

UNITED NATIONS



**SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS**

UN LIBRARY

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

AUG 2 1981

1747th

MEETING: 21/22 OCTOBER 1973

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1747)	1
Statement by the President	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-SEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Sunday, 21 October 1973, at 9 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/1747)

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 10.15 p.m.

Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT: I am grateful to the members of the Council for agreeing at such short notice to attend this meeting, which I have called at the urgent request of the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union.

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)

2. 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. Y. Tekoah (Israel) and Mr. H. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic) took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with further decisions taken at previous meetings, I propose also, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Nigeria and Saudi Arabia to participate in the discussion without the

right to vote. I shall ask them to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be called upon to take a place at the Council table when it is their turn to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. E. Ogbu (Nigeria) and Mr. J. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT: I wish to draw the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution, sponsored by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America [S/11036].

5. Mr. SCALI (United States of America): The United States, together with the USSR, has called for this meeting of the Security Council with one purpose in mind: to take joint action and to present a joint proposition to the Council whose aim is to bring an immediate cease-fire in place and to begin promptly negotiations between the parties under appropriate auspices looking toward a just and durable peace based on Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

6. As the members of this Council know, the tragic fighting over the past 17 days has been both furious and costly. We believe that the prolongation of the war is not in the interests of the parties or the peoples in the area, and its continuance carries grave risks for the peace of the world. Because of this, President Nixon agreed that Secretary Kissinger should fly to Moscow, in response to an invitation of General Secretary Brezhnev. As a result of these discussions, the Council has before it the draft resolution agreed jointly by the United States and the Soviet Governments, on which both our Governments request immediate action on the part of the Security Council.

7. Let me make a few brief remarks regarding the three short paragraphs of the draft resolution, for they all stand clearly on their own words and speak for themselves.

8. Paragraph 1 calls for an immediate cease-fire. In our view, as well as that of the Soviet Union, this applies not only to the parties directly concerned but also to those who have joined in the fighting by sending units. This paragraph calls for the stopping of fighting in the positions at present occupied by the two sides. We believe that 12 hours should allow ample time to achieve the practical implementation of this paragraph.

9. Paragraph 2 calls for the implementation of the Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in all of its parts

after the cease-fire. The members of this Council as well as the parties concerned are fully familiar with that resolution and it needs no elaboration here. The paragraph is linked to paragraph 3 which calls for the immediate beginning of negotiations between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East. We believe that from the tragic events of the past 17 days there must be a new resolve, a new attempt to remove the fundamental causes that have brought war to the Middle East so frequently and so tragically. Another respite between two wars is just not good enough. And for our part, both the United States and the Soviet Union are ready to make our joint good offices available to the parties as a means to facilitate the negotiating process.

10. Finally, I want to report to the Council that both the Soviet Union and the United States believe that there should be an immediate exchange of prisoners of war. We believe this is an historic moment for the Council. We believe that this Council, in exercising its primary responsibility in the field of peace and security, can make a major contribution to this end by adopting this draft resolution promptly.

11. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): In the Middle East, because of the absence of a political settlement, the war is continuing. For the third week now fierce and bloody battles have been raging, causing casualties and destruction. The situation that has arisen in that area poses a serious threat to the maintenance of international peace. The dangerous situation in that part of the world requires that the Security Council take the most urgent and immediate measures both to call a halt to the bloodshed and to bring about a practical peaceful settlement on the basis of the notable resolution 242 (1967) adopted on 22 November 1967. We are all aware that in recent days intensive multilateral consultations have been in progress, including high-level meetings, with a view to bringing an end to the war in the Middle East. At the present time, as a result of these consultations, the Soviet Union, together with the United States of America, is submitting to the Security Council a draft resolution [S/11036] designed to bring about the cessation of military activities and the immediate practical implementation of resolution 242 (1967) regarding a political settlement in the Middle East. This draft resolution would have all parties to the present fighting cease all firing and terminate military activity immediately, no later than 12 hours after the moment of the adoption of this resolution by the Security Council, in the positions they now occupy. The draft resolution also provides that the parties concerned should start immediately after the cease-fire the practical implementation of resolution 242 (1967) in all of its parts. The draft also embodies a decision by the Council that immediately and concurrently with the cease-fire, negotiations should start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East. The dangerous turn of events in the Middle East, running counter to the easing of tension which has recently been achieved, demands that all those concerned with strengthening the cause of peace must make urgent efforts to channel the course of events in that area towards the early achievement

of a peaceful and just settlement. Time will not wait. It is the opinion of the Soviet delegation that the Council must act without delay in accordance with the Charter and must take the necessary decisions on this very day, at this meeting. The Soviet delegation appeals to the members of the Security Council to do this.

12. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

13. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I cannot compromise my conscience by keeping silent about this momentous meeting of the Council which reaffirms what has become common knowledge all over the world, namely, that the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, are once again engaged in the game of power politics and spheres of influence.

14. In 1947, by the partition of Palestine, the usurping State of Israel was created by these two self-same Powers, abetted by their client States. The creation of Israel was accomplished for different motives. The chief architect of that State was, however, the late President Harry Truman. He flagrantly threw by the wayside the principle of the self-determination of the Palestinian people, and not only personally involved himself in opting for having the Palestinians robbed of their homeland but brought pressure to bear on many States which needed United States aid after the Second World War. All this Mr. Truman did contrary to the advice of his State Department. "Who are these striped-pants experts to tell the President of the United States what he should do?" was his over-confident remark. The erstwhile haberdasher from Kansas knew better than the specialists of his State Department who told him that the partition of Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish State in the Middle East would cause continuous disturbances and eventually would alienate the Arabs from the United States. President Truman is reported to have retorted that he had many Jews and very few Arabs in his constituency.

15. Thirty years before the partition of Palestine, Arthur Balfour had obtained the approval of the Zionists in England for the infamous and equivocal Declaration known by his name. The Rothschilds approved it as the cornerstone for the creation of the Jewish State. The reason why Balfour gave in to the Zionists is clearly explained in a relatively recent book by Sir John Glubb—although I knew about it as far back as the 1920s, when as a young man I began serious research on the perfidious policies adopted in Versailles after the end of the First World War. I can do no better than quote from a book by Sir John Glubb. He says:

"It is necessary to remember the war situation in 1917. Russia ceased to fight, and the whole strength of Germany, Austria and Turkey was turned against the Allies. When the Balfour Declaration was issued, the continued independence of Britain and France themselves hung in the balance. The best, perhaps the only hope of being able to repulse the German offensive in the spring of 1918 was to secure the entry of the United States into the war. The British Government was advised that this could most easily be achieved by conciliating Jewish

opinion, in view of the powerful influence exerted by leading Jews in America."

16. Is it any wonder that the Germans in the 1920s considered the Jews their enemy? After the Weimar Republic, even during the Weimar Republic, they considered that they had been sold out by the Jews, since the Kaiser failed in 1898--

17. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Mr. President, I do not believe that at this important moment the United Nations should be subjected to hearing a defence of Hitler, Hitlerian theories and Nazi policies.

18. The PRESIDENT: I think I shall allow the representative of Saudi Arabia to proceed for the time being, but I would appeal to him, as I have on earlier occasions, to keep his remarks within what I think are regarded as the reasonable standards of debate in the Council. He may proceed.

19. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): With all due respect to you, Sir, as President, I should like to say that I did not mention Hitler. But this gentleman wants to interrupt me. Do you mean to say I should tailor my speech to his liking? I never interrupt him. He has said many things about the Arabs that have been distortions, but I have never interrupted him. Therefore it is uncalled for to make any remarks as to how I should deliver my speech. If he has a bad conscience, let him cleanse it and then he will not be disturbed. May I proceed now?

20. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Saudi Arabia may proceed.

21. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I do not wish him to interrupt me, but if he does, by Jove I will interrupt him too.

22. The PRESIDENT: I hope that the representative of Saudi Arabia will take notice of my appeal. He may proceed.

23. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Thank you for your kindness.

24. Is it any wonder that the Germans in the 1920s considered the Jews their enemies? That is what I had started to say when I was interrupted. Again I quote from the book by Sir John Glubb:

"The Mandate of Palestine allotted by the League of Nations consisted principally of provisions in favour of the Jews, although the Jews constituted 7 per cent of the population. The word 'Jews' or 'Zionists' appeared 12 times in the Mandate. The Arabs, who were 93 per cent of the population, were not once mentioned."

25. What kind of Mandate was that? What kind of business was that at Versailles? What a travesty of justice. No wonder the League of Nations foundered and paved the way for the Second World War. I was in London in 1937--or was it 1936--when Sir Neville Chamberlain sent his brother, Austin, to Mussolini to tell him that he had the

green light for his adventure in Ethiopia provided that he, Mussolini, did not ally himself with the Germans. That is why the League of Nations foundered. They wanted to sell the peoples of Asia and Africa down the river.

26. Hence the corner-stone of Israel was laid by Balfour. And Truman was the President who from the beginning helped to build the structure. Balfour acted to save Britain and its Empire from possible defeat at the hands of the Germans in 1917; and Truman obtained the Jewish vote wholesale, and through the Zionists he also got the votes of gentiles brainwashed by them. Hence, from the beginning justice flew out the windows of Downing Street and, subsequently, from the windows of the White House, and the Palestinians were sold down the Thames and the Potomac. Where is the British Empire which Balfour and subsequently Churchill tried to save? It went down the drain. And what has happened to the United States, because Truman helped create and subsequent United States Governments have supported Israel? I leave the answer to the members of the Council. Billions upon billions of American dollars are being squandered to maintain Israel, a usurping State which has been lording it over the Arab world.

27. What have the Arabs, at a distance of 3,000 miles from London, done to the British to have them perpetrate this tragedy upon them? They fought with the British in the First World War. It was the perfidy of Balfour which sold them down the Thames.

28. And what have the Palestinians and the Arabs done to the Americans and their Chief of State, the late Harry Truman, and other United States Presidents to deserve United States unremitting enmity? America is at a distance of from 3,000 to 6,000 miles from the shores of Palestine. My dear Mr. Scali, you are a learned journalist and a statesman. Have we ever threatened the American people or Government since they liberated themselves from the British in 1776? Have we? It is your privilege to remain silent and not to exercise your right of reply, but I should welcome it if you would tell me of one instance when the Arab people hurt the United States. What have we done to your Mr. Nixon and to the Congress and to the Senate of the United States to have them side with the usurper amongst us? We opened our doors to you. It was Western and not Russian companies which developed our oil and other resources. We have repeatedly warned American Governments that there would be no peace as long as the Zionists were supported by them--the more so when they were supported militarily. They turned deaf ears to our pleas and warnings.

29. I remember when in 1967 I sat at this very table and asked the United States representative the same question, my dear Mr. Scali--I asked him to tell his Government to leave us alone. You would not leave us alone. And on that day, arriving from Geneva, Switzerland, I picked up *The New York Times* which was saying what a good thing had happened. No, it was not *The New York Times*; it was the late Robert Kennedy, who belonged to the Democratic Party, and Nelson Rockefeller of the Republican Party who, each to make sure he would not be outdone by the other, said--and I am paraphrasing: "What a great thing that

the Zionists should vanquish the Arabs. They bring civilization to them." I retorted: "What kind of civilization? Hot dogs and miniskirts?" I think today the miniskirts are shorter and the hot dogs adulterated.

30. That is what has happened to the United States: squandering its substance in order to suppress the Arab world.

31. Now I come to the Russians. Laugh, laugh: Phase Five is coming, when the dollar will go down to 10 cents and we will all suffer. As I say, I now come to the Russians. After the Second World War the Russians had practically no influence in the Middle East, and almost no chance to set foot in that region. Do you remember, my good friend Ambassador Malik, the McCarthy era in the United States? The Russian Communists were ogres: they were said to be bent on destroying the Western world. Many innocent Americans who were not Communists were nevertheless considered traitors because they sometimes spoke fairly about the Russians. Had it not been for the Russians the Western Powers would have been crushed by Hitler. They forgot that; they have short memories. However, you, like any other great Power, wanted to set foot in the Middle East—I will not go into the details of your reasons for that.

32. But the Russians had practically no influence in the Middle East, and almost no chance to set foot in the region. The United States, by its support of the Zionists, provided them with a unique opportunity. I still remember how Mr. Gromyko took issue with the United States delegation at Lake Success—you remember, I was sitting in those meetings at Lake Success. Mr. Gromyko took issue with the United States delegation to the United Nations at Lake Success for wanting to postpone the vote on the partition of Palestine for a few days so that some other solution could be explored. Mr. Gromyko insisted on a quick vote, and it looked to me at the time that both the Russians and the Americans were vying for Zionist favour. I am talking about myself: that is how it looked to me, and I was vindicated by what happened later.

33. It was an opportunity for the Soviet Union to enter the Middle East arena. But no sooner had partition been voted in 1947 and Israel recognized by Mr. Truman in May 1948 than the Zionists turned their backs on the Soviet Union. Just the other day Mr. Tekoah took issue with you, my good friend Mr. Malik: he reminded you how you had voted for partition, and wondered how come you had now turned your back on this usurping State.

34. The Zionists turned their backs on the Soviet Union; they knew what side their toast was buttered on and where the money was at the time. Where? In the United States, of course. From 1948 through the early 1950s the United States Government dominated the Arab world and made sure that the Soviet Union would be sealed off by what they termed "the Northern Tier of Defence": Turkey, Iran and all those countries—Pakistan, India, Afghanistan—the Northern Tier. I do not have to tell you what it is; I mention it for those who do not know what "the Northern Tier of Defence" meant.

35. Finally Mr. Dulles "goofed"—to use an American term—and rebuffed the late President Gamal Abdel Nasser on the financing of the Aswan Dam. The Soviet Union was ready to come to the assistance of Egypt, and the rest is history.

36. In short, the Middle East thenceforth became the chessboard on which the United States and the Soviet Union have been playing their political chess game—not with wooden pieces but with the destiny of the peoples of the area. Who can refute this statement of mine?

37. One day we are with you; one day we are not with you; one day we help this party; one day we come to an understanding. Did they ask your Government, my good friend from China? I do not think Peking has even had time to reflect on this Kissinger-Brezhnev pact. At whose expense? Not necessarily at the expense of the Arab people, but at the expense of the Palestinians, who are the indigenous people of that land who were driven out by terrorism perpetrated by the Zionists in the 1920s, when, as my good friend Sir Donald Maitland, who is an Arabist, knows, they hanged Tommies from the trees and bombed the King David Hotel, from where the officials of the Mandate functioned. He also knows how they killed Lord Moyne, how they blackmailed the United Kingdom, and how the United Kingdom finally found that it had made a mistake, and sent various Royal Commissions, the last being the Peel Commission. The United Kingdom regretted what had happened. And finally it was dragged into the Second World War, from which it emerged almost insolvent.

38. So the United States came to the financial rescue of the Allies, and finally the United Kingdom threw the whole question into the lap of the United Nations, just as the United Kingdom left the question of the Mandate to the Versailles politicians, who sold the Palestinians down the river.

39. My memory goes back: I was sitting here; Ambassador Fedorenko of the Soviet Union was sitting where Ambassador Sen of India is now sitting; and when they came to the question of resolution 242 (1967)—by the way, why do you not add it to the New Testament, my good friend Mr. Scali; it is not apocryphal; everybody is charmed by 242—I told Lord Caradon and Ambassador Fedorenko that that was the knot that would break the carpenter's saw—as the Arabic proverb says—and I told my Arab colleagues that they had been duped. They rushed to me, saying: "For heaven's sake, Baroody, do not oppose 242." I opposed 242; I opposed the transfer of this question of the Middle East to a special session of the General Assembly: I knew it was a trap. But whatever you may say about the Arabs, they are good-hearted. I hope they will not be duped anymore. Resolution 242—it is the eleventh commandment; Moses had ten, and this is the eleventh commandment. Resolution 242—I have heard it umpteen times.

40. They have no business in our area. The other day when I replied to Mr. Eban in the Security Council or in the General Assembly—I forget which—I said that it is immaterial who wins this war; there will be another round. It is, as I said, a link in a long chain of conflicts.

41. And this brings me to the best parallel that had happened in our area—the Crusades. Do we not learn anything from history? There are parallels—not identical events, parallel events. The motivation of the Crusades was religious, just as zionism was predicated on the premise that God gave Palestine to them. And time and again I have said that God was not in the real estate business. But now they do not reply to this. “Our people, our Jewish people.” Their Jewish people are of many cultures, of many languages, of many backgrounds. There is no such thing as one Christian people, one Jewish people, one Muslim people. There are peoples. But the motivation they used was a religious motivation to play on the duped fundamentalists in the West who still believe literally in every word of the Bible.

42. But the leaders knew what they were aiming at. Of course, some of them felt reverence for the land of Palestine because there were Jewish prophets. But what about Jesus, who they say is a false prophet? Well, in spite of what they say, they are a billion Christians, and to them Jerusalem is holy. And what about the 600 million Muslims to whom Jerusalem and the land of Palestine is sacred? Urban II, the Pope of those days, when he saw that his vassals were veering away from him—he was the temporal as well as the spiritual power in Western Europe—had a propagandist, none other than Peter the Hermit. And there was famine and there was pestilence in those days in the Middle Ages in Europe.

43. So what was the motivation of Pope Urban II but to use Christianity, the religion of peace and love, to motivate the people of Western Europe? They were told that penitence and the pilgrimage to Palestine, in order to wrest the land from the hands of the infidels—meaning the Muslims—would be their way to heaven. Jerusalem fell several times into the hands of the Crusaders, many of whom were opportunists who had no religion in their heart, who massacred anyone whom they met on their way.

44. I have a quotation from Western European sources—scholars who decried the Crusades, eight of them. When Jerusalem surrendered to the Crusaders, after more than a month's siege, on 15 July 1099, the Crusaders put the people of Jerusalem to the sword and the blood of the natives of the city ran in streams. The Crusaders on the same day entered the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and clasped their blood-stained hands, praying to Jesus, the Prince of Peace. What hypocrites, what bandits. The Crusades were motivated by religion for a political and economic end.

45. See the parallel, members of the Council. Here we have a movement called zionism which wants to ingather all the Jews of the world in Palestine, if it can, so that it may develop and exploit the three continents from that cross-road: Palestine. And even Mr. Eban the other day said, Why do not we and the Arabs have a common market? I am paraphrasing. They went there to trade. The Rothschilds and their ilk, who feel that taxes are rising in Europe and in the United States, consider that place virgin territory for the investment of their capital. Whom do they think they are fooling, those Rothschilds? I knew some of them in the 1930s; anything for money.

46. I can go on and on citing history. I told the Zionists, when I was on talking terms with them, that we have nothing against the Jew as such, but the exploiting Zionists will not survive in the long run. I am not talking about the fact that they would twist my words to mean that the Arabs would want to throw the Jews into the Mediterranean. I am saying that, like the Crusaders, the Zionists have no opportunity to survive in the long, long run.

47. Here we come to the draft resolution, which, if adopted, may create a phoney détente, like the détente we are witnessing between the super-Powers. This time it will be a détente between some of the Arab leaders and some of the Jews, or the Zionists rather, because the Zionists want to expand until they get to western Iraq, until they get to the Nile. Then what will we have profited: the United Nations as an instrument for peace or as an instrument for delaying tragedy and perpetuating it?

48. Now, what is the alternative? It is a fait accompli, as De Gaulle once said to King Faisal in 1967 before the conflict of that year. It was in May. De Gaulle was maligned by many Zionists. He said: “But what can you do, it is a fait accompli.” And His Majesty King Faisal retorted: “Did you consider the invasion of the Nazis a fait accompli, or did you leave and struggle until the Nazis were defeated?”

49. And now, and tomorrow, and the day after tomorrow, should there be a fait accompli, the Arab youth will not stay quiet. They will call those who make peace with the usurpers of the Palestine people traitors. Mark my words. I may not be living then, but here in the record let it figure: traitors. I know the youth in the Arab lands. That is the best we can do, the Security Council. As long as there is an injustice which is perpetrated, there will be another round, and still another round. I cannot tell you the intervals of those rounds because the age of prophecy has gone, but having been seized of the situation since the early 1920s, I hope you will heed what I am saying. I am giving you warning here, members of the Council, that you are solving nothing—just because it does not suit the Soviet Union and the United States to come to grips. A military confrontation will bring down mankind. It might be suicide.

50. There will be other conflicts as long as the major Powers do not formulate their policies on the basis of justice. And the Arab people will struggle until injustice disappears in their area.

51. Now, is there a solution? It sounds like warlike talk here. Yes, there is a solution. Instead of the two super-Powers becoming the arbiters of what they think they may accomplish to serve their national interests, let me tell them what I think would be a fair solution. We do not want the Jews to suffer, nor do we want the Arabs to suffer. They hoisted a flag of their own, which is a symbol of colonialism—extreme colonialism, because the colonial Powers did not expropriate in the past the assets of the natives of the land. Live as Jews, if you want to, amongst us, but not as Zionists. That flag is the symbol of your aggression. But you could adopt another flag, a flag that will fly over Jews and Arabs of Palestine. Let it be a crescent and inside of the crescent we will accept your star as Jewish, what you call the Star of David as Jews. Remember,

that crescent is always surrounding you. If you try to be aggressive, it will close up on you. Otherwise that symbol of aggression will lead to further aggression. Who begins it is beside the point. As we say in Arabic, "He who starts evil is really the aggressor". We did not go and hurt any Jew in Eastern and Central Europe, just as we have never hurt either the British or the French or the Americans. And they come to our region and wage war by proxy. Beware. There is no one who went to our area but disappeared. I am not going back before Alexander the Great. The Romans, the Seleucids, the Byzantines, the Seljuks, the Crusaders from all Western Europe, and our brothers the Ottomans--although it was a sort of a commonwealth, the Ottoman Empire.

52. Then it was the turn of the British and the French, in their Mandates, which was a sort of colonialism. And now it is the turn of whom? Of the Eastern and Central European Zionists who have started that movement of aggression amongst us. Where are those who preceded them? Gone with the wind. And you also in time will go with the wind. But we do not want to hurt you as people. We are defending ourselves from an alien culture, from an alien language, from an alien way of life. And that is why you have become a foreign element in the body social and body politics of the Arab world, causing an abscess, and the abscess is causing a high fever. And not until the puss of aggression is squeezed out for good and people live like brothers in peace, Jew or gentile, under a common flag, will there be peace in the land of Palestine and in the Middle East.

53. Sir Donald MAITLAND (United Kingdom): When I addressed this Council on 8 October [1743rd meeting] I suggested that we had two immediate responsibilities: first, to seek the earliest possible cease-fire and, second, to treat the renewal of hostilities as a catalyst for starting a genuine diplomatic process which would lead to a settlement.

54. In the 17 days since the present war began, this Council has been unable to find a way of discharging either of these responsibilities. Meanwhile, the States involved in the fighting have suffered tragic losses and the risk to international peace and security has grown alarmingly. The conclusion must inevitably suggest itself that a solution to the Middle East problem is not to be found by military means. There is only one decisive victory to be gained. That is the achievement of a just and lasting peace.

55. The just and lasting peace which must now be sought with the utmost vigour could bring great benefits to the people of the Arab States and Israel. We know that they have for long sought the opportunity to devote their talents and their resources to the economic and social problems that face them and so create stability in place of tension, hostility and violence.

56. But it is not only the Arab States and Israel which have suffered. For many years now the interests of many countries in Europe, Africa and Asia have been closely affected. The will is strong in these three continents for lasting peace in the Middle East and they have the opportunity to express it in this debate.

57. My Government has too close a knowledge of the difficulties which will have to be overcome to believe that a settlement can be achieved tomorrow. A period of hard negotiation lies ahead.

58. But as we call tonight for a cease-fire, the members of the Security Council possess one valuable asset which was not available on 6 June 1967. The only prescription for a settlement which commands unanimous agreement is already on our statute book as resolution 242 (1967). All energies can not be devoted to the implementation of that resolution in all of its parts. After six years of fruitless activity, the Security Council is fully justified in calling upon the parties to take immediate steps to that end.

59. The United Kingdom delegation will vote for the draft resolution sponsored by the Soviet Union and the United States [S/11036]. We believe that it offers a unique opportunity to stop the fighting and to start real progress at last towards a settlement.

60. I reminded the Council at the beginning of this debate of my Government's views on the detailed provisions of such a settlement, which would combine the requirements of sovereignty with those of security. I do not propose to restate those views tonight. I wish only to say that they have not changed.

61. With regard to the draft resolution now before us, I should like to add two points. First, my Government believes that the efforts aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East would best be pursued under the aegis of the United Nations. This is how my delegation would interpret the reference to "appropriate auspices" in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution before us.

62. My second point is this. Since, as I have argued, there is no security in resort to military force and real peace can come to the Middle East only in the wake of a settlement, my Government hopes that as soon as the cease-fire has become effective, the United States and the Soviet Union will cease supplying arms to the area. As members of the Council know, my Government suspended all shipment of arms to the battlefield as soon as hostilities broke out. My Government acted at once out of the conviction that this was the only right policy if the aim is, as it must be, to seek reconciliation and prevent any further war between the Arab States and Israel.

63. In conclusion, may I say that my Government stands ready to play its full part in the urgent effort which must now be made to seek a lasting settlement.

64. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): Following the grave developments in the situation in the Middle East, the United States and the Soviet Union jointly called for the immediate convening of the Security Council in order to place before it the draft resolution now before us for consideration. Mindful of the urgency of the matter, I shall be very brief. While we sit here listening to speeches, in the Middle East men are fighting, men are dying.

65. My delegation will vote in favour of the text submitted by the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States, because that text meets the necessity of putting an immediate end to a struggle that has claimed far too many victims, a struggle the prolongation of which can bring only greater suffering and perhaps other dangers.

66. My delegation, however, would wish to make the following observations. The draft now before the Council responds to the concerns of the French Government as expressed by our Prime Minister on 9 October in an address before the National Assembly. In that statement, Mr. Messmer emphasized the link that must exist between a cease-fire and the immediate start of the process that should lead to a definitive settlement of the conflict in accordance with resolution 242 (1967), which was accepted by all and which offers to all the necessary guarantees for security. The draft before us also provides for the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) in all of its parts. France abides by its interpretation of resolution 242 (1967), in particular as regards withdrawal, and by its conception of the role of our Council and its permanent members in the peace settlement and its implementation.

67. In submitting this draft resolution, the United States and the Soviet Union assume, in our view, the responsibility for contributing to the best of their ability to the implementation of resolution 242 (1967). However, as regards the negotiations provided for in the Soviet-American text in paragraph 3, my delegation wishes to stress that the phrase "under appropriate auspices" can mean nothing other than under the aegis of the Security Council.

68. Lastly, I should like to emphasize that the text on which the Council is about to vote will have its full effect and have a chance of leading to the restoration of peace only if it is understood that the Powers that have proposed this text intend to cease very soon their massive deliveries of armaments to the belligerents.

69. My delegation fervently hopes that the Council will take a decision at the earliest possible moment in favour of the text before us. Too much blood has already been shed for the Council to show any hesitation whatsoever in adopting a draft resolution that offers the immediate advantage of bringing about a cease-fire and thus putting an end to the fighting, while at the same time opening the way to the over-all negotiation which alone will make possible the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

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

71. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I would be remiss in my duty if, in asking to speak today, I did not mention something which took place in our Organization last week and which directly concerns the Security Council. I refer to Iraq's election on 15 October to membership of the Security Council of the United Nations.

72. Iraq's election is a travesty of the Charter of the United Nations. It further debases the Security Council; the

General Assembly and the entire Organization. Article 23 of the Charter clearly stipulates that in the election of non-permanent members of the Security Council due regard should be "specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security".

73. For the last 25 years, since the Arab invasion of Israel in 1948 in defiance of the United Nations, Iraq has pursued war against Israel, refusing to sign the armistice of 1949, which had been sponsored by the Security Council, and actively supporting terror warfare against Israel, and joining in the Egyptian-Syrian aggression of 6 October 1973. Throughout this period Iraq has openly proclaimed its objective to be the total destruction of a Member State and the denial to the Jewish people of Israel of its right to self-determination and freedom.

74. The election of Iraq to this Council, only a few days after it had resumed active aggression, again illustrates the shortcomings and failings of the General Assembly and the Security Council in matters concerning the Middle East.

75. It was not my intention to speak at this stage of the meeting; the statement delivered by the representative of Saudi Arabia compels me, however, to do so. Only the other day I was interrupted five times in this very chamber in the course of expressing grief over the death of innocent civilian victims of the war, whether they be Egyptian, Syrian, Israeli, or nationals of other States. Yet today we listened to a statement by the representative of Saudi Arabia into which he succeeded in packing the maximum of nonsense into maximum of verbiage and venom. He did not stop at distorting fact and history. He insulted Heads of States, including those of permanent members of the Security Council. He slandered nations. He abused civilizations and religions. He extolled Hitler and anti-Semitism. Yet no one except me tried to call him to order. His falsifications and calumnies do not deserve any response. I should, however, like to refer to one point in his speech: his attack against zionism—because he is not the only one who resorts to these perfidious views and expressions.

76. Zionism is the love of Zion. Zionism is the Jewish people's liberation movement, the quest for freedom, for equality with other nations. Yet in an organization in which liberation movements are hailed and supported, the Jewish people's struggle to restore its independence and sovereignty is maligned and slandered in an endless spate of malice and venom.

77. In his drive to annihilate the Jewish people, Hitler began by distorting the image of the Jew, by rewriting Jewish history, by fabricating some of the most odious historic and racial theories. The Arab Governments, in their campaign to complete Hitler's crimes against the Jewish people and destroy the Jewish State, have adopted the same method of falsifying Jewish history, and in particular the meaning of the Zionist movement and the significance of its ideals.

78. What is zionism? When the Jews, exiled from their land in the seventh century before the Christian era, sat by the rivers of Babylon and wept and prayed but also sought

ways to go home, that was already zionism. When in a mass revolt against their exile they returned and rebuilt the temple and re-established their State, that was zionism. When they were the last people in the entire Mediterranean basin to resist the forces of the Roman Empire and to struggle for independence, that was zionism. When for centuries after the Roman conquest they refused to surrender and rebelled again and again against the invaders, that was zionism. When, uprooted from their land by the conquerors and dispersed by them all over the world, they continued to dream and to strive to return to Israel, that was zionism. When, during the long succession of foreign invaders, they tried repeatedly to regain sovereignty at least in part of their homeland, that was zionism. When they volunteered from Palestine and from all over the world to establish Jewish armies that fought on the side of the Allies in the First World War and helped to end Ottoman subjugation, that was zionism. When they formed the Jewish Brigade in the Second World War to fight Hitler, while Arab leaders supported him, that was zionism. When Jews went to Nazi gas chambers with the name of Jerusalem on their lips, that was zionism. When, in the forests of Russia and the Ukraine and other parts of Eastern Europe, Jewish partisans battled the Germans and sang of the land where palms are growing, that was zionism. When Jews fought British colonialism while the Arabs of Palestine and the neighbouring Arab States were being helped by it, that was zionism. Zionism is one of the world's oldest anti-imperialist movements. It aims at securing for the Jewish people the rights possessed by other nations. It harbours malice towards none. It seeks co-operation and understanding with the Arab peoples and with their national movements.

79. Zionism is as sacred to the Jewish people as the national liberation movements are to the nations of Africa and Asia. Even if the Arab States are locked today in conflict with the Jewish national liberation movement, they must not stoop in their attitude towards it to the fanaticism and barbarism of the Nazis. If there is to be hope for peace in the Middle East, there must be between Israel and the Arab States mutual respect for each other's sacred national values—not distortion and abuse.

80. Zionism was not born in the Jewish ghettos of Europe, but on the battlefield against imperialism in ancient Israel. It is not an out-moded nationalistic revival but an unparalleled epic of centuries of resistance to force and bondage. Those who attack it attack the fundamental principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

81. Egypt's and Syria's Yom Kippur aggression against Israel is in its third week. What has it brought the aggressors? Nothing. Nothing but another debacle. Those who chose war and not peace have again exposed themselves to the inevitable consequences of war. Those who preferred to deal with Israel through bloodshed and not agreement have brought bloodshed upon themselves. When, six years ago, the Arab assault against Israel's existence was foiled and the armies of Egypt and Syria repelled to the 1967 cease-fire lines, Arab leaders complained of humiliation. The world was called upon to consider Arab failure to destroy Israel's independence as Arab humiliation by Israel.

How is the world to regard the new repulse given to Arab aggression? What is the world to think and to say of Governments which for six years have prepared themselves for war, armed their military forces with the most sophisticated weapons, supplied in unlimited quantities, tried to weaken Israel by a war of attrition and by terror warfare, and then attacked on Judaism's holiest of days; attacked when all Israel was at prayer, fast and rest, when the cease-fire lines were manned by a handful of defenders; attacked with all the might of 4,900 tanks, 1,100 aircraft, hundreds of missiles, and over 800,000 men under arms, and then find themselves in the situation which they are in today? There is only one word to describe such a development: disgrace. Disgrace not for the Arab soldier who fought as a soldier fights; disgrace not for the Arab peoples, which, like all peoples in the world, aspire to peace; but dishonour and disgrace for those leaders of Egypt and Syria and their supporters who have led their States into more devastation and sorrow. It is nothing but disgrace to sacrifice the lives of thousands and thousands of young men in order to escape the necessity of building peace. It is nothing but disgrace to engulf the entire Middle East in flames in an attempt to sabotage preparations for peace.

82. In 1967 the plea of humiliation was an invention of Arab leaders to justify their rejection of peace and their refusal to negotiate peace with Israel. This time their disgrace is a fact. The annals of history mirror few instances in which a policy of war has come to a more ignominious fate. This time, no pretexts, no inventions, no pleas must be permitted to enable the Arab leadership to free itself from the consequences of its abject disgrace of preferring war over peace. They must be persuaded once and for all to abandon those policies which have caused the present conflagration.

83. To the Arab Governments the Egyptian-Syrian aggression of 6 October has brought failure and disgrace. To Israel it has confirmed the correctness of its views and the reality of its apprehensions. It is clear now that, after having launched war 25 years ago against Israel's existence, Arab leadership still aims at Israel's elimination as a sovereign member of the family of nations. The nature, the timing, the extent of the Yom Kippur aggression leave little room for doubt. The active participation of such States as Syria, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Libya, which openly and officially go on denying till this very day Israel's right to independence, strengthens this grim truth.

84. President Sadat's close confidant and adviser Hasseini Heykal had no qualms about reiterating publicly the real objective of Egypt's renewed assault. In his weekly article in *Al Ahram* he wrote the following on 19 October 1973, last Friday:

"The aim at this phase is not a piece of territory in the Golan, the Golan as a whole, a part of Sinai, or all of Sinai. Nor is the problem Jerusalem, the West Bank of the Jordan River, Gaza and the rights of the Palestinians. The matter does not relate to the liberation of the Arab territories which were occupied since 5 June 1967, but strikes further and deeper against the future of Israel, even if this is not immediately apparent. If the Arabs will

succeed in liberating by force their lands occupied on 5 June 1967" --

85. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, you advised the previous speaker to be more reasonable. Could you give the same advice to the present speaker? Thank you.

86. The PRESIDENT: May I say to the representative of the Soviet Union that I shall be glad to advise the representative of Israel in the same terms that I used in my word of advice to my friend and colleague the representative of Saudi Arabia. In other words, I would ask the representative of Israel to bear in mind what I said earlier in the meeting on the subject of the reasonable licence that we members of the Council and those who are invited to speak before it normally observe and are normally given by the President. The representative of Israel may proceed.

87. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Thank you, Mr. President. I was quoting from a statement made by Mr. Heykal in his weekly editorial article of last Friday. I shall conclude that quotation. Mr. Heykal said:

"If the Arabs will succeed in liberating by force their lands occupied on 5 June 1967, what can actually prevent them in the next phase from liberating by force Palestine itself? "

88. Now, after two weeks of fighting, the situation on the ground is as it is. This is neither the time nor the place to analyse the factors that have brought it about. One factor does belong, however, to this debate. Inherent in it is the very essence of the Middle East conflict. That factor is the spirit of the Israeli fighting man. For 25 years he has been in a war which he did not want, a war which had been imposed on him, but he knew at all times that he was defending his life, the life of his family, the existence of his people, the independence of a State. Opposing him were armies which were told that the Jewish people has no right to equality with other nations. They were told that sand dunes and rocks are more sacred than life, that the restoration of artificial lines through the desert is more important, more valuable than peace and construction and creativity. The Israeli soldier fought to defend the lives of those he loved. The Egyptian and Arab soldier was ordered to fight and die in the name of hatred and hostility. This is the difference between Egyptian-Syrian aggression and Israel's struggle of self-defence. This is why as we meet here this evening the Israeli forces, and behind them the entire people of Israel, can look to the future with certainty and assurance.

89. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Saudi Arabia has asked to be allowed to speak, and I now call on him with an appeal to him to cast his eyes towards the clock. I am sure that he will.

90. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, I would abide by the rules and exercise the right of reply later. But I should like to ask you if there are members who wish to speak. If there are, I defer to them.

91. The PRESIDENT: There are no further names on the list of speakers, unless the representative of Saudi Arabia wishes to speak now, it would be my intention to proceed to the voting. Does the representative of Saudi Arabia wish to speak at this point or does he wish to speak in explanation of vote if we should proceed immediately to the vote?

92. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): How can I speak in explanation of vote? I am not a member of the Council and I cannot vote. If I could vote. I would cast a veto. You know very well that I cannot vote.

93. Mr. SEN (India): Mr. President, I think the point made by the representative of Saudi Arabia is very valid. As a Member of the United Nations invited to take part in our debate, he should be given the floor to exercise the right of reply after the business of the Council is over.

94. I did not inscribe my name on the list of speakers. I think the meeting was convened in such a hurry that there was very little consultation, very little orderly arrangement of statements and so on. I would therefore suggest that, particularly since the purpose of the draft resolution is to stop the fighting, the sooner we adopt it, the better it will be. That is only one aspect. I was therefore wondering whether you, Sir, in your wisdom would not allow the members of the Council to speak, vote—decide on the draft resolution—and then perhaps give the representative of Saudi Arabia the opportunity to exercise the right of reply. From what I gathered from his statement, he would be perfectly happy with this solution. If that is so, and if there are no other names on the list of speakers, I should like to speak now.

95. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

96. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): If my good colleague from India wishes to speak now, I shall be all ears to listen to what he has to say. If he wants to speak after the vote, then I do not mind replying after the vote.

97. But while I have the floor, Sir, I should like to say that I have a great deal of respect for you and to ask you please to bear with me sometimes when I take the floor to explain the situation—which perhaps by this time you know by heart, having served for many years in the United Nations. But I do not speak for the benefit of the old timers, I speak for the benefit of the new members of the Council who have had no opportunity to research the Palestine question and zionism.

98. On the other hand, I am speaking also not to Mr. Scali alone but to the people of the United States who are hosting this Organization, because of the fact that the mass media of information are controlled and manipulated to a large extent by the Zionists. So it stands to reason that I should explain the situation of the Arabs beyond these chambers, unless, of course, my statements are either cut off, slanted or distorted as has been the case for the past 25 years by none other than the Zionist press as well as radio and television in this city and in many other cities of the United States.

99. I shall speak later if my good friend from India wishes to speak now.

100. Mr. SEN (India): By all standards I should be happy that fighting and bloodshed would end by the adoption of the draft resolution before us, but I am not, and this for two weighty reasons. First, for years now we have maintained that justice must be combined with peace. The justice we have repeatedly emphasized is that the Arab lands occupied by Israel must be evacuated before serious and fruitful negotiations could start. Secondly, we have always been cautious, if not obstreperous, about any solution arrived at by the great Powers without full consultation with the general membership of the United Nations.

101. One might argue that that is exactly what we have been doing tonight, but let us examine briefly what has happened. At 8.30 tonight we made a formal call to find out if the Council was meeting tonight, having been told at 7 p.m. that such a meeting was planned and that a draft resolution had been worked out. The next two or three hours we spent in intensive consultation, but of course without instructions or guidance from our own Government.

102. Two matters are quite clear. The first is that the military situation on the field is difficult to assess and that the United States and the Soviet Union have come to an agreement the details of which are not fully known and perhaps cannot and should not be known to us now or in the foreseeable future. So, given this lack of knowledge—a lack explained by the United States reference to the prisoners of war, which is not mentioned in the draft resolution—we are indeed in great difficulty, which I do not have to elaborate.

103. Our second difficulty is that the two Powers, however great and however powerful, have come to an agreement and we have to underwrite it quickly. No non-aligned country can welcome this turn of events, not merely for this specific case but as a general rule to which we have repeatedly drawn attention. None the less, the general conclusion is clear: for whatever reasons the principal parties to the fighting seem to have accepted the joint draft resolution and we have very little choice left to us except to support it. But in doing so, we should make it clear that the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) means first that the Arab territories must be vacated subject to minor adjustments agreed to by the parties, secondly, that Israel has a right to exist as a sovereign State and, thirdly, that a proper settlement of the rights of the Palestinian people must be accepted.

104. Therefore, while we shall support the draft resolution, we cannot be unaware that it is vague—a vagueness compounded by the reference to resolution 242 (1967), which has bedevilled our discussions for six years because of these characteristics—and we shall support it in the hope that this vagueness will not come in the way of a just solution. It is on this understanding that we are prepared to support the joint draft resolution, with many hesitations and several reservations, not the least of which is with regard to the reference to “appropriate auspices” under

which the negotiations are to be held. We can only hope that our hesitations and reservations are unjustified.

105. Mr. MUNGAI (Kenya): When addressing this Council at the 1746th meeting, on 12 October 1973, I stated that a cease-fire should come into effect immediately in the Middle East so that lives and property could be saved. I also stated that the parties concerned should enter into immediate negotiations with a view to solving other outstanding problems. My delegation still believes that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) remains a valid basis for negotiations among the parties concerned. I said that my delegation would participate in every possible constructive effort to bring about a normalization of relations in the Middle East. Bearing this in mind, Kenya welcomes the draft resolution sponsored by the Soviet Union and the United States and just introduced by the delegations of those two countries.

106. Referring to paragraph 1, my delegation heartily welcomes the call for an immediate cessation of fighting in the Middle East. All men of good will would expect the Council to do no less in the wake of the heavy toll of life so far, the grave injuries inflicted on many people and the incalculable destruction of property in the area since the war broke out on 6 October.

107. Referring to paragraph 2, I have said before, and I have just said, that implementation of resolution 242 (1967) forms the basis for a solution in the Middle East. But for six years this resolution has not been implemented. I hope that now there is going to be an honest and earnest desire to have peace in this troubled area. Therefore it is hoped that the factors that have frustrated a realization of the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) will not now occur again.

108. Referring to paragraph 3, I believe that a permanent solution can be found only if both parties in the Middle East conflict have the will and the desire to live in peace with one another. No resolution can bring peace to that ravaged section of the world unless the will to live in peace exists in both parties. If we are to understand that both parties are willing to meet and negotiate to arrive at a just and lasting peace, my delegation will welcome this, but I must make some observations in this regard. I would call upon the super-Powers to desist from accelerating the arms race in the area, because as long as these weapons are supplied they are going to act as catalysts to warfare in that region.

109. At the same time, my delegation believes that to implement resolution 242 (1967), to accomplish the withdrawal of troops, to ensure the inviolability and political independence of every State in the area, to ensure the freedom and rights of navigation in the region and also the rights of the refugees, an international system will be required to guarantee all these points. Yet I believe that the system should come from the United Nations and that there should be regular reports to the Security Council.

110. We in Africa are desirous of having peace in that region. We are a developing nation, and I should like to emphasize that we want to develop and we can only develop in an atmosphere of peace in the world. Unless

there is peace we cannot achieve the results we should like to have. Although we are a small nation and not in a position to dictate any terms to anybody, I believe even small nations can come up with words of wisdom occasionally. Therefore I feel that the African countries should be listened to when we talk here, because of our small size and of our desire to have peace so that we can develop.

111. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We consider that the joint action taken by the United States and the Soviet Union in proposing the draft resolution in document S/11036 represents a step in the right direction, and for this reason the delegation of Panama will vote in favour of it.

112. The suffering and pain of the peoples of the Middle East that are parties to the conflict have been enormous. In particular we deplore the large number of innocent victims. We hope that this cease-fire will minimize the serious risks to world peace because of this war. As the draft resolution we are to vote on speaks of the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) in all of its parts, it is worth recalling that my delegation, in this Council on 14 June last [*1726th meeting*], set forth the position of the Government of Panama as regards the interpretation of resolution 242 (1967).

113. In conclusion, we express the hope that the negotiations to be carried out between the parties will lead to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

114. The PRESIDENT: I had understood that the representative of Saudi Arabia was willing to postpone his statement until after the voting. Does he wish to speak now?

115. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): If you do not want me to speak now, I will speak after the vote is taken, or whenever you say; but I do not want to be interrupted when I speak. It is up to you—to call on me now, or after the vote. I am at your command, so to speak.

116. The PRESIDENT: May I say to the representative of Saudi Arabia that there are now two members of the Council who wish to address the Council, and I feel I should give them priority.

117. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): With pleasure. It is up to you, Sir, to call on me, before the vote or after the vote. I will respect your wishes.

118. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): I will be extremely brief, as I cannot improve on what my colleague from India, Ambassador Sen, has so clearly stated.

119. My delegation has decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution which has been jointly submitted by the Soviet Union and the United States of America. In doing so I would like to remind the Council of what I said in my statement on 9 October last:

“Members have referred to resolution 242 (1967) as the basis for finding a solution to the Middle East problem. My delegation agrees with that view. However, when the

Council adopted resolution 242 (1967), in its wisdom it left the provisions of that resolution open to contradictory interpretations, *a priori* dooming to failure efforts for their implementation. It seems to my delegation that adherence to resolution 242 (1967) alone will not help us towards a solution of the Middle East conflict, as has been proved by the failure of all efforts during the last six years. If resolution 242 (1967) has to be the basis of the search for a solution, the Council has to agree on one and the same interpretation in order to be able to implement its provisions effectively

“As far as my delegation is concerned, the only interpretation of resolution 242 (1967) that can lead us toward peace in the Middle East is to follow the sequence of, first, withdrawal of Israel from occupied Arab territories, then negotiation as to the outstanding issues, including the rights of the Palestinians. If these two aspects are settled, secure and recognized borders can be established and peace has a realistic chance of returning to the Middle East . . .”. [*1744th meeting, paras. 169-170.*]

120. It is with this understanding that my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution, especially with regard to its operative paragraph 2.

121. In conclusion, I would like to assure the Council that Indonesia will co-operate in all efforts to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

122. Mr. PEREZ de CUELLAR (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation could not oppose the adoption of the joint draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, despite its obvious vagueness, since it is intended to put an end to the bloody conflict that has intensified over the past three weeks, and since it reaffirms that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) is the framework for a just and final settlement of the Middle East problem.

123. We fully agree that the cease-fire should determine the concomitant initiation of negotiations among the parties concerned, since, as we said on 11 October, this appeal for an end to the fighting “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” [*1745th meeting, para. 56*].

124. We trust that the “appropriate auspices” mentioned in the draft will directly involve the United Nations through the Secretary-General and the Security Council. And it is worth recalling that the Council is composed of 15 members, eight of which represent the so-called third world.

125. We shall vote in favour of the draft resolution with satisfaction, because it represents the will of the Council to assume its responsibilities; and with hope, since we trust that the parties—that is to say, all the States and peoples concerned that should and must participate in the negotiations—are at last embarked upon the road to peace.

126. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Israel, who, I understand, wishes to supplement his earlier remarks.

127. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I should now like to refer to the draft resolution on which the Security Council is about to vote. In the General Assembly on 8 October¹ and in the Security Council at its recent meetings, the Israel delegation explained its view on the origin of the war now raging in the Middle East. Israel has successfully resisted an attack which, had it succeeded in its objective, would have placed Israel's security in great jeopardy. Our Prime Minister said on 11 October that we have no ambition in this war except to repel an assault on our security. Our supreme national objective is the attainment of a negotiated peace.

128. Those considerations explain our positive attitude to the draft resolution, paragraph 1 of which:

"Calls upon all parties to the present fighting to cease all firing and terminate all military activity immediately, no later than 12 hours after the moment of the adoption of this decision, in the positions they now occupy;"

129. It is evident that Israel's compliance with the proposed cease-fire is conditional on its acceptance and observance by all the States taking part in this fighting. Moreover, every Government accepting the cease-fire must obviously be responsible for ensuring that it should apply not only to its own troops but also to troops from other countries operating on its soil, as well as to irregulars of any kind. We have in mind, for example, the terrorists firing on villages in northern Israel from Lebanese territory, or infiltration across the border. The cessation of military activity must include the elimination of the blockade now imposed by the Republic of Yemen at the Bab el Mandab Straits. The obstruction of waterways to international navigation is certainly an act of war which this resolution should bring to an end.

130. We accept paragraph 2 of the draft resolution in the sense defined by Israel in its decision of 4 August 1970 in connexion with the United States cease-fire initiative, and also in our communication to the Secretary-General of 4 August 1970, and in the address of our Prime Minister, Mrs. Golda Meir in the Knesset on that day.

131. We attach great importance to the provision of the draft resolution in paragraph 3 deciding "that immediately and concurrently with the cease-fire, negotiations shall start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East."

132. We have constantly emphasized that the absence of free, direct, normal peace negotiations between Israel and its neighbours lies at the heart of the deadlock in the Middle East. Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, and the statement made by the representative of the United States represent important progress in international policy on this crucial point.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2143rd meeting.

133. The hostilities launched on 6 October have resulted in hundreds of military personnel becoming prisoners of war. We regard the release of all prisoners of war now held in the countries involved in the conflict as an indispensable condition of any cease-fire agreement.

134. In conveying its positive response to the proposal made by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Government of Israel hopes that the bloodshed and hostility which have tormented the Middle East for so many years will be replaced by an era of peace and co-operation between all the States in our region.

135. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): In our statement at the meeting of the Security Council, on 8 October, in considering the question of Israeli aggression against Egypt and Syria, the Chinese delegation clearly pointed out that:

"If the Security Council is to adopt any resolution at all, it must condemn all the acts of aggression by the Israeli Zionists in the strongest terms, give the firmest support to the Egyptian, Syrian and Palestinian peoples in the just action they are taking to resist the aggressors, demand the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli Zionists from all the Arab territories they have occupied and explicitly provide for the restoration of the national rights of the Palestinian people." [1743rd meeting, para. 57.]

136. The draft resolution tabled today by the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics delegations has failed to reflect that just position. It must also be pointed out that what the two super-Powers have done in the whole course of the current event has revealed their contention as well as collusion in the Middle East and their attempt to impose the situation of "no war, no peace" again on the Arab people. This time, these two super-Powers have hurriedly introduced a draft resolution of their concoction to the Security Council and asked for its immediate adoption allowing of no full consultation between the States members of the Security Council and preventing them from seeking instructions from their respective Governments. This practice of imposing one's views on the Security Council is most unreasonable and is one we cannot agree to.

137. In view of the foregoing, the Chinese delegation decides not to participate in the voting on the draft resolution.

138. Mr. KHALID (Sudan): For over two weeks now the Middle East has been inundated in blood while its children wailed and its mothers wept. In the process more countries were engulfed and the whole area was about to be incinerated by a contagious war. Ever since the outbreak of hostilities on 6 October, none of us has sat idly by. With no sense of partisanship—this is no moment for that—let us praise the solidarity, serenity and sense of justice with which the problem was handled here by the oppressed and their supporters. Without their solidarity and serenity we could not have reached even this initial step. All that they have been calling for, and are still calling for, is an honourable peace, a peace without vilification, blood and

hard feelings among countries that know full well that they depend on each other in a world where no country is an island unto itself.

139. Tonight we were hastily presented with a draft resolution that ostensibly seeks to bring permanent peace to the Middle East. To us—as to our Indian colleague—this draft resolution came as a surprise which we received with a great deal of misgiving, if only because of the complete lack of prior consultations.

140. Some have already welcomed this draft resolution in the sense that all's well that ends well. But is it really going to end well? The cease-fire is an initial step towards the badly needed solution of a problem that needs all our humility and awareness of the consequences attendant on any further faltering. By those words we mean humility and dispatch.

141. If there has been no peace in the Middle East for the last 25 years, it was because of national vanity and the ignorance that such vanity made possible. Israel and its supporters were prompted in their actions by an irrational subjective certainty which leads individuals as well as nations—to use the words of one of the better minds of this century—to what Freudians call “the death wish”.

142. Now that the myth of invincibility has been dislodged, one would hope that the pertinacity with which some people clung to myth will be at least diluted if not dissolved. But what is more important than this is that the great Powers which have always viewed the Middle East through the distorting prism of the Israeli myth should now have a fresh look at the problem, a look with realism and a sense of justice. This is why we guard against any further faltering, and this is how we view the references in the draft resolution to, first, the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in all its parts, and second, immediate negotiations concurrently with the cease-fire for the establishment of a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

143. For this end, all must be clear. We need not resort to ambiguities for the sake of a compromise. Compromise is not an end in itself. Just and durable peace is the end. Ambiguity is the source of all our agony. Mr. Scali told us that we are all familiar with resolution 242 (1967), and indeed we are. We know what peace means. We know what territorial integrity means, and we know what inadmissibility of occupation means. We hope that at long last our minds will be at one with that of the United States on this issue, rather than resorting to the vacuous terms of constructive ambiguity.

144. Our labours have not been in vain thus far. Let us start again now that the chance is afforded the world. Without any intention to introduce any element that might lead to argument, I find it my duty to say clearly that a cease fire, important step that it is, cannot be but a prelude to peace. Peace can only be achieved through the full implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations. Those resolutions speak the mind of the world that wants this crisis out of its way once and for all—and I say the resolutions of the United Nations.

145. There is no peace with occupation. Occupation invites resistance, and resistance is war. There is no peace without going to the root causes of the problem: the Palestinian reality in which face many of us have chosen to fly, including, I should say, some of the successive American administrations. Peace cannot be achieved by clinging to territory.

146. The experience of 6 October is a telling evidence of that. A *pax Israeliana* would have no better luck than the *pax Romana*. The only peace that is valid within the United Nations is the peace of the just.

147. May I refer to one important additional point. The draft resolution is telling us of negotiations “under appropriate auspices”. For us there are no auspices more appropriate than the United Nations. Any other interpretation will be the first transgression of resolution 242 (1967). In this year we have all been preoccupied with the reform of the United Nations, until we were deflected from that honourable cause by the fourth war in the Middle East. I hope we may make a start on this long-cherished hope by putting this new-born babe in its lap. It is the proper ward. Under its auspices, let us hope it will grow and prosper. One cannot conceive of a more appropriate ward, nor of a better-equipped auspices. The big, the medium and the small must stand by it.

148. That is our understanding of resolution 242 (1967). It is the understanding of all but one in this Council, and we hope that the one is coming at long last to the fold. That is our sense of a just and durable peace: the peace of understanding, not dictation of humility, not vanity; of accommodation, not subjugation; of the rule of law and not the logic of expediency and necessity. With the old logic of necessity came the tyrant's plea that excused his devilish deeds. That old logic was the one of a paradise lost. Those who plead it today are only yearning for an impossible dream.

149. With this understanding, and only with this understanding, the Sudan will not adopt a negative attitude towards the draft resolution which is before us.

150. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): My delegation has welcomed the speed with which the Council has been called to meet tonight and is about to act. The terrible war in the Middle East, the renewed bloodshed and destruction, has been a source of deep and growing concern for the world community. In these days the eyes of the world community have been set on the United Nations, and I believe they are set upon us tonight.

151. The new and tragic events in the Middle East have, moreover, cast a large and menacing shadow over the prospects of peace in the world at large, prospects enhanced by recent progress in world détente.

152. My delegation took the earliest possible opportunity in the Council, on 9 October [744th meeting], to call for an immediate cessation of hostilities and renewed efforts to build a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. In the days following the first meetings of the Council, in the face of continued fighting, my Government repeated this call for

an end to the hostilities. In a communiqué signed in Vienna on 12 October, the occasion of the visit of the President of Bulgaria to Austria, the two sides expressed their deep concern about the resumption of hostilities in the Middle East. It was their unanimous understanding that all efforts ought to be made for the immediate cessation of hostilities between the parties to the dispute, and that all the possible appropriate measures ought to be supported in order to attain, in the shortest possible time, a just and lasting peace in the Middle East on the basis of resolution 242 (1967).

153. It is, therefore, for these reasons that my delegation will support with its vote the draft resolution submitted jointly by the USSR and the United States of America. If the cease-fire is the most important step of the hour, concerted efforts to achieve peace, as set out in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution before us, will be the next command to be followed immediately and concurrently.

154. As to the nature and shape of this peace, Austria remains firmly committed to the principles set forth in resolution 242 (1967), whose immediate implementation in all of its parts is now called for. We are fully aware of the delicate structure of balance represented by this draft resolution, whose combined elements have all to be faithfully respected in order to be operative. But we are sure that the cause of peace and the cause of justice can prevail only if this resolution is implemented.

155. We trust that in this task ahead the vast capital of experience and knowledge accumulated by the United Nations in 25 years of continuous peace efforts in the region will be a safe basis on which this new search for peace can be conducted. The Council is now about to exercise its primary responsibility for peace and international security. The Council and the United Nations, in the days to come, will need the full support of the international community, the support of the parties, whose fighting we hope will now come to an end, and the support of the permanent members of the Council, on whom the Charter confers a particularly heavy burden of responsibility.

156. We trust, however, that with this support, rapid and constructive action will be forthcoming, and my delegation is fully prepared to lend its support to all these efforts.

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

158. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): I did hope that this would be a meeting at which I would not speak. But now, having asked for the floor, let me first send a fervent and respectful greeting to those who are standing on both sides of the Suez Canal, defending the freedom and the territorial integrity of their land, Egypt. Let me send an equally fervent and proud greeting to those who are standing on the territory of Syria, fighting for the freedom and territorial integrity of their land, Syria. Those are men who have preferred to stand on their feet and die, rather than to live on their knees.

159. My heart also goes out to the families of the victims of the policies of aggression and violence, of the dreams of

arrogant domination and of living by terror and trying to act as invincible supermen.

160. Having said that, let me state again that the targets of Egypt as I have explained them still stand: liberation of our lands, preservation of our territorial integrity, determination that the usurped rights of the Palestinians will be preserved. These are targets that are not ours alone. Indeed, they are yours; they are the targets for which the overwhelming majority of this Council voted and for which the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly voted, proclaiming again that the acquisition of territory as a result of war is inadmissible; that the territorial integrity of all nations is sacred; that the right of self-determination is one of the most fundamental rights, a right for which men have fought and for which this United Nations will always stand.

161. But I really asked to speak in order to say that I have not heard the two sponsors of the draft resolution say anything concerning the absurd conditions in the paragraphs of the Israeli *diktat* which we have heard in this room. Unless they are really adopted by the two sponsors and we hear them say so, I would consider them to be null and void and having no meaning at all, especially as they come from someone who has given pain to you, I am sure, Mr. President, and to everyone around this table by speaking about this Council and saying that it has been further debased. I am not a member of the Council. Had I been a member, I would certainly have moved that all those words of insult be stricken from the records of this Council.

162. Mrs. Jeanne Martin CISEÉ (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): I shall be very brief. My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document S/11036, submitted by the Soviet Union and the United States, because our affirmative vote will express our position in favour of peace and an end to violence.

163. For 17 days now war has been raging in the Middle East, blood is once again being shed and thousands of human lives are being sacrificed. For these reasons, we welcome paragraph 1 of the draft resolution which calls for an immediate cease-fire.

164. We are happy that the Council has assumed its responsibility for the re-establishment of peace and the maintenance of security in that part of the world that has suffered for 25 years. The joint initiative of the two Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, was greeted with relief by my delegation, which has always placed responsibility on the great Powers in the conflict that pits the Powers in the Middle East against each other. The events we have been witnessing for the last few hours show that we have been quite right.

165. We express the hope that the resolution on which we shall shortly be voting will actually be put into effect. We should like to believe that its adoption will mean the withdrawal by Israel from all occupied Arab territories and the preservation of the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine. It will also mean for us that the negotiations envisaged in paragraph 3 of the draft will be carried out at the United Nations, through the United Nations.

166. The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of Saudi Arabia insist on speaking now? We had understood that he was happy to accept a promise from me that after we had completed the voting I should be glad to call on him.

167. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I will speak after the voting, Mr. President, if you insist. I know what the voting will be. But if you insist, I will abide by your wish. I think I should be afforded a chance to say a few words, but if you want me to speak later, I will. However, I do not see why an exception should be made with regard to my request. Still, I am in your hands, but I do not want anybody to say that you took advantage of me, because we are friends, outside of politics.

168. The PRESIDENT: The last thing I wish to do is to deny my friend the representative of Saudi Arabia full opportunity to express his views. However, I do appeal to him, if I may, to withhold his request to speak until after we have finished the voting. There will, I think, be other statements at that time and we shall be very happy to listen to him then.

169. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I will do that—but only to please you, Sir.

170. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers, and it is therefore my intention to ask the Council to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution contained in document S/11036. As no representative wishes to speak at this stage in explanation of his vote, I take it that the Council is ready to vote on the draft resolution.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

One member (China) did not participate in the voting.

The draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none.²

171. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Yugoslavia in explanation of vote.

172. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Point of order.

173. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

174. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): My understanding was that I would take the floor after the voting. I do not know whether explanations of vote are part and parcel of the voting. The vote is one thing, and an explanation of vote is another. I do not want to be left to the last. I was generous with my colleagues, although I could have exercised my right of reply as Mr. Tekoah did. But generosity has gone far enough. May I now take the floor?

175. The PRESIDENT: I assure the representative of Saudi Arabia that he will not be the last speaker, but I do appeal to him to be patient a little longer while I call on the representative of Yugoslavia. Then I shall call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

176. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): The Yugoslav delegation has listened most attentively and carefully to the state-

ments made by the sponsors of the draft resolution, the representative of the United States, Mr. Scali, and the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Malik. Let us hope that the joint action of these two permanent members of the Security Council will indeed make a major contribution to a lasting and just peace, because peace without justice will bring the same consequences as those with which we have been faced during all these years. Let us also hope that the termination of all military activities not only will save human lives, the lives of fighters and civilians of all the present belligerent parties, but will also save future generations from the same tragic losses, suffering and sacrifices.

177. In explanation of the vote of the Yugoslav delegation I would like to state clearly the following. The Yugoslav position on the matter of the Middle East crisis, its origins and the steps to be taken towards its settlement is both firm and well known. It was recently stated clearly in the Council's debates in June and July. It was contained in the non-aligned countries' draft resolution [S/10974], which received 13 affirmative votes in the Security Council. It was stated at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, in Algiers, and it was also stated in our statement in the general debate in the General Assembly,³ as well as in our statement in the Security Council on 9 October last [1744th meeting].

178. Concerning the provisions of the resolution which has just been adopted, we note that the provision for the cease-fire in place is firmly linked to the immediate start of negotiations for the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). We have supported resolution 242 (1967) since its adoption and have always considered it as an agreed basis for a settlement, and therefore all the principles and requirements of that resolution must be equally implemented. And here we would like to state most categorically our firm understanding of what that entails.

179. First, it clearly requires the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the territories occupied as a result of the 1967 war; and that means withdrawal to the lines of 5 June 1967. There can be no other interpretation because that same resolution postulates another basic principle which is generally accepted by the United Nations, and that is the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war.

180. Second, following those two principles, it recognizes the right of all States and peoples in the region to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force. Secure and recognized boundaries cannot be based on conquest, terror or military occupation. We indeed agree that occupation means resistance, and that justified resistance leads to war, and that therefore peace and occupation cannot coexist. Secure and recognized boundaries result from peace, from the legal acceptance of such boundaries through the liquidation of the state of belligerency and any need to make war—which means that the occupation of all Arab territories acquired by war must be terminated. Such secure and recognized boundaries can then be guaranteed through some international system

² See resolution 338 (1973).

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2130th meeting.

within the framework of the United Nations, once we have the commitment on the essential point: the withdrawal of troops from all occupied territories.

181. Third, the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine must be recognized and implemented. Our debates here in June and July, numerous resolutions of the General Assembly, and subsequent events have again proved that the plight and the fate of the Arabs of Palestine and their rights are one of the fundamental issues at stake. We cannot build the structure of peace leaving out the solution of this problem which, if left unsettled, will continue to cause major convulsions in the Middle East.

182. In saying all that, I should like everyone to note that it is the most fundamental Yugoslav position, the position of basic principle, that we the United Nations cannot negate any people's right to fight for the liberation of its territory. No cease-fire, including the one on which we have just decided, should be a cover for continued occupation and annexation. No cease-fire can survive unless it is clearly and specifically linked to the immediate beginning of the process of solving the basic problem, which is the problem of the occupation of all Arab territories. Resolution 242 (1967) postulates the territorial integrity of all the States in the area too. On the basis of that, a system can be devised to enable all the States in the region, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, with all the other principles of resolution 242 (1967) implemented as well.

183. In conclusion, I would like also to point out that the basic Yugoslav position was always that the over-all solution of the Middle East crisis, and particularly the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) in all its parts, should not only be based on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, but also should be firmly in the hands of the United Nations and its main organ, the Security Council. In this spirit, we understand the resolution just adopted, particularly paragraph 3.

184. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

185. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I did not use insulting words filled with venom against the Jews, to paraphrase what Mr. Tekoah said in exercise of his right of reply. Nor did I at any time interrupt Mr. Tekoah whenever he took the floor in this Council. But it seems that the truth of what I said must have so cut him to the quick as to elicit what almost amounted to a vitriolic verbal barrage. I am used to Mr. Tekoah's effusions. I feel sorry for him for having developed the Zionist psychosis as to the right of the Jews, wherever they come from, to flock to Palestine in accordance with the Zionist ideology. Does he claim that all Jews living in the world, and especially those of the Soviet Union and the United States, should settle in Palestine? What if five or 10 million Jews emigrated to Israel within the next decade or two? The Soviet Union has been under great pressure from the United States Congress and the Senate to allow Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith to emigrate to Israel. Thirty-three thousand emigrated from the Soviet Union in one year to Israel. If the United States had failed to admit Jews in 1945 and 1946, as I well

remember, why doesn't Congress open the gates of the United States to Soviet Jews, especially those emigrating from the Soviet Union? They can give them territory in Texas, or in Kansas. New York does not have any more room for them.

186. Why, my dear Mr. Scali, do you not ask your Government—through you I am asking them—“Why do you want to go to Palestine?” Now, for your information—I am sure you are a learned man, and know the Zionist ideology—it is for the ingathering of all the Jews of the world in the land of their so-called ancestors. They had forgotten that this was the land of Canaan, populated before our Jewish tribes sauntered to the south and finally went to Egypt.

187. Of course, Ambassador Malik of the Soviet Union does not know any more than I do what secret deal was struck between Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Brezhnev. Surely the two super-Powers have come to an agreement without consulting with the members of the Council. We ourselves who are not members of the Council were left outside the pale of Mr. Kissinger's negotiation with Mr. Brezhnev. Without observing diplomatic niceties and antiquated decorum, I would be failing in my duty if I did not say that both these Powers could have prevailed on Israel to abide by the Charter and to respect the score of resolutions passed by this Council during the last 25 years. Or have we gone back to the era of brinkmanship resorted to by the late John Foster Dulles? Or again, I must frankly ask the representatives of both the Soviet Union and the United States, have they struck a secret deal—whilst we were left in the dark—to serve their national interests? The super-Powers may inadvertently be prolonging the suffering and misery of the people of the Middle East, whether Jew or gentile, in order to salvage their détente. Time will tell. We will be patient while people are lost.

188. And now, a few remarks to the representatives of the host country, meaning the United States of America. Again I must say we did nothing to hurt you—we, the Arabs in their totality. Do you want your interests in our part of the world to go with the wind? You do not care. You are 6 per cent of the population of the world and you want to police the whole world, including ourselves. You will not succeed. We have not hurt you. We appeal to you to come to your senses and not send Phantoms to kill our people there. Ah, the Soviet Union has sent arms. But who started not only sending arms but being committed to the Zionist State? We warned you time and again and you did not heed our warning. But because you are 210 million and wield world power, we should be submissive. What did Tom Paine say—you remember, do you not—about liberty and death? He said that if he could not have liberty, he would take death. And that is how we feel in the Arab world about the United States. Otherwise do you think a gentleman 67 years old, none other than His Majesty King Faisal, who was always called a friend of the United States, would have stopped the inflow of the oil? And to the great honour of Libya, of Algeria, of Kuwait, of Qatar, of Bahrain—there were eight of them—you treat them wantonly as if they did not exist. What have they done to you? You are committed to the preservation of Israel in contravention of the mutual interest between you and the Arab world. All

right, if you want to have it that way. This is only a round in the conflict. Your journalists always say: "It is the only democratic State in the Middle East." Let me ask you, my good friend Mr. Scali—you are a noted journalist—who are the masters of the mass media in your country. When I first came to this country in 1933 there were five major newspapers in this city: *The New York Times*, which had been bought by Ochs, who had one of his daughters married to Sulzberger, and they are still the owners; there was *The Herald Tribune* owned by Whitney—they would not advertise in it any more so it had to fold up; there was *The Sun*—you remember *The Sun*; leave aside the *Brooklyn Eagle*; these were independent newspapers; there was the Hearst *Journal American*—do you remember it; and there was the *Daily News*, which had to support the Zionists because if it did not, they would not advertise in it. Those were the principal newspapers in New York City. Who now owns the mass medium of the press here? *The New York Times* and *The New York Post*, and they are both Zionist.

189. Freedom of the press? All right, who are the masters of the mass media in another field, television? You would like to know them, would you not? Who is the President of ABC? Leonard Goldenson? He is a gentile from New England is he not—Vermont? Then there is Mr. Martin Rubenstein. At CBS the top man, there since 1948, is William S. Paley. And Robert Sarnoff, the son of Robert Sarnoff Sr., controls NBC. I could go on and on.

190. Have you forgotten the \$72 million with which the Zionists bought many provincial newspapers in the United States? That was a few years ago.

191. I challenge Mr. Tekoah, or whoever now sits in his chair—Mr. Tekoah is gone; he probably got so irritated tonight; I feel sorry for him; let him go and have some rest—to refute what I said. Those are the facts.

192. Why do I raise my voice? You want me to pursue the orthodox way, the game of saying what I do not mean and meaning what I do not say. What a game. It foundered before the Congress of Vienna when Talleyrand and Metternich divided Europe into spheres of influence.

193. Let us do something else, let us probe a little more. You, the United States—whom we befriended and which befriended us allegedly—out of 30 foreign grants voted by your legislators in Washington 12 were for Israeli schools and hospitals. Total: \$5,620,000. That grant was voted at a time when schools all over this country, the United States, were closing up or cutting down the school year for lack of funds. Poor American taxpayers; what they do not know.

194. Where is the television now? Has the United States shut it off? Let them hear. Perhaps they will set the legislators on the right path.

195. And that Mr. Henry Jackson from the State of Washington, which is almost 3,000 miles from here. I know the State of Washington; it produces luscious apples. He would have done better to be a farmer there than, at 6,000 miles from our homeland, to raise the banner of those who

have persecuted the indigenous people of Palestine. Henry Jackson, more Jew than the Jews, more Zionist than the Zionists, *plus royaliste que le roi*.

196. And then the array of senators. Seventy-eight of them. Are they bringing pressure on you—not you, my good friend, but your Government—to give most-favoured-nation status? We are sold down the river and you here namby-pamby, vote for a resolution. Another round will come.

197. Baroody is telling you that because I am a man of the area. Those people from Shanghai and South Africa know nothing of the situation. And also the members here know nothing of the situation, with the exception of our colleague from China, who instead of vetoing perhaps saw best not to participate in the debate because his veto might have been misinterpreted. The only one who stood, China—800 million—kept in the dark like us about the deal which was struck between Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Brezhnev—Mr. Kissinger, the Nobel Prize winner. Since when he negotiated thousands were killed and millions became destitute.

198. Let us see why all this trouble with our Jewish brethren, because after all we are brothers in humanity, although we are having wars. Now let Mr. Tekoah refute and say I am fabricating history. He has his prefabricated speeches. I see them handed to him; I am well located here; they hand them to him, typewritten before he reads them out word for word. Whom does he think he is fooling?

199. I do not have a prefabricated statement, but I have these statistics so that my memory will not falter. And I challenge the Zionists to refute what I am going to say.

200. Since the days of the ancient Egyptians when Moses led the Israelites to Palestine, Rome expelled those Zionists amongst them who set themselves apart, and the poor innocent Jew suffered. That was in the year 70 A.D.

201. And England. Where is Sir Donald Maitland? Has he become tired? Go to the Encyclopaedia Britannica, which, incidentally, is now published in Chicago. Yes, put on a bold face, my good young friend from the United Kingdom. You will find that England expelled them in 1290.

202. Germany did so in 1298. And of course Hitler carried out a lot of persecution, and we all deplore those who perished at his hands. But now a *volte-face*. West Germany wants to do business with international bankers, as they call them. They have to be in the good graces of Mrs. Meir to wash away the sins of the Nazi era. But Germany expelled them in 1298.

203. I see Mr. Lecompt is here. Ambassador de Guiringaud has gone to sleep too. France expelled them in 1306, Austria in 1421, Spain in 1492, Portugal in 1496. Oh, the racists—Portugal—they should never have done that.

204. These were Zionists, the leaders—not the poor Jews, who were living at peace wherever they went. These were Zionists. Mr. Tekoah talked of zionism, of the glory and greatness it enfolded in its ideology. Now more and more

jets are promised for Israel, cease-fire or no cease-fire, and if the cease-fire one day ceases to be, will there be an outflow of diabolic arms sent by the United States on credit—which means pay later or perhaps not at all? What do you think the United States Congress, which is forcing the hand of the United States President, is doing to us? It is killing the Palestinians and usurping their homes. Here again I want to use that American term “namby pamby”. These are the poor Jews. Some of the Jews are poor. Some of them are taxi drivers. Some of them want to identify themselves, and have done so, with their countries of birth or adoption. But the Zionists do not leave them alone. They want them all ingathered in Palestine—10 million, 20 million, as many as they can. Will they succeed? This is the big question.

205. Those are the facts, which are not fabricated. Every word of them will be found in the record. If I have made one or two mistakes unwittingly, I stand to be corrected, but I challenge anyone to refute those historical facts.

206. Now, looking at the resolution—the last inspiration—paragraph 3 states: “*Decides* that, immediately and concurrently with the cease-fire, negotiations shall start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices”. What will prevent Israel from saying that the negotiations to start between the parties concerned should be at the same table? Who is going to say what “under appropriate auspices” means? The vagueness reminds me of “occupied territories”—whether they are “occupied territories” or “the occupied territories”. For six years Israel has debated this definite article “the” and the way it wants the phrase to be interpreted. Who is going to be the arbiter in these matters? Of course the Soviet Union and the United States can put an end to it and prevail on Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories and to grant the Palestinian people their right of self-determination. They fought the mighty Hitler. Can they not prevail on Israel? Or do they have some interest with Israel? Let them come out with it if they have and not hide it.

207. I am getting personal and unorthodox in my approach to the subject. What is the use of not speaking the truth and giving vent to our suspicions? We hope our suspicion is unfounded, because we like Jews—we do not have anything against the Jews. We have to defend ourselves from Zionist aggression in our midst. Let Zionism, political Zionism, disappear and no Jew, I can guarantee, will be molested. In our tradition we will defend the Jews if anyone tries to molest them. Israel’s ideology is European and alien to our area. If it wants peace, let it bring down the flag and let there be a common flag. This is what I have said time and again to the usurpers, who, it seems, have got drunk with the euphoria of victory, as others have. The Arabs had four empires. When their leaders got drunk they tottered and fell, and rightly so. I hope we have learnt from history. But the Zionists, like the Bourbons, forget nothing and learn nothing. They are the aristocracy of the world. They are the chosen people of God. All the others are second. We were put in a second mould by God. What

about those who do not believe in God or do not belong to a monotheistic religion? Should they be sent to hell or what? All this is fiction that God gave them Palestine.

208. I thank you, Sir, for your indulgence and for having kindly at last given me the floor.

209. The PRESIDENT: It is exceedingly late and we have done what we came here to do, but I hope members of the Council will bear with me for not more than one minute longer before I adjourn the meeting.

210. I believe that we members of the Council both individually and collectively should have reason to feel satisfaction at the outcome of our meeting this Sunday night and Monday morning.

211. The fighting in the Middle East which broke out two weeks ago on Saturday, which has raged unchecked since then and which we have considered at four meetings has been, I think we can all agree, a source of grave concern to the world community at large and no less to us as members of the Council, charged as we are under the Charter of the United Nations with grave responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. It was our duty in this Council to work with all the power at our command to bring an end to this most tragic war and to co-operate in building henceforward a lasting peace in the Middle East. As members of the Council we must unite now in calling upon the parties to accept this resolution and to work urgently, diligently and faithfully to implement it. The resolution can succeed only if the parties determine to make it succeed. For our part, we must stress that we expect them to do so, without at all underestimating the difficulties that lie before them. We must also send to them on our collective behalf the clearest possible message that we stand ready at all times to render them all the assistance they may need to attain the objective of the resolution, which ultimately must surely be a peace in which all men, women and children in that troubled region of the world can live in conditions free from fear and want.

212. Speaking now as the representative of AUSTRALIA, I wish only to associate myself fully with what I have just said as President of the Council. The adoption of this resolution will be received with great satisfaction and relief by the Australian Government and people. As a nation we welcome it whole-heartedly, and we shall offer our full support and sympathy to the crucial work of implementation.

213. As PRESIDENT, I now propose to adjourn this meeting. The Council will, of course, continue to watch developments with the closest attention and will be ready to meet again at any time if it can assist the parties concerned to carry out as speedily as possible the terms of this resolution.

The meeting rose on Monday, 22 October, at 1.30 a.m.