuter Agency in that city:

“Official sources here tonight denied that any Russians at the Soviet Embassy or the Soviet Cultural Centre were killed during today's Israeli air attack on Damascus. The sources said the Cultural Centre had been hit and the woman director, a Syrian, was seriously wounded. An unspecified number of Syrian students attending a Russian language course were also wounded. Journalists who toured the capital said the Soviet Embassy was undamaged. It stands in the eastern part of the city while the Israeli air raid was in the west.”

187. I think it would be of interest to compare these facts with the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union on 9 October. A woman was killed? Have you ever expressed any regret, Mr. Malik, over the Jewish blood spilled during these last 25 years? Have we heard any condolences expressed to those who are suffering, to the bereaved families of those who were killed simply because they wanted to be alive, as you and your people are?

188. You mentioned, in your usual manner, Goebbels and his methods. If my memory does not fail me, there was a time when Goebbels was Stalin's ally; and if my memory does not fail me, you were brought up in the so-called Stalinist school. If anyone round this table is continuing, meeting after meeting, to use Goebbels' methods, it is you.

189. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Egypt.

190. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I am aware that the hour is late and I apologize to you and to the members of the Security Council for speaking now, but I am sure you will agree with me that these are very serious times and that we cannot pass over in silence what has been said just now. The exercise of our right of self-defence is labelled aggression committed by Egypt and Syria. The representative of Israel has been hammering away on that point and constantly repeats it, imagining that he will be believed. Egypt and Syria are defending themselves. We are not in Israeli territory; we are on our territory, our national territory. I should like to say to the representative of Israel that we shall defend our territory with all our force and strength. If Israel has not understood this in the last six years, you must understand and believe it now, because we will continue to defend ourselves and we will defend our right with all the determination which the Arab people possesses. The Arab people have been the victim of aggression since 1967, not the aggressors.

191. The aggressors believe, or believed, that that state of affairs could go on. They have never understood that they were mistaken. I hope that they will realize it before it is too late for them.

192. You are all informed of the physical structure, the geographical change which is taking place in the occupied Arab territories and the desire for permanence of the situation which existed was certainly the dream of the Israelis. Need I mention the violations of the rights of the civilian populations of these territories which have been chased out, persecuted, imprisoned? The United Nations annals are replete with these facts.

193. That is my reply to the representative of Israel. We are at present going through a very serious period and I am certain that the Security Council will take due note of this because Egypt and Syria are determined to defend themselves.

194. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the Soviet Union to exercise his right of reply.

195. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): What impression do we get from the latest reply of the representative of Israel? I get the impression that he regrets that so few Soviet citizens were killed in Damascus. Yes, the number of casualties does not tally with the figures given in the United Press International and Agence France-Presse reports of 9 October. That is the only conclusion I have been able to draw. But the attitude of the representative of Israel is the attitude of a murderer who regrets that so few people have

been killed. I categorically reject his slander. He says that one of the Arabs informed me about these casualties. That is quite wrong; the first to speak and offer his condolences was the distinguished representative of France--on the basis of the Agence France-Presse report. Then the United Press International report appeared. I was reading from the reports of agencies which cannot be suspected of pro-Soviet leanings. So, Mr. Tekoah, do not make up stories; you will convince no one with them. Everyone here knows how this happened.

196. It is true that there was an outburst of hatred and indignation from me and my colleagues here. I do not deny it. I can imagine what would happen if the Israeli representative at the Council table received a United Press International and Agence France Presse report that 36 of his peaceful fellow-citizens, including diplomats, had been killed. Would he have remained silent, without reacting or showing his feelings in any way? It is inconceivable. So try to understand my reaction. It was a correct reaction and was supported by many Ambassadors; for the first time in the history and practice of the Security Council loud applause was heard--in support of my attitude towards the murderers.

197. You are not speaking the truth when you say that not once have I expressed regret at the death of Jews. Read the records of the Council. I told you plainly that I am distressed that 6 million Jews died in Hitler's Germany. I said that I was distressed; you do not deny it but you continually slander me--"no, no, no". Read the records for last year. But you, Mr. Tekoah, have never said that you regretted the death of the 20 million Soviet citizens who died to save all the other 15 million Jews throughout the world, including yourself.

198. If we and our allies had not won the Second World War, you would not be here; there would be "Hitler's World Reich". Yes, we saved you, so be grateful. I recommended you to advise your Government that instead of slandering the Soviet Union and inciting American Zionists to hate the Soviet Union, it should erect a monument in Tel Aviv in honour of the Soviet warrior by way of showing gratitude for the salvation of the Jews. I advised you to do that a long time ago.

199. As to the fact that the Soviet Union voted for the establishment of the State of Israel, yes, it is true, I voted and I spoke in favour of it. Why? On the basis of the Leninist principle of respect for the right of every people to an independent existence, to independence and self-determination. We are proud of the struggle which the Soviet Union has been waging for more than 50 years for the right of peoples to self-determination. We have supported, do support and will continue to support all such peoples. Ask the Africans. We have helped many of them to become independent, free and sovereign. They are grateful to the Soviet people for that.

200. The highest praise which I have received from a foreign statesman was that given by Mr. Kaunda, President of Zambia, when he said to me that the Zambians were grateful to the Soviet people and its armed forces for having beaten Hitler. If we had not beaten him, he said, the

Africans would have remained slaves, and we, the Soviet people, would have become slaves. That is the highest praise of the heroism of the Soviet people and Soviet armed forces that I have heard from a foreigner. None of your petty slander, Mr. Tekoah, will expunge from the pages of world history that great exploit of the Soviet people and the Soviet Union which saved the peoples of the world from the Fascist plague and saved all the Jews in the world.

201. But when Israel became an aggressor, we changed our policy towards it. We cannot agree with Israel's policy. We categorically condemn it. Israel has become an aggressor. We are helping the victims of aggression and we are proud to be helping them and will continue to do so. You have read this on numerous occasions in the statements of the Soviet Government and you have heard my statements here as official representative of the Soviet Union. To fight against aggression is one of the sacred principles of our foreign policy. That was and will always be the case.

202. Do not speculate about anti-Semitism and do not accuse me of it. My best friends are Jews. I can tell you their names—Brotsky, Chernyak, Shub and others. They were and still are my friends. In our country we have no racial discrimination or racial hatred. When in 1968 I came here for the second time, I, a Ukrainian, was proud to have sitting on my right my deputy Mendelevich, a Jew, and on my left Israelyan, an Armenian. The former United Kingdom representative, Lord Caradon, with his characteristic sense of humour, made a joke in the Security Council. There was the Russian team, he said—a Ukrainian, a Jew and an Armenian. That was a joke but, I think, a friendly joke, and we are proud of it. It is an indication of the equality of all nationalities in the Soviet Union. We have no hatred, no racial discrimination. The Soviet Union is a model of complete equality and equality of opportunity. None of your slander about anti-Semitism will help you. You can mislead only little children or big fools, as we say. But the whole world knows that there are more than 100 nationalities in the Soviet Union and that they are all equal, including the Jews. That is the true situation. You have spoken about a challenge. We have rebuffed the aggressor's challenge; we have always done so and will continue to do so.

203. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

204. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Thank you, Mr. President, for being so gracious as to give me a few minutes at this hour to exercise my right of reply, taking into account that such statements in exercise of the right of reply—as we have been witnessing here—may become interminable, fruitless and abortive. There is no end to accusations and recriminations. However, since Mr. Tekoah chose the path of propaganda and distortions, I feel constrained to set the record straight.

205. Mr. Tekoah said that the Arabs have a fanatical hatred for the Jews. I can assure him that it is not a question of hatred. It is the question of defending the Arab homeland, the homeland of the Palestinians that is the core of the whole problem. Even the occupied territories of

Syria, Jordan and Egypt are side issues, although we are directly seized of the recent events.

206. And here is where I want to correct a misconception. Mr. Tekoah always refers to anti-Semitism and says that the Arabs are anti-Semitic. Well, if anybody is Semitic it is the Arab. But those who are converted to Judaism are not Semitic in culture. They are Semitic in religion. There are three Semitic religions. They are Judaism, Christianity and Islam. If the ancestors of Mr. Tekoah were original Jews or converted Jews, that does not make him or his ilk Semitic, because he was reared and grew up like all the converted Khazars. A distinction should be made between Judaism and political Zionism. The mere fact that Zionists are Jews does not necessarily make them Semites. Let this be clear. We cannot be anti-ourselves, we Arabs in the area. How can we be anti-Semitic? This is my first correction.

207. Secondly, Mr. Tekoah gave the impression that the Arabs collaborated with Hitler. I know whom he has in mind. He has in mind the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and Rashid Ali Al-Kailani of Iraq. Both these gentlemen may, perhaps, have had some communication with the Nazis because they found that the British would not help them. We were placed by the British under a mandate. Iraq was placed under a mandate, and Palestine was placed under a mandate. The British were strong then. They had an empire. You could not talk to them. When you have an empire you get drunk with power. Now they are very reasonable—we are very glad that we have reasonable British diplomats to talk with—because they lost their empire. Not only the British, but also the Romans. Who could talk to the Romans? We know from history. And now Israel is a small empire. You cannot talk to them. They have to be right. Propaganda.

208. Hitler had contempt for Jew and Arab alike and he never collaborated with anybody, not even with his generals. He had a mind of his own. He was independent. That is why he lost the war. He would not heed his generals.

209. So you say that some of us collaborated with Hitler against the Jews. Have you forgotten who Rosenberg was? He wrote the book *The Aryan for Hitler*. He was a Jew.

210. Where did you want the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and Rashid Ali Al-Kailani of Iraq to go? To London or to Paris? They would have hanged them. Or to New York City where there are 2 million Jews who pull the strings? Are you listening, Mr. Scali? You have 2 million Jews here. The Grand Mufti and Rashid Ali Al-Kailani of Iraq thought that the best thing would be to negotiate with the enemy of the enemy. There are many Jews I know who actually collaborated with Hitler, merely because of the fact that there were many Jews in Germany. There were practically no Arabs in Germany. You Zionists dance on many ropes.

211. Now you talk about war. I agree that war is war and many victims are lost, innocent victims. We know what happened in Viet-Nam; certain villages were wiped out. We know what happened in Korea; we know what happened to Dresden. Nobody talks about Dresden except myself, and I am not German. Why does not anyone mention Dresden?

Who wiped out 200,000 in Dresden? You know what happened in Stalingrad, how the Germans erased it. We know what happened in Coventry. Ambassador Malik mentioned all that.

212. We deplore the loss of life amongst the Jews, whether they be in Syria, in Palestine, in Germany, or wherever they are. But those Jews, innocent Jews, who lost their lives have been the victims of political zionism—just like the Russians were the victims of nazism; just as the British were also the victims of German nazism, and so on. Therefore, do not accuse the Arabs and say that through the operations of war some Jews have been killed. Accuse yourself. If you have a conscience, say, “Well, let us analyse dispassionately this factor”, and you will find that those poor Jews have been the victims of political zionism.

213. Now, again, Mr. Tekoah maligned the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is a big country. They have an Ambassador who is capable, more capable than I am. He defends his country. But I want to tell you about an Arabic proverb we have which says: “If I give him one inch, he wants five inches or the fingers of my hand; if you give him five inches, he wants a foot; if you give him a foot, he wants a yard; if you give him a yard, he wants a mile”, and so on.

214. What more do you want? They sent you 33,000 Soviet Jews to Palestine last year, in one year. And you still whip them—33,000. I told Ambassador Malik that we consider that a hostile act against us, because, for sure now, they will consolidate them in the occupied territories. I have no right perhaps to interfere in the domestic affairs of Ambassador Malik. But you are having it all your own way. The Americans give you Phantoms and the Russians give you immigrants, what else do you want? And still you come and curse the Ambassador of a great country. I think it is shameful. I stand on his human rights as well as on your human rights if anybody will try to curse you—and nobody should curse one another. But these are the facts. They are more eloquent than anything else—33,000 in one year. What do you want them to do? Are you going to build skyscrapers in so-called original Israel? Where will you get the proteins to feed them, from the desert? You have to expand because your plan has been the in-gathering of all the Jews into Palestine. And we also know your plans. I have read them. One day you will say that Abraham lived in Ur of the Chaldees in western Iraq, so this is hallowed land. You forget that Abraham is also the ancestor of all the Semitic people or a good part of them through Ishmael, Isaac, and then Jacob. I do not have to go into the genealogy. You should know it, but I think you are secular. You are too much concerned with the political aspects of political zionism as to heed the genealogy of the Bible.

215. The creation of Israel was a mistake from the beginning. Now you can check what I say here, because I have a witness who was with me in 1947 at Lake Success. Do you know the illustrious General Romulo? He is today the Foreign Minister of the Philippines. He was one of those who attended the San Francisco Conference. Then, in 1947 he was a representative of the Philippines at Lake Success. I happened to be also at Lake Success. Mr. Romulo spoke for an hour almost, saying that it is not wise to partition Palestine. Because now I want to tell you how Israel was

created. He said it was not wise to partition Palestine, because many countries have certain racial minorities, elements or groups. They would want to secede and become independent. At that time the Jewish people of Palestine was less than one third of the population. And none other than Mr. Evatt was in the Chair, from Australia. Ask me. I set the record straight for you all. And they brought pressure on Mr. Evatt and many others. The illustrious General Romulo spoke against partition. Mr. Truman—listen to me, you Americans—sent word to the President of the Philippines and told him: “If you want to receive aid”—after they had suffered through four years—“you vote for the partition of Palestine or you will not receive aid.” Ask Mr. Romulo. Let someone go and see where he is. Let somebody go and tell him that Baroody is talking and he can check what I am saying, to see whether it is true or not. And Mr. Romulo, like a valiant representative, said: “I cannot vote like that”. He had self-respect and he thought it was the policy of his country. But his country changed its policy because our American friends would withhold wheat and footstuffs, and I don’t know what, to the Philippine people. So the poor President of the Philippines was compelled to tell Romulo: “Vote for partition.” Romulo said: “I will not vote.” So he left on a ship, and the Philippine President ordered his Embassy in Washington to send a representative to raise his hand for partition.

216. All right, I am not going to say anything because I have some Latin American friends here. I do not want to embarrass them. It was a Latin American country and they told me about it personally. I am not talking from hearsay. You were not there anyway, Mr. Tekoah, you were in Shanghai.

217. This gentleman assured us that they were against partition, for reasons of their own, not because they were in love with us or something. They were 6,000 miles away from the Arab lands. And then the gentleman came to us and said: “I have received instructions after I cleared the question of partition with my Government, and now I have instructions to vote for partition; they even tried to bribe me.” And another Latin American representative spoke. This is very significant, because I am telling you facts. I am not talking from hearsay or engaging in propaganda—for the benefit of Mr. Tekoah.

218. They tried all kinds of persuasion, and inducements. He said: “But I cannot vote for partition of Palestine because I have already made my speech.” Then this representative was surprised by his wife, who said: “It is not my birthday. What is this fur coat you sent me?” He asked: “I sent you a fur coat?” The fur coat came from the American Zionists in order to influence her husband. But she did not know that; she thought her husband had given her the coat.

219. I know many things but I do not want to enumerate them so as not to embarrass him. I stand for his human rights. You will be embarrassed; your face will turn the colour of a tomato if I tell you. I feel pity for you, Mr. Tekoah. Honestly, I am not putting you on. I wish you to know that this State was artificially created. I do not care whether the Russians or the Americans were with you;

I care for the Palestinian people. There was the Charter and there was the principle of self-determination in the Charter. If the British sold Palestine, because of Balfour, down the Thames and then Truman sold it down the Potomac, this does not change one iota the principle of self-determination enshrined in the Charter, and the United Nations had no right to partition Palestine.

220. Mr. Tekoah asks: "The Jewish people's right?" The Jewish people we all respect and admire, but not political zionism, which is an imperialist colonial movement trying to make of Palestine a crossroads for the Rothschilds, the Montagues and the Oppenheims—the bankers and the bullion merchants and the brokers for international trade. We know it.

221. Judaism, a religion, has been used as the motivation for a political and economic end. And in fairness to the leaders of the Zionists, most of them are secular like any other leader in the world nowadays who, even if they go to a church, a synagogue or a mosque, the next day they cut each other's throat.

222. We know what leaders are, and you are no different. You are only trying to play on the sentiments—

223. The PRESIDENT: I should like to make an appeal to my good friend Ambassador Baroody. We have had rather a long day—

224. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Why did you not appeal to the Soviet Union?

225. The PRESIDENT:—and it is rather late in the evening.

226. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Yes, it is late. Never mind. What do you think we are doing here? Playing? We have to work.

227. The PRESIDENT: We admire—indeed greatly admire—the eloquence of the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia. I should like to remind him that he was the very first speaker I heard in the United Nations in 1950 and I have enjoyed his eloquence since then. But I would, if I may, appeal to him to wind up.

228. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Yes, I shall wind up to please you as a friend, Sir. I shall take the floor again

tomorrow. There is "Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow" as Shakespeare said in Macbeth. I shall wind up, Sir. I mean that. It will take me two or three minutes.

229. I shall not go into the rest of my notes, but I want to be frank. My approach to any subject is unorthodox. If I were to talk in clichés or engage in propaganda, I would not stay here; I would refuse to stay here. And the record of my statements testifies to that.

230. My last question is directed to my good friend Ambassador Scali. I am not trying to embarrass him. This is a question of war or peace in the whole Arab world and everybody might be involved. I should feel remiss if I did not pose this question. I mentioned the 33,000 the Soviet Union saw fit to send. That is their business. I want to ask a certain question. Yesterday I heard that the United States is sending military aid in large quantities to Israel, which will of course prolong the war. I was requested by many Arab colleagues, some of whom are Foreign Ministers, to find out what the truth was—if it was true or not true.

231. Like the Soviet Union, you are free to send arms—just as they are free to send immigrants. I addressed my specific question to Ambassador Bennett. I could not talk to you, Mr. Scali, because you were very busy. So far I have received no reply. And I do not blame you because, after all, your Government is not responsible to us here in the United Nations to tell us all it does. But I think you sit in the Cabinet—at least, your predecessors did. You should know. I am not blaming anybody—the Soviet Union for sending 33,000 and the United States, whether or not they are sending arms—but we want to know the truth.

232. We should like to have a direct reply. First, from the Soviet Union: Will you continue to send us immigrants? And, secondly, from the United States: Is it true that you are sending arms, and is Congress forcing your hand? Whatever you want to tell us, please tell us. But do not leave us in the dark because we do not want to go by rumours.

233. I thank you, Mr. President, and I hope my two friends will have occasion to let me know what is the policy of their Governments.

The meeting rose at 11 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
