



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

OCT - 7 1980

1748th

MEETING: 23 OCTOBER 1973

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1748/Rev.1)	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-EIGHTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 23 October 1973, at 4 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/1748/Rev.1)

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 4.35 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

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

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

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Zayyat (Egypt), Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) and Mr. H. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic) took places at the Council table.

2. 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.

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

4. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): A lot of precious time has already been lost since we asked that the Council should meet. I do not therefore propose to lose any more time. We have asked for a meeting of the Council to consider the non-implementation of its resolution 338 (1973), the breaking down of the cease-fire ordered by the Council.

5. Mr. President, if you would allow me, I would defer any remarks until the Council has taken a stand on this subject.

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

7. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Before the vote on Security Council resolution 338 (1973) I declared at the meeting of 21 October, in conveying the positive response of the Government of Israel to the proposal made by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that "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" [1747th meeting, para. 134].

8. Bloodshed has not stopped because those who started the bloodshed on Yom Kippur of 6 October are continuing it. The attitude that the parties would take to the Security Council's cease-fire call was evident from the very beginning of the Egyptian-Syrian aggression.

9. It was no secret that the Security Council on 12 October suspended its week-long discussions of the renewed fighting, unable to reach any decision on the cessation of hostilities, because Egypt and Syria and their supporters did not want any such decision. It is no secret that the Security Council did not meet for nine days between 12 October and 21 October, while the fighting was raging, because the Arab aggressor States and their followers wanted the bloodshed and destruction to continue. The attitude of the parties to a cease fire was also evident at our last meeting. At that meeting Israel expressed its readiness to comply with the proposed cease-fire on the understanding that it would be accepted and observed by all the States taking part in the fighting. The Syrian representative remained silent. The Egyptian Foreign Minister had some

comments about my statement, but did not respond to the cease-fire call.

10. Immediately after the adoption of resolution 338 (1973) the Government of Israel announced that it agreed to the cease-fire in accordance with that resolution. Iraq was first among the Arab Governments to reject the cessation of hostilities. It was followed by Libya, Algeria and others of the 10 Arab States participating in the aggression against Israel. Syria did not respond to the cease-fire call at all. Jordan made some positive affirmations, but announced that the Jordanian armed forces on the Syrian front were under Syrian command and would abide by Syria's orders. A few hours before the cease-fire was to enter into force the Egyptian Government announced that it agreed to it.

11. The Government of Israel responded immediately with the following communiqué:

"The Government of Israel has been informed that the Government of Egypt has instructed the armed forces of Egypt to cease hostilities in accordance with the Security Council resolution concerning a cease-fire. Following on this, the Government of Israel has given orders to the Israel defence forces to stop the fighting on the Egyptian front at 1852 hours this evening local time, provided it is confirmed that the Egyptians have indeed ceased hostilities. The cease-fire will therefore come into effect at the end of the 12-hour period stipulated in the Security Council resolution."

12. It soon became apparent, however, that Egypt's professed acceptance of the cease-fire was not being translated into action. Those who followed the news from the area yesterday as the hour of the cease-fire was approaching and then after the cease-fire deadline recall that there was virtually no time during which the Egyptian forces stopped shooting. The cease-fire never became effective. One report after another carried by international news agencies and correspondents at the front, broadcast over the radio and television, gave information of continued Egyptian attacks in violation of the cease-fire.

13. The shooting became particularly violent at 2038 hours when Egyptian forces opened fire on the Israel bridgehead on the west bank of the Suez Canal from the east and from the north. At 2056 hours the Egyptians opened fire on the Israel bridgehead from north of Deversoir. Later, Israeli forces were shelled from bazookas. At 2123 hours Egyptians again opened fire on the Israeli bridgehead. At 2132 hours there was bazooka shelling, and at 2134 hours the bazooka shelling of Israeli forces intensified and was extended in area. While this was taking place the spokesman of the Israel defence forces repeatedly drew attention to these Egyptian attacks.

14. At 20 hours local time, only one hour and eight minutes after the cease-fire he announced:

"Egyptian artillery fire at the area of Israel's bridgehead north of the Bitter Lake. Artillery fire on Israel forces in the northern section of the front. Egyptian fire on Israel forces in the area of Ismailia."

15. At 2230 hours he announced that Egyptian forces had opened fire on Israel forces at several points along the cease-fire line. And early this morning, 23 October, at 0050 hours, we announced that the cease-fire had not been observed; that the Egyptians were shooting with all kinds of weapons in almost all sectors of the Egyptian front.

16. At 0555 hours the communiqué stated that the Egyptians had opened artillery and other fire on Israel forces towards the end of the night of 22-23 October; at 0800 hours, early this morning, that the Egyptians had opened heavy fire on Israel forces on the west bank of the Suez Canal; and at 0900 hours, that the Egyptian forces were continuing to violate the cease-fire in the southern sector of the Suez Canal.

17. Facing this situation, the Israeli defence forces were ordered to continue fighting in this sector of the front.

18. It is clear who accepted the cease-fire and who rejected it, who has observed it and who has violated it. Of all the 10 Arab States attacking Israel, there was only one that was willing to announce that it would order its forces to cease hostilities. However, even this announcement has thus far proved to be spurious.

19. In the light of the developments, Egypt's announcement yesterday that it accepted the cease-fire appears to have been nothing but a propaganda move under the cover of which the Egyptian forces expected to continue their attacks in places of their own choosing and in the hope that the Israeli forces would remain restrained by the cease-fire orders. It was inevitable that such a design should misfire. It was inevitable that the Israeli forces should react to Egyptian aggression.

20. That, and only that, is what has been happening since last night. Israel cannot acquiesce in the notion that the Egyptian forces should be free to attack us and to inflict casualties while the Israeli defence forces should remain passive, confined to their positions, and should refrain from taking all the action necessary for self-defence.

21. The fact of Egyptian aggression is the cause of Israel's military actions since yesterday, and it is the fact that will determine the Israel Government's attitude towards any draft resolution or resolutions submitted to the Security Council.

22. Israel's position remains as expressed in my statement to the Security Council on 21 October. Israel is prepared to cease fire immediately, provided Egypt ceases fire. As I emphasized in my statement at the last meeting, Israel accepted the cease-fire in the hope that all the Arab States would accept it and all the parties would observe it.

23. The problem which together with the actual observance of the cease-fire weighs most heavily upon us is the question of prisoners of war. Our experience in the past compels us to feel serious concern regarding the situation of Israeli prisoners of war and to strive for their speedy release in the framework of a general exchange of prisoners of war. We have taken note of the undertaking expressed at the Council meeting of 21 October on behalf of the sponsors of

resolution 338 (1973) that "there should be an immediate exchange of prisoners of war" [*ibid.*, para.10]. As I declared on that occasion, 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. Israel expects that urgent action will be taken to bring that about.

24. Mr. SCALI (United States of America): I have been authorized by my Government to sponsor with the Soviet Union a draft resolution [S/11039] which reads as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Referring to its resolution 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973,

"1. Confirms its decision on an immediate cessation of all kinds of firing and of all military action, and urges that the forces of the two sides be returned to the positions they occupied at the moment the cease-fire became effective;

"2. Requests the Secretary-General to take measures for immediate dispatch of United Nations observers to supervise the observance of the cease-fire between the forces of Israel and the Arab Republic of Egypt, using for this purpose the personnel of the United Nations now in the Middle East and first of all the personnel now in Cairo."

25. I should like to reserve the right to comment briefly at a later stage of the proceedings.

26. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I should like to reserve my right to speak on the substance of the question somewhat later.

27. For the present I wish to state that the Soviet delegation, jointly with the United States delegation, is introducing a draft resolution, the aim of which is to confirm the decision taken by the Security Council on 22 October for an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal without delay of troops to the positions they occupied at the time when the Council ordered the cease-fire which came into force on 22 October 1973.

28. This draft resolution also provides that the Secretary-General be requested to dispatch United Nations observers immediately to the cease-fire area. I should particularly like to emphasize that both sponsors of the draft resolution, the Soviet Union and the United States, consider that the troops of the parties should be returned to the positions they occupied at the time the cease-fire adopted in resolution 338 (1973) came into force—that is, their positions at 1250 hours New York time on 22 October.

29. The Soviet delegation would urge members of the Council to take a decision immediately on the basis of the draft resolution before it, and I formally propose that, in view of the urgency of this question and the situation on the spot, the draft resolution should be put to a vote immediately and all delegations wishing to speak should have an opportunity to do so after adoption of the draft resolution.

30. The PRESIDENT: I still have on the list of speakers the names of some representatives who wish to speak before any voting takes place. The next speaker—

31. I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

32. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I have formally proposed that the draft resolution be put to the vote. I wish to put forward my procedural proposal that the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union and the United States should be voted on immediately.

33. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of China on a point of order.

34. Mr. CHIAO Kuan-hua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Mr. President, the Chinese delegation would like to speak. We cannot allow any imposition of view. May I speak now?

35. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I wish to speak on a point of order.

36. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has raised a point of order. Could I ask the representative of China to wait while we hear the point of order that is raised by the representative of the Soviet Union?

37. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): There is no question of imposing anything. We have here a draft resolution, a very simple resolution, with which all members of the Security Council became acquainted a few hours ago. Israel, the aggressor, has violated the decision of the Security Council on the cease-fire, and Egypt, as the victim of aggression, has proposed to the Security Council that it should convene urgently. The meeting was scheduled for 12 o'clock. Because of various manipulations, the meeting started, in fact, only at 4.30 p.m. This is an urgent matter and the situation is critical. According to rule 34 of the provisional rules of procedure, I am proposing that this draft resolution should be voted upon and that we should hold a discussion after that. I am accordingly presenting the formal motion that my proposal on the vote on the draft resolution should be put to the vote for a decision by the Security Council.

38. The PRESIDENT: I ask the representative of China to state what I understand is his point of order.

39. Mr. CHIAO Kuan-hua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Mr. President, the statement just made by my colleague, Mr. Malik, is completely unreasonable. Before the United States and Soviet draft resolution is even tabled, you allow no one else to speak. This is the wrong attitude. We are firmly opposed to that. The United Nations is not a tool to be manipulated by the two super-Powers.

40. This morning the President of the Security Council informed the Chinese delegation that an urgent meeting of the Security Council would be held to discuss the so-called

violation of the cease-fire in the Middle East. After we arrived at the conference hall the Chinese delegation was told that there would be no Security Council meeting and that the United States and the Soviet Union would reach an agreement, which would then be transmitted through consensus to the Secretary-General for implementation.

41. The Chinese delegation firmly opposes such a malicious practice of using the United Nations Security Council as a tool to be juggled with by the two super-Powers at will. In our opinion, this also shows utter disrespect for the other States members of the Security Council. The Chinese delegation cannot tolerate such a practice. We have something to say. We believe that the other States members of the Security Council also have something to say from the bottom of their hearts.

42. Now the Chinese delegation would like to state once again our views on the Middle East situation and on the manipulation of the Security Council by the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union.

43. Since 6 October the broad masses of the army men and people of Egypt, Syria and Palestine have won a series of brilliant victories in their heroic fight against Israeli aggression. Egyptian national flags have again fluttered over the territories on the eastern bank of the Suez Canal which had been occupied for more than six years. The Syrian army men and people have inflicted heavy casualties on the enemy troops at the Golan Heights. The Palestinian guerrillas have also launched attacks valiantly. The sacred fight against aggression—

44. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I wish to speak on a point of order.

45. Mr. CHIAO Kuan-hua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): This is unreasonable, Mr. President. It is unreasonable for the representative of the Soviet Union to interrupt my statement. Why should he have such a privilege?

46. The PRESIDENT: I must say to the representatives of China that it is, I think, the normal practice of this Council when a point of order is raised by a member to give that member the opportunity—

47. Mr. CHIAO Kuan-hua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Mr. President, I did not interrupt his statement. He should allow me to finish my statement. Mr. Malik, you can speak when it is your turn to do so. Could you not wait a little while?

48. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Point of order.

49. The PRESIDENT: Could I appeal to the representative of the Soviet Union to allow—

50. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I wish to speak on a point of order. I should like to point out that anyone delaying with futile talk the adoption by the Security Council of an

urgent resolution to restrain the aggressor is in fact helping the aggressor. Therefore, I insist that the draft resolution—which has been placed before a meeting of the Security Council that was convened urgently at the request of the victim of aggression—should be put to the vote immediately.

At this point a number of representatives, without having been called upon by the President, made interjections simultaneously from their places at the Council table, and others at the side of the Council Chamber called out.

51. The PRESIDENT: Order, please. This meeting is suspended for ten minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 5.10 p.m. and was resumed at 5.30 p.m.

52. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of China.

53. Mr. CHIAO Kuan-hua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Mr. President, my statement was interrupted. I should like to express my dissatisfaction. I should like to voice my protest.

54. On 21 October the Soviet Union and the United States concocted a draft resolution allowing no one the time for consideration and allowing no one the time to report to and ask for instructions from their respective Governments, trying to railroad the draft resolution through the Council. Such imposition is intolerable. As far as the Chinese side is concerned, taking into consideration the over-all situation, we refrained from vetoing it and adopted the method of not participating in the vote. Originally we could have vetoed it. Why not? Why cannot a United States and Soviet draft resolution be vetoed? However, our goodwill has been abused.

55. Today, before the draft was introduced and even up to now we still do not have the Chinese text. How can we vote? Now, there is talk that we should take a vote right away. Does the world belong solely to the United States and the Soviet Union? It does not. The Chinese have the right to speak. The other members of the Council have the right to speak. Because you interrupted my statement, Mr. President, I should like to start from the beginning.

56. I know that my colleague, Mr. Malik, has something to say. Of course, Mr. Malik, but please wait. What does it matter? If you have truth on your side, what does it matter if you wait a few moments? Is that not right? You should do things with style. Show your style. Why the hurry? There is no hurry. It does not matter. If you have something to say, you can say it. There is place for you to say it. You can say it here. Please wait, do not be in such a hurry. I have known you for decades. You have never changed your old habits. Why do you not change your ways a little bit?

57. Now, Mr. President, I should like to start from the beginning, and I ask for your indulgence.

58. This morning the President of the Security Council informed the Chinese delegation that an urgent meeting of

the Security Council would be held to discuss the so-called violation of the cease-fire in the Middle East. After we arrived at the conference hall the Chinese delegation was told that there would be no Security Council meeting and that the United States and the Soviet Union would reach an agreement which would then be transmitted through consensus to the Secretary-General for implementation.

59. The Chinese delegation firmly opposes such a malicious practice of using the United Nations Security Council as a tool to be juggled with by the two super-Powers at will. In our opinion, this also shows utter disrespect for the other States members of the Security Council. The Chinese delegation cannot tolerate such a practice. We have something to say. We believe that the other States members of the Security Council also have something to say from the bottom of their hearts.

60. Now, the Chinese delegation would like to state once again our views on the Middle East situation and on the manipulation of the Security Council by the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union.

61. Since 6 October the broad masses of the army men and people of Egypt, Syria and Palestine have won a series of brilliant victories in their heroic fight against Israeli aggression. Egyptian national flags have again fluttered over the territories on the eastern bank of the Suez which had been occupied for more than six years. The Syrian army men and people have inflicted heavy casualties on the enemy troops at the Golan Heights. The Palestinian guerrillas have also launched attacks valiantly.

62. The sacred fight against aggression and for the recovery of occupied territories waged by the army men and people of Egypt, Syria and Palestine has broken through the situation of "no war, no peace", deliberately created by the two super-Powers in the Middle East for their respective interests, exploded the myth about the "invincibility" of Israel and demonstrated the strong fighting will of the Arab and Palestine people, who have been greatly encouraged. At the same time, many Arab countries have successively sent out their troops to the front of war against aggression and fought shoulder to shoulder with the army men and people of Egypt, Syria and Palestine.

63. Many other Arab countries and people are giving active support and assistance by various means to this war against aggression, demonstrating the unprecedented militant unity of the Arab countries in their common fight against the enemy. The facts prove that the Arab and Palestinian people are heroic people and that the struggle they have been waging since 6 October is perfectly just. The United Nations and all justice-upholding and peace-loving countries and people of the world are duty bound to give the most active support and assistance to it, and no one has any right to engage in obstructions and sabotage.

64. However, we have to point out with indignation here that the two super-Powers have played a most inglorious role throughout the incident. It is known to all that the dangerous development of events in the Middle East is caused not by the Arab and Palestinian people but by the

Israeli Zionist aggression and provocations with the support and connivance of the two super-Powers. After Israel unleashed the recent new provocations, the two super-Powers have successively supplied arms to the belligerent parties. Here it must be pointed out that in supplying arms to the Arab countries the purpose of the Soviet Union is by no means to give true support to them in resisting Israeli provocations, but to control the development of the Middle East situation so that it will not go beyond the limits it has agreed to with the other super-Power.

65. The Soviet Union also made a big hue and cry that the Arab peoples' struggle against aggression had confronted détente with a "dangerous development of events" and that the development of the situation "ran counter to" the easing of tension recently attained.

66. What does this show? This shows that what the Soviet Union calls "détente" is based on the submissive prostration of all oppressed nations and peoples before the condominium of the two super-Powers. The United States and the Soviet Union, contending as well as colluding with each other, have blamed and obstructed in every possible way the just struggle of the Egyptian, Syrian and Palestine people against aggression and are trying by all possible means to strangle it, for the purpose of stopping the struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples, biting their hands and leaving them at the mercy of the two super-Powers.

67. In order to further divide up spheres of influence in the Middle East and re-impose the situation of "no war, no peace" on the Arab peoples the two super-Powers, after hectic bargaining behind the scenes for their respective interests, produced a draft resolution at the Security Council early on the morning of 22 October in an attempt to use the United Nations and the Security Council as their hired tool to rubber-stamp the dirty deal of the two super-Powers.

68. All people with a discerning eye will see clearly that that so-called draft resolution is even more ambiguous than resolution 242 (1967) and is a scrap of paper, a fraud, which can solve no problems. Basically speaking, the Chinese delegation was not in favour of this so-called draft resolution. However, it was only taking into consideration the desire of certain countries concerned that the Chinese delegation refrained from voting against it and did not participate in the voting. As we have foreseen, as soon as that draft resolution was adopted, the Israeli Zionists immediately and flagrantly continued to expand their aggression against Egypt and Syria. It can thus be seen that what the Soviet Union calls justice is partiality towards Israel.

69. We firmly support Egypt and Syria in their just denunciation of Israel's expanded aggression. No matter what measures the Egyptian, Syrian and Palestinian people may take on their own occupied soil for the recovery of their lost territories, they are all just, whereas any slight provocation made by Israel constitutes a criminal act.

70. We maintain that the two super-Powers, which have all along been obstructing and sabotaging the just struggle of

the Army men and people of Egypt and Syria and which have concocted the said draft resolution must be held fully and unshirkably responsible for the recent expanded aggression by Israeli zionism.

71. Following the resolution of 22 October, the United States and the Soviet Union have today introduced a new draft resolution on what they call supervising the cease-fire. This is a fresh insult to the United Nations. Like the previous resolution, this draft resolution is a mere scrap of paper which makes no condemnation of Israel's expanded aggression, puts the aggressor and the victim of the aggression on a par, and still fails to make the slightest mention of the demand for the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli aggressors from all the occupied Arab territories.

72. Fundamentally speaking, the Chinese delegation is opposed to this draft resolution.

73. I deem it also necessary to point out that the evolution of the United Nations to the present state of affairs has reached intolerable limits. What is the need for the United Nations? Would it not suffice to have the condominium of the United States and the Soviet Union plus a Secretary-General? Nevertheless, out of respect for the countries concerned, we would give consideration to this draft resolution. But we will never allow it to be imposed on us. They want to force through the draft resolution before it is distributed. What on earth kind of logic is this? If the countries concerned—I repeat, the countries concerned—want such a thing, we have no alternative, but the maximum we can do is to refrain from opposing it. But we are deeply convinced that the broad masses of the Arab people will never allow themselves to be controlled by the two super-Powers perpetually. History is long. The people will invariably carry on the struggle and live on. All this will be nothing but an interlude when we look back after a few decades.

74. Fundamentally speaking, the days are gone when the two super-Powers could manipulate and dominate the affairs of the world. Neither one super-Power nor the two super-Powers combined can impose their will on the people of the world, on the third world countries and other States members of the Security Council. The Palestinian and other Arab peoples are politically conscious people with a strong will. Tested and tempered in the struggle against aggression over the past years and in the recent days, they will still less docilely allow themselves to be manipulated and duped by the two super-Powers. The 700 million Chinese people and the numerous third world countries and peoples, as well as all those upholding justice, sympathize with and support them.

75. So long as the national rights of the Palestinian people are not restored and the lost territories of the Arab countries are not recovered, there can be no lasting peace in the Middle East. The heroic Arab and Palestinian people will certainly draw the necessary lessons from what the two super-Powers have done, continue to break through the situation of "no war, no peace" which the two super-Powers try to reimpose on them, continue their persistent struggle, enhance their unity, act independently and on their own initiative, ceaselessly strengthen themselves,

surmount all kinds of obstructions and difficulties and carry on the just struggle against aggression. The great Arab people will certainly win liberation.

76. The PRESIDENT: There are no further names inscribed on the list of speakers. I take it, therefore, that the members of the Security Council are now prepared to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution in document S/11039.

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.¹

77. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

78. Mr. SCALI (United States of America): I should like to put on record my delegation's deep regret that our proceedings were interrupted by unfortunate disorder. I wish also to compliment our President, Ambassador McIntyre, on his patient efforts to maintain and restore order in the chamber. This wrangle was particularly regrettable because of the urgency of the issue before us. The issue is peace, and while we speak men are dying.

79. My delegation, for its part, was prepared to allow the representative of China to speak. We did not believe he would speak for an unreasonable period of time. The issue has been resolved, and we fervently hope that we may be spared further interruptions in the future.

80. The United States joined with the Soviet Union in introducing the draft resolution adopted by the Council because of its concern that the cease-fire ordered by the Council on 22 October be made fully effective at the earliest possible moment.

81. There have been charges from each side of violations allegedly committed by the other. It is obviously impossible at this moment to determine the accuracy of those charges. No third-party evidence from an objective source is available to us.

82. The resolution just adopted confirms the Council's decision of 22 October on an immediate cessation of all kinds of firing and of all military action, and it urges that the forces of the two sides be returned to the positions they occupied at the moment the cease-fire became effective. The resolution also suggests that the Secretary-General take measures to dispatch United Nations observers immediately to supervise the observance of the cease-fire, using personnel of the United Nations now in the Middle East and first of all the personnel in Cairo.

83. We consider the central features of the resolution to be those in which the Council confirms its position for a cease-fire and in which it provides for the stationing of observers between the forces of Israel and the Arab

¹ See resolution 339 (1973).

Republic of Egypt. The former provision will put an end to bloodshed; the latter will result in the creation of a clear line of demarcation separating the forces of the two sides.

84. We have agreed, for reasons of principle, with the provision of the resolution urging the forces to return to the positions they occupied when the cease-fire became effective. We put forward the principle of return to positions occupied before hostilities broke out in the statement I made in this chamber on 8 October [1743rd meeting]. At that time the principles did not receive support from the Council. Consistent with our view at that time, we agree today that forces should return to the positions occupied at the time the cease-fire became effective. But we must point out that there will be great difficulty in establishing actual cease-fire lines and in fixing the positions of forces which have been manoeuvring in the desert. I hope that this will not become our central preoccupation as we search for a just and durable peace.

85. It is important that the United Nations resume at once the function of observation of the forces of the parties. Fortunately, the United Nations has in the area officers of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization who can proceed quickly to the cease-fire area. With the adoption of this resolution we would expect the Secretary-General, through the Chief of Staff of the truce supervision organization, to put observers in place at once and to receive immediately reports from them on events in the areas of contact between the two sides. These reports would, of course, be transmitted to the Security Council forthwith.

86. Finally, we must look to the future. Our paramount task is to bring about an effective cease-fire and to halt the bloodshed. We are therefore glad that the Security Council gave prompt consideration to the United States-Soviet resolution, so that the fighting may be stopped and negotiations can begin, looking towards a just and lasting peace.

87. Mr. MOJISOV (Yugoslavia): It was very late, last Sunday night and early Monday morning, when the Security Council had been convened for an extremely urgent meeting, on the 21st and 22nd of this month, that we were asked to adopt the joint Soviet-American draft resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire in place and for the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). We have adopted that draft resolution which has now become Security Council resolution 338 (1973). That resolution is now only two days old. We expressed the hope then that following the cease-fire peace would finally come to save not only the lives of the fighters involved in the war operations but also future generations from the same tragic events. Peace was our sincere hope and we truly would not like this hope to be transformed again into an illusion.

88. The cease-fire in place was to take effect and all military activities were to end, 12 hours after the adoption of the resolution. By a special communiqué of 22 October 1973, Egypt accepted the resolution. But less than 40 hours have elapsed and once again we are confronted with Israel's usual behaviour—that of utilizing cease-fires in order to

obtain a military advantage of flouting Security Council decisions, and this time bringing into question the assurances, explicit or implied, given by the sponsors that all could expect the resolution to be respected. We have now received fresh information of Israel's armed forces attempting to proceed with their operations on the West Bank of the Suez canal while, on the other front, again attacking Syria with renewed and intensive fire in clear violation of the cease-fire in Security Council resolution 338 (1973), thus causing the cease-fire, which seemed to have taken hold, to break down quickly.

89. The Security Council and all responsible international parties, especially those directly involved in the attempts to influence the situation in the Middle East so directly, have an obligation and a duty under the Charter to make Israel stop its firing and all its military activities, and to stop violating the cease-fire and immediately to start implementing Security Council resolution 242 (1967), as requested in paragraph 2 of resolution 338 (1973), in all its parts. The withdrawal of Israel's occupation forces from all Arab territories seized in the 1967 war back to the lines of 5 June 1967 is one of the basic provisions of resolution 242 (1967), and its immediate implementation means that Israel must start its withdrawal now.

90. Instead, we have a situation very reminiscent of our past painful experience of every cease-fire, which resulted in Israel's expanding its territorial hold, which has always meant the sowing of the seeds of new wars in the Middle East. Are we now to conclude that so soon after we adopted the Soviet-American draft, so soon after resolution 338 (1973) was to be implemented without delay, instead of moving to peace and to a just and lasting settlement, despite all assurances which were made in order to enable the Council to adopt its important decision of 21 and 22 October, that so soon after that, all we have is another repetition of Israel's thwarting of any promise of peace because Israel covets other people's territories, which means war?

91. My delegation, aware of the urgency of the situation in the field which called for prompt action on the part of the Security Council, voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document S/11039.

92. Mr. KHALID (Sudan): When we accepted the cease-fire resolution we did so in trust, and therefore refrained from discussing its implications. We marked the hasty manner in which it was conceived, we marked the hasty manner in which it was presented to us, we marked our rejection, as loyal members of this Organization and as a non-aligned country of any concept of condominium that reduces this Council to a rubber stamp. We observed that it would be a supreme insult to this Council—and indeed to the United Nations—if the term "appropriate auspices" meant anything other than this Organization. But, on the other hand, we were ready to forgo all those considerations if that would help stop blood-letting.

93. Unfortunately it now appears that we have not achieved much of that by simply adopting resolution 338 (1973).

94. One would not like to pose as being wise after the event. It is a fact, though, that whatever is now happening on the battlefield is due to the lack of an instrument to enforce the will of this Council. One would have hoped that the Powers, or their interlocutors, who had worked out the resolution would have also worked out the instruments to enforce its aims. We cannot talk of a cease-fire without talking of modalities of supervision and control, and if our fears are proven right on this point our worst fears on the whole question are yet to come. What is the machinery for the immediate implementation of resolution 242 (1967) referred to in paragraph 2 of resolution 338 (1973)? What is the machinery for negotiations referred to in paragraph 3 of that resolution? We are told that such negotiations and the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) shall be concurrent with the cease-fire, that is, that it would take place side by side with it, if words are to be given their plain dictionary meaning.

95. However, there is no way for us to run away from our responsibilities. It is the duty of this Council to supplement immediately its resolution with a decision to reinforce the United Nations observers who are already there and entrust them with the job of observing and controlling the cease-fire. The Powers who conceived the resolution may now call upon the Secretary-General to help in the translation of the Council's resolution into action. We have entrusted him with this task under Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and we reaffirmed our support for that resolution only yesterday. If we call upon the parties to implement resolution 242 (1967) in all its parts, we cannot in the same breath violate the same resolution by diluting if not negating the role of the Secretary-General and of the Security Council. It was in this spirit that we voted positively for the draft resolution in document S/11039.

96. We do not believe that Security Council resolution 338 (1973) is an open sesame. It cannot, by itself silence the shooting. Let us all back our words with deeds and let us not deceive ourselves, and for an obvious reason. The silencing of war machinery will not mean peace. It is only the point of departure for peace and the road is long, very long in fact. A lot of goodwill is needed, goodwill that not only should be there but should be seen to be there. It is needed even if human genius can settle the question of withdrawal and of boundaries. It will take another long and earnest heave to set people's minds at rest. The mind of the area was poisoned for more than half a century, and peace is predominantly an attitude of mind. This cannot be achieved through gimmickry. It cannot be achieved through hopeful procrastination, and it shall certainly not be achieved through vague compromises concluded by Powers outside this Organization and brought to us only to have us cloak them with the garb of respectability.

97. Sir Donald MAITLAND (United Kingdom): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution which the Council has just adopted since it was clear to us that further action was urgently required to back up resolution 338 (1973), adopted by this Council yesterday. While we welcome the fact that both Egypt and Israel have accepted the call to end the fighting, the cease-fire is clearly not yet fully effective; in certain areas fighting is still continuing. In

this situation, it is the Council's duty to call once more upon all parties to the present fighting to stop all military activity immediately.

98. My delegation also welcomed the fact that the resolution which we have just adopted provides for the immediate dispatch of United Nations observers to supervise the cease-fire in Egypt. I agree with the Prime Minister of the Sudan that, with the advantage of hindsight, it is unfortunately clear that a cease-fire in such a complex military situation could not have been self-policing. If the cease-fire is to be maintained, there must be proper arrangements on the ground to supervise it, of the sort which have been tested and have on the whole proved effective over the years. In this connexion, it seems to my delegation that the number of existing United Nations observers may be inadequate for the task they are being called upon to perform, and that this number may well have to be increased if they are to be able to provide this Council with the comprehensive coverage which will be needed. If this should prove to be the case, my delegation would see no objection to the Secretary-General's taking the necessary action, in consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization.

99. If in what I have said I have concentrated on the cease-fire, this is not because my delegation does not attach the highest importance to the earliest possible start of the negotiations referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3 of resolution 338 (1973), which are designed to bring about the implementation of resolution 242 (1967). Rather the reverse: it is because we feel that a start should be made at once on the difficult and delicate task of achieving a settlement, that we believe that the cease-fire must be made effective without delay.

100. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Security Council has met today at the request of the Government of Egypt, because of the extreme urgency of considering the question of the violation by Israel of the decision of the Council concerning a cease-fire, the decision adopted by the Council in resolution 338 (1973), on 22 October.

101. The statement made by the representative of Egypt in the Council has outlined the concrete facts, namely that Israeli armed forces, in violation of that decision of the Council on a cease-fire, have renewed hostilities against Egypt, with the participation of large military units, in order to expand the territories they have seized. Thus the Council has once again been confronted with a new challenge by Israel, in contempt of the Council's decisions on a cease-fire and in continuation of its aggression in the Middle East.

102. The Council is well aware of the cynical and contemptuous attitude of Israel towards decisions taken by the Council and decisions of the United Nations as a whole. Only recently, at the last meeting of the Security Council, the representative of Israel engaged in abusive, provocative and contemptuous tirades against the United Nations. The Security Council has on many occasions considered the question of violations by Israel of decisions of the United Nations and has sternly condemned Israel for such viola-

tions. No State Member of the United Nations has been so frequently condemned by the Council and by the General Assembly as has Israel for its aggressive actions against the Arab States.

103. Israel's distaste—Israel's hatred, even—for the United Nations is entirely understandable. The aggressors and racists whose policies have been so frequently condemned in the United Nations did not and do not find these United Nations decisions to their liking. But, as we all know, the United Nations was created for the establishment and strengthening of peace and for guaranteeing international security and restraining aggressors, and an aggressor is obliged to bow to the decisions of the Security Council and carry them out faithfully. Yet we have once again, at the present moment, a repetition of the usual story of Israel's actions. At this very moment, while this meeting of the Security Council is proceeding, the armed forces of Israel are continuing their attempts to extend their incursions further into Egyptian territory.

104. As you know, the Government of Egypt declared that it accepted and supported the decision of the Security Council for a cease-fire and cessation of hostilities in accordance with the time-limit laid down by the Council in its resolution 338 (1973). However, Tel Aviv, in pursuance of its policy of aggression and expansion in the Middle East, decided to take advantage of the fact that Egypt was observing the Security Council resolution and treacherously to deal new blows in order to seize new strategic positions and enlarge its beach-heads.

105. In the extremely grave situation now developing in the Middle East, fraught as it is with danger for the maintenance of international peace, the Soviet delegation considered it necessary that the Security Council should be immediately convened, and accordingly at once gave full support to the proposal to that effect made by the Egyptian delegation, in the persons of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. El-Zayyat, and the Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations, Mr. Abdel Meguid. We immediately took steps to ensure that the Security Council should adopt a decision confirming its previous resolution of 22 October and should make the aggressor withdraw from the territories he had seized after the coming into effect of the cease-fire.

106. The Soviet delegation expresses its gratification that the Council was able to take an urgent decision immediately and to request the Secretary-General to take effective measures for the immediate dispatch of observers to the cease-fire line, so as to compel Israel to respect the decisions of the Council on the cease-fire and to withdraw its troops from the territories it had seized after the cease-fire came into effect.

107. The attempts on the part of Israel further to pursue its policy of expansion in the Middle East by taking advantage of the fact that Egypt is observing the decisions of the Security Council are inadmissible and cannot be tolerated by the Council. It is time to put an end to this cynical attitude of Israel's towards the decisions of the Security Council.

108. In connexion with this violation by Israel of the Security Council cease-fire decision, the Soviet Government today published a special, urgent statement, which I shall read out here for the information of the members of the Council:

“The entire world was gratified and relieved to hear of the decision of the Security Council on 22 October on a cease-fire and a cessation of all hostilities in the Middle East.

“The Egyptian leaders have started their readiness to fulfil this decision of the Security Council and to put an end to hostilities on the Egypt-Israel front.

“The Government of Israel also announced its agreement with the Security Council decision. However, the Tel Aviv statement was actually a blatant falsehood under the cover of which the Israeli military treacherously threw itself on the positions of the Egyptian troops and also on populated civilian points in Egypt. These actions on the part of Israel are a gross flouting of the Security Council's decisions and a challenge to the peoples of the entire world. For these gross violations of the Security Council's decision the Government of Israel must bear full responsibility.

“The Soviet Government and the entire Soviet people voice their angry protest at this treacherous act on the part of the Israeli Government and demand that Israel should immediately cease firing and all military hostilities against the troops of Arab States and withdraw its troops to the cease-fire line of 22 October, in accordance with the Security Council decision of 22 October 1973.

“The Soviet Government warns the Government of Israel”—I would like the Israeli representative to heed this statement—“of the very serious consequences involved in the continuation of its aggressive actions against the Egyptian Arab Republic and the Syrian Arab Republic.”

109. And now a few words on the cynical anti-Soviet statement of the representative of China. China, by delaying the taking of a decision by the Security Council, has helped the aggressor to continue for some time his violation of the cease-fire.

110. The rules of procedure enable the Council to vote on the proposal without prior discussion. This was an extremely urgent matter, and a proposal was made by the delegation of Egypt. The meeting was convened for 12 noon; then it was put off until 4.30 p.m.; and the Chinese delegation has helped to drag out the meeting until almost 6 o'clock.

111. All members of the Security Council were aware of the two main points in the draft resolution: it confirmed resolution 338 (1973) and urged that the aggressor's troops be withdrawn to the cease-fire lines of 22 October. Members of the Council were well aware that a provision was also included which requested the Secretary-General to take measures for the immediate dispatch of United Nations observers—those now in the Middle East, and first of all the personnel now in Cairo—to the cease-fire lines.

112. Egypt requested an immediate vote on that draft resolution, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt was willing to refrain from speaking before that vote was taken. The fact that no one—no single member of the Security Council, apart from China—addressed the meeting speaks for itself. It shows that the members of the Security Council understood the urgency of the issue, were aware of the emergency situation prevailing, and preferred to express their attitude toward the aggressor by voting for the draft resolution. Only China held up the adoption for almost another hour and a half, thereby enabling the aggressor to continue to violate resolution 338 (1973) for a further period of time.

113. The fact that Council members are speaking after the vote and not before is the best possible object lesson and a slap in the face for the Chinese delegation. It shows the isolation of China in the Security Council, for no one supported the Chinese representative in what he did. These are the hard facts. And despite all the Chinese representative's frantic efforts to invent anti-Soviet lies, these facts are plain to the entire world and to the entire United Nations.

114. Mr. Chiao should draw the appropriate lesson from this—if he is able to realize the situation in which he finds himself at this meeting of the Security Council. He spoke because he is an apologist of chaos; his policy is: "the worse it is, the better". That is the essence of what he said. He threatened to veto the previous resolution in June and July and also the present draft resolution. Suppose the veto had been applied. I should have liked to see Mr. Huang or Mr. Chiao raise their hands and veto resolution 338 (1973) and today's resolution. Such a veto could have helped only Israel, and Israel would have set up a monument to them in Tel Aviv as a sign of gratitude for giving such assistance to the aggressor. That is what China's policy would lead to. The fact that China decided not to use the veto only shows the cowardly and unprincipled nature of its position in this matter. It was impossible in this case to use the veto and thereby help the aggressor. And instead of putting his hand up, Mr. Chiao chose to hide it under the table. But such an attitude also helps the aggressor.

115. If all the members of the Security Council had done the same, who would have thanked us, Egypt or Israel?

116. If we ask that question, the answer is perfectly clear. Israel would have thanked us for such an attitude on the part of the Security Council and its members if they had taken up the position adopted by the Chinese representative in this matter.

117. Mr. Chiao spoke about the outstanding successes of the Arab people and armed forces. Yes, we are all delighted; the Arab people and its armed forces have shattered the myth created by Zionism throughout the world about the "invincibility" of Israel.

118. The heroic armed forces of the Arab people have shattered the myth that the Arabs do not know how to and are unable to wage war.

119. But, Mr. Huang and Mr. Chiao—I am sorry he is not here—I should like to ask whether it was China, with its

anti-Soviet pronouncements and its out-and-out anti-Sovietism, or the Soviet Union that gave them and taught them to use those weapons. Let us look at the question that way to understand what the Chinese representatives' position is and what our position is. Who is helping the aggressor, and who the victims of the aggression? We have all been convinced that, in his statement, Mr. Chiao gave vent to all his anti-Soviet anger and spleen. He used the Council meeting to dole out the usual share of anti-Soviet slander. We do not think it necessary to answer that; it has become a habit of the Chinese representatives, just as Orthodox Christians recite the "Our Father". Mr. Chiao censured the United Nations and blamed it for its ineffectiveness. The day before yesterday, at the meeting of the Council, we heard cynical and insulting attacks by the Israeli representative against the United Nations and today we heard similar attacks from the Chinese delegation. That is what Israel and China have in common against the United Nations—they criticize and slander it and blacken its image. Their attitude in this matter is the same. Israel does not like resolution 338 (1973). Israel's representative made wild attacks against the United Nations, and against resolutions adopted by the Council supporting the victim of the aggression and condemning the aggressor. And China does not like these resolutions either. There again Israel and China take a common stand. I think Israel should thank China for taking that position. How has China helped the United Nations in the last two years to become more effective? What constructive contribution has China made? I should like the members of the Council and representatives to answer that question. China's attitude in the United Nations is to criticize and reject everything. But that will not take the Chinese representatives very far. If they seriously want to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations, let them act together with all the Members of the United Nations. They must not think they are wiser and more orthodox. In the past two years they have done nothing constructive in the United Nations. The United Nations is expecting some constructive proposals, some useful initiatives in order to strengthen the United Nations and make it into an effective instrument which would strengthen peace and international security and would protect the victims of aggression against the aggressor. So far the Chinese representatives have confined themselves to anti-Soviet gossip, fanatical anti-Sovietism, and they have used the United Nations to make anti-Soviet attacks. But that will not take them very far either. That is how matters now lie.

120. In conclusion, it should be noted that if China had given the Arab world as many rifles, machine-guns, automatic weapons, tanks, rockets and planes as the Chinese representatives have vented bile and anger here in the Council against the Soviet Union, the Arabs would have had more tangible help from China. The anti-Sovietism of the Chinese delegation in the United Nations is of no help to the Arabs as victims of aggression. On the contrary, it is useful and profitable only to the Israeli aggressor.

121. Mr. de GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): It is almost two days since we adopted resolution 338 (1973). Yet we are told that the fighting has not yet stopped. In particular, military operations are continuing on the Israeli-Egyptian front, which is likely seriously to

jeopardize an early start of over-all negotiations on the Middle East conflict. My delegation attaches the greatest importance to those negotiations starting as soon as possible. We therefore consider that it was up to the Council to pronounce itself most clearly in favour of an immediate cessation of all hostilities, in accordance with resolution 338 (1973).

122. In that connexion the draft resolution which has been submitted to us for a vote under the joint sponsorship of the United States and the Soviet Union, and which we have just adopted, seems to us to respond at least to the immediate needs of the situation. Paragraph 1, on observing the cease-fire, urges that the forces of the belligerents withdraw to the positions they occupied at the moment the cease-fire become effective. That specific statement seems to be fully warranted.

123. The last paragraph of the draft resolution refers to the establishment of a system of observers along the new lines occupied by the forces involved. The Secretary-General is requested urgently to take measures by using the UNTSO personnel available. In the event that such personnel were to be insufficient in number, because of the responsibilities they would have to undertake and because of the new cease-fire lines, doubtless it would be desirable for the Secretary-General to be authorized to proceed to the recruitment of an additional number of observers. The desirability of setting up a satisfactory observation mechanism will be clear to all, I am sure.

124. Those considerations, which I need hardly prolong, explain why my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted to us, in the hope that it will put an end once and for all to the fighting and thus make it possible in a short time to begin genuine negotiations.

125. Mr. SEN (India): On the morning of 22 October when we adopted resolution 338 (1973) I commented on the circumstances and the procedure we were obliged to follow. I do not consider it necessary or useful to repeat those comments. However, when we adopted that resolution we had assumed—it seems wrongly—that all parties to the conflict had agreed in advance to respect the cease-fire if it were decided upon by the Security Council, and to make an immediate beginning on the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) and undertake negotiations for bringing about a just and durable peace. That resolution had barely been put into effect, and only the paragraph 1 of it to begin with, when we were faced with complaints of cease-fire violations.

126. Today's resolution, which has just been adopted, became necessary, first, to ensure that the cease-fire would be respected and that any infringement would be brought to our notice immediately so that remedial measures could be taken at once. In voting for the draft resolution we were guided by one consideration, and one alone: that the parties, the parties which are actually fighting, accepted it. This was also the supreme consideration in our mind when supporting resolution 338 (1973), adopted yesterday. Obviously, in order to observe that the fighting is not renewed, the United Nations observers will be necessary, and probably we should have provided for them even

yesterday. The existing observers can be used straight away, and if the parties show the willingness, which we have every right to expect from them, to respect the cease-fire, these observers may be adequate and may indeed be surplus. But if, unfortunately, the number is not adequate for the task, should the Secretary-General come to the decision that a significant and substantial increase in the number of observers is necessary, we would expect the Council to be consulted as a matter of urgency. Secondly, we would hope that the observers will be placed on both sides of the opposing forces so that we are assured of the co-operation of all sides and receive the best and most objective reports.

127. So while we shall support all measures to enforce the cease-fire, in our view such a cease-fire is only a prelude—a most temporary prelude—to a search for a just and lasting peace. We would urge, therefore, that while the cease-fire is being made increasingly effective, negotiations should begin immediately and simultaneously in order that the terms of resolution 338 (1973) are faithfully carried out and the seeds of conflict in the Middle East are eliminated with a degree of assurance and permanence.

128. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): Two days ago we were asked to vote on a draft resolution practically without being given time to study it properly. Because my delegation did not want the fighting in the Middle East to continue one second longer than necessary, we voted for the draft resolution, although with some apprehensions as many questions remained unanswered in our mind with regard to the implementation of its provisions. If we had asked at that time how the sponsors thought that the provisions in paragraph 1 on the cease-fire were to be implemented without providing an instrument for its verification and observation, this stormy meeting perhaps would have been avoided, although the meeting of two days ago might have lasted a little longer.

129. Now we have voted for another draft resolution submitted to us by the same two super-Powers because apparently the provision for a cease-fire in paragraph 1 of resolution 338 (1973) has not been respected by the parties. My delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution for the same reasons that we did two days ago, when we supported the adoption of resolution 338 (1973), although this time again with some apprehensions. We would have voted for the draft resolution with less apprehension if the sponsors had given us some clarification on paragraph 1 of the text, which reads:

“Confirms its decision on an immediate cessation of all kinds of firing and of all military action, and urges that the forces of the two sides be returned to the positions they occupied at the moment the cease-fire became effective;”

130. We are concerned about the following: who is going to determine where those positions are exactly situated, and how is it going to be done? Second, when was the exact moment that the cease-fire became effective, as fighting apparently has not ceased since the adoption of the resolution? My delegation hopes that the resolution we have just adopted will be respected and will pave the way to the full implementation of resolution 338 (1973). My

delegation remains of the view that it is crucial for the restoration of peace in the Middle East that paragraph 2 of resolution 338 (1973) be implemented in accordance with the only correct interpretation of resolution 242 (1967), that is, immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces to the lines they occupied before the June 1967 war, and discussions on outstanding issues, including respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

131. Mr. PEREZ de CUELLAR (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In my statement on the night of 21 October, I stated that my delegation could not object to the adoption of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union and the United States of America, which was later adopted as resolution 338 (1973), despite its obvious lack of clarity [1747th meeting, para. 122].

132. Now I am bound to say that my delegation deplores the continuation of military action which has given rise to this additional meeting. But we believe that its continuation could perhaps be attributed precisely to the lack of clarity in resolution 338 (1973) and also to the excessive speed with which it was adopted.

133. Once again we have adopted, almost without considering it, a draft resolution submitted by the United States and the Soviet Union. We agree with the view that the situation on the battlefield makes it necessary for the Council to take immediate action, and we have therefore supported it. Nevertheless, we wish to state for the record that recourse has not been had to the necessary prior consultations called for.

134. We well know that the five permanent members of the Security Council, because of the veto, are in a special situation in the peace-keeping machinery which the Council is. But it is not the individual members but the Council as a whole which, under the Charter has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. That is why Article 28 of the Charter provides for the permanent presence at Headquarters of the representatives of all members of the Council. There is, therefore, no excuse for not holding consultations among all the members whether they represent large or small States.

135. The text we are now considering, in so far as it refers to resolution 338 (1973) of barely 40 hours ago, is obviously just as unclear—and therefore entails the same risks. However, we completely agree with paragraph 1 since it calls on the forces to return to the positions they occupied at the moment the cease-fire became effective. We hope that the provision of paragraph 2, namely the dispatch of United Nations observers, will contribute something which may have been lacking two days ago.

136. It is our understanding that the Council's decision to shoulder its responsibility and to state that it is responsible for the maintenance of peace, means that the Security Council will be continually seized of the matter. Our decision, adopted as it was for lack of something better, is binding.

137. For its part, the delegation of Peru will fully co-operate in the Council so that it can discharge its duty in

enforcing its resolutions, it being understood that the appropriate auspices referred to in resolution 338 (1973) directly involve the United Nations through the Secretary-General and the Security Council.

138. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Soviet representative, Mr. Malik, just now made a lengthy statement slandering the Chinese delegation. However, his statement has completely ignored facts and is filled with lies. I should like to cite a few facts which everyone here has seen. Who delayed the proceedings of the Council? This morning the Chinese delegation arrived in the Security Council chamber on time, as notified by the President, and said that it was ready at all times to take part in the formal meeting of the Council to discuss related proposals. But we saw no draft resolution until this afternoon. It was only after the formal meeting of the Council had begun, in the process of the statement by the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of China, that the representatives received the draft resolution in English.

139. It was only after Mr. Malik interrupted the Chinese Vice-Foreign Minister's statement that we received the draft resolution in Chinese. How can the Security Council tolerate such an unreasonable demand: we were asked to take a vote before the representatives had even seen the draft. This morning until the afternoon, because of the differences between you two, the United States and the Soviet Union, the proceedings of the Council were delayed. Behind the scenes you were making a deal and you did not present your draft until after the afternoon meeting of the Council had been convened. Is that not a fact known to all? But Mr. Malik lied by saying that the Chinese delegation knew about the content of the draft long ago and that the statement of the Chinese Vice-Foreign Minister had delayed the Council's action.

140. Secondly, Mr. Malik accused the Chinese delegation of creating disorder. This is all the more a deliberate fabrication by Mr. Malik. You have put forth a totally unreasonable point of procedure in order to deprive the Chinese representative of the right to speak. This disorder was precisely created by Mr. Malik's unreasonable behaviour.

141. Thirdly, who assisted Israel in its aggression? Mr. Malik talked unabashedly about China and Israel forming a so-called alliance. This is making a mockery of the common sense of the representatives. We, the People's Republic of China, have never had any diplomatic, economic or cultural relations with Israel. And how about you? It is precisely the Soviet Union that has long maintained diplomatic, trade and cultural relations with Israel. After the 1967 aggression launched by Israel against the Arab countries, you have stepped up sending immigrants to Israel, with over 30,000 per year, including technical and military personnel. What is your purpose? You are preparing to take over Israel in the future so that it can turn from the ally of one super-Power into the ally of the other super-Power.

142. Take the draft resolution concocted by you two on 22 October. That resolution contains no reference whatsoever to the supervision of the cease-fire. Could that be an

oversight? You have deliberately created such a situation so as to enable Israel to expand its aggression. No one will believe that this is an oversight on your part. You were deliberately vague, so as to enable Israel to utilize it to continue to expand its aggression. Of course, it will be nothing but a fraud with or without the provision for supervising the cease-fire.

143. The United States and the Soviet Union, at the meeting of the Security Council on 22 October, after your behind-the-scene deals, you hurriedly produced a draft resolution allowing none of the other members of the Council the time to hold consultations or to seek instructions from their respective Governments, and you asked for an immediate vote on that draft. This is your arbitrary attempt to establish a United States-Soviet condominium in the Security Council. Such behaviour is an insult to the Security Council. You have placed many members of the Council in a very difficult position. All self-respecting representatives of sovereign States cannot tolerate such gross and arbitrary manipulation of the Security Council.

144. Many members of the Council have expressed their dissatisfaction with your behaviour. Yet Mr. Malik has shown utter contempt for this just opinion. Today Mr. Malik, even more openly and more flagrantly, asked the Security Council to take a vote before the Council had even seen the draft. What is the purpose of that? It is precisely to prevent the Chinese Vice-Foreign Minister from speaking, because he is afraid that the Chinese Vice-Foreign Minister would expose the dirty deal made behind the scenes between it and another super-Power, because in the Security Council he wishes to establish a new order of manipulation of the Council by the two super-Powers. This will never succeed. From the clumsy performance by Mr. Malik at today's Security Council meeting, people can see that they have applied power politics of the super-Powers to the Security Council.

145. The Chinese people adhere to principles. We are not afraid of your slanders. We shall definitely not allow you to establish any kind of super-Power condominium in the Security Council. Mr. Malik said that the Chinese delegation had obstructed the realization of the cease-fire. You are making a mockery of the common sense of the representatives around here. If you are truly concerned about the Palestinian and other Arab people who have been displaced for a long time and who have shed their blood in sacrifice, then what have you done over the past six years?

146. Israel has not withdrawn even for an inch. There is still no trace of the national rights of the Palestinian people. For the past six years, in order to contend with another super-Power for hegemony, at one time you turn on the tap and at another time you turn off the tap, saying that you are concerned about the sacrifices of the Arab people, saying that you have supported the struggle of the Arab people. That is a hundred per cent hypocrisy. You are only shedding crocodile tears. As the Chinese saying goes: "The cat is crying over the death of the mouse". That is sheer hypocrisy. In short, you are a downright hypocrite. That is your true feature.

147. From today's meeting, I hope that everyone will draw a lesson: that is that they must heighten the vigilance

against the two super-Powers' ambition to establish their condominium in the Security Council. We definitely must not allow such ambitions to be realized.

148. The PRESIDENT: The Secretary-General has asked to make a statement, and I now give him the floor.

149. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Yesterday, I submitted to the Security Council, in document S/7930/Add.2210, a summary of the current status of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) as of 1200 hours GMT on 22 October 1973. As I stated in this report, pending a further directive from the Security Council I have instructed the Chief of Staff of UNTSO to hold the United Nations military observers in readiness in their present locations.

150. Now that the Council has decided that the military observers should be stationed to observe the cease-fire called for by the Security Council in resolution 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973, I shall immediately take steps to put the military observers in place in the shortest possible time.

151. As all members of the Council are aware, the active functioning of military observers requires the active co-operation of the parties concerned and is based upon their acceptance of the cease-fire.

152. I also wish to inform the Council that it will in all probability be necessary to increase the number of military observers now available in the area in order to carry out effectively the intentions of the Security Council. The Chief of Staff of UNTSO will be in immediate contact with the military authorities concerned with a view to working out the details of the observation operation. It goes without saying that I shall keep the Council promptly informed of further developments.

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

154. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): I should like first to thank our colleague Ambassador Sen of India for having had the courtesy to offer to let me speak before him. I had thought that I could put forward some remarks—brief remarks, as always—which would perhaps be of some benefit to the Council. Of course I could have spoken at the beginning of the meeting, but, because of my great respect for human lives, I thought it would be much better to delay speaking if by that we could indeed save some lives.

155. The Council has now adopted a resolution and has confirmed again its decision of 22 October 1973 that "an immediate cessation of all kinds of firing and of all military action" should take place and urged "that the forces of the two sides be returned to the positions they occupied at the moment the cease-fire became effective".

156. The cease-fire became effective 12 hours after the adoption of the Council's previous resolution, that is, resolution 338 (1973). And if there were some doubts in some minds, whether real or fictitious, the Secretary-General knows that I replied to his letter to me at 1840 hours Cairo time, 1240 hours New York time, on 22

October, and the cease-fire became effective at 1852 hours Cairo time.

157. In the letter of my Mission to the Secretary-General, we annexed a declaration made by the President of Egypt in which he said:

"In view of all these considerations, the President, in his capacity as Supreme Commander of Armed Forces, has issued an order to the High Command to cease fire at the time fixed by the Security Council on the basis of reciprocity."

That letter and its annex were received, as I said, at 1240 hours New York time yesterday by the Secretary-General.

158. The President speaks in that declaration about "considerations" for his acceptance of resolution 338 (1973). Let me tell the Council and everyone here what these considerations are.

159. It was the weight of the two countries proposing the draft resolution, the United States of America and the USSR, that guaranteed to us that whatever we were trying to do by ourselves would indeed be done by the international community and the permanent members of the Security Council, mainly responsible for the maintenance of peace and order and having special responsibilities by virtue of the veto power and other prerogatives they have in this Council. Our target was simple, is simple, remains simple, and will always be simple: liberating our occupied territories and giving the Palestinian people the rights to which they are entitled under the Charter and by virtue of the Council's resolutions.

160. We are not fond of blood. We do not want to use it or to spill it or sacrifice it if there is a way to avoid it under international law, through the international community. Our presence here in this Council, in this Chamber, in June and July testifies to this. But in accepting the draft resolution which was adopted by this Council on 22 October 1973, my Government had reason to understand that the two countries proposing the draft resolution indeed guaranteed that the cease-fire would take effect on the spot at the given time and hour; that is, 1252 hours New York time on 22 October 1973. Since this resolution which has just been adopted urges that the forces be returned to the positions they occupied at the moment the cease-fire became effective, we refuse to take this as only lip service to a principle. We think that it means what it says, and we take it to mean that the forces must be returned to the positions which they occupied when the cease-fire went into effect. This has been supported by almost all the speakers around the Council table, the last of whom was the representative of Peru; and I can mention also the representative of France and many others. Indeed, without this support, the voting would be in vain.

161. The question of the principle of withdrawal, which has been asserted by the representative of the United States of America, really should have been explained as withdrawal to the lines from which the attack began, as referred to in resolution 242 (1967)—that is, those of pre-5 June 1967. This is the principle, if a principle is to be respected.

But this resolution which has just been adopted by the Council would have no meaning if indeed the cease-fire is not respected as and when it became effective at the hour and the day mentioned, in compliance with the Council's resolution.

162. The second understanding, on the basis of which Egypt made no objection to resolution 338 (1973)—which resolution we accepted before the expiry of the 12 hours—was indeed that it was to begin the machinery for putting into effect resolution 242 (1967), asking for specific provisions in order to obtain peace in the area. Our main objective was the withdrawal of all forces of occupation from our lands. I have said repeatedly, and I cannot repeat too often, that occupation means resistance. Resistance is war; and you cannot have war and peace; you cannot have occupation and peace. We must remove this occupation because this is the condition *sine qua non*. Since we fight for peace and insist on peace, we hope to solicit the help of all members of the Council in this struggle. It is our understanding that the responsibility of the two super-States, the two permanent members which have produced resolution 338 (1973), will be accepted. We hope that the cease-fire will be respected.

163. I do not wish to take up the time of the Council, but I can read communiqués issued this morning—and just about one hour ago there was a last communiqué issued, at 2300 hours Cairo time or 5 o'clock New York time. And all these communiqués detail the sordid story of the Israeli forces using the cease-fire to occupy further territory and to attack civilians as well as military forces, as has been mentioned by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Malik.

164. If our communiqués are not sufficient, I have here something from Senator Jackson saying that he has learned from his sources that Israeli units drove freely over pontoon bridges guarded by Egyptian soldiers, who waved at the Israeli troops because they were in Syrian uniforms, in Syrian tanks, and told them that they were coming back to refuel. Mr. Jackson reported this from his sources—I can assure the Council that they are not Egyptian sources. And, again, this happened after the cease-fire.

165. We are not taking this Council lightly. We are indeed living in historic moments, not only hours and not only days. We are engaged in a generation's struggle for peace. For the sake of peace we accepted the draft resolution offered by two permanent members of the Council, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. For the same reason we accept now and take literally and seriously everything in this resolution which has just been adopted by the Council. We hope that they will live up to their responsibility. Indeed it is a source of satisfaction to see that the Soviet Union has issued today what seems to be a response to this responsibility.

166. Before I conclude, and before we speak about aggression and non-aggression and all that—ways of trying to get more time to kill more people in the Middle East—I must say that we are grateful to those members of the Council who have upheld our case in the Council; and not

only to them, but also to those Members of the General Assembly who have themselves taken measures that really show their displeasure and disgust at the continuing aggression in the Middle East. Since this new aggression began on 6 October, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Upper Volta, Dahomey, Madagascar and the Central African Republic have broken their diplomatic relations with Israel. Today we have heard with satisfaction that the Emperor of Ethiopia has taken the same step, and since I have begun many of my statements by quoting from the Emperor, allow me to read a few lines from his latest statement:

“Consistent with her stand of opposing territorial annexation . . . and because Israel has failed to withdraw from the occupied territories, Ethiopia has decided to sever her diplomatic relations with Israel until such time as Israel withdraws from the occupied territories. We express the hope that all nations will make their maximum contribution towards bringing permanent peace in the Middle East.”

167. The maximum contribution that all nations must make is to exert all their efforts, to spare no efforts, in order to implement at least this resolution religiously, and not to say this is only put forward because of a principle which does not happen to be applicable here or cannot be applied with accuracy.

168. Those who, as the representative of the United States just said, think there is no evidence available as to who attacked after 6 October certainly have ways and means of informing themselves and, indeed, of informing the Council concerning who broke the cease-fire after it took effect at the time fixed by the Council.

169. We should like to consider it a test of good faith, a test of a real effort to bring peace to a world that has been hungry for peace for the last quarter-century, that the resolution just adopted be applied by all. The observers who are to go to the area cannot, indeed, push back the forces of aggression to the places they came from. But there are forces in the Mediterranean and off our shores which have always been displaying their force and making a show of force everywhere. Let them—the two sponsors of the resolution—make a joint effort to apply the resolution just adopted. That is, let them get all forces back to where they were and should have stayed according to this Council’s resolution of 22 October.

170. That is the test of faith; that is the test of peace, the test of whether or not our efforts in this Council and everywhere else are going to be crowned with success. Failing that, I am afraid we shall have to leave this Council with a message of despair.

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

172. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, thank you for finally calling upon me. I now speak by the grace of God and my very good friend Sir Laurence McIntyre.

173. Mr. President, through you I want to appeal to the representative of the United States to do something, if he so chooses, in the sense that the American people has always shown fair play. After all, we are not talking to ourselves; we are talking to the world.

174. The United Nations Secretariat and also my office have received many requests for copies of my previous statement because on certain channels there was static and a commentator who was speaking at the same time as me, as though my English is an enigma like Einstein’s theory of relativity. Is that the freedom of information the host country has always boasted of? Of course the United States Government might say, “We have freedom of the press”; Is freedom of the press the freedom to distort the news? Is it freedom of the press to use static when I speak, so that the people may not get our message?

175. When he was addressing this same Council a few years ago they faded out Chief Adebo of Nigeria in the middle of his speech. Then he learned, and many others learned, that it was because Baroody was to speak after him, and some of the mass information media gave the excuse that there were some technical difficulties, while others said the time allotted to the United Nations had run out.

176. So let the American people to whom I am speaking through you, the representative of the United States, heed so that the voice of justice—not necessarily my voice; the voice of others also—may prevail. And if you want to check how the commentators are behaving now—by omission and distortion—it is your privilege to do so. And you do not have to report to me; you are not, after all, responsible to me. But you are my colleague, and I think I have the right to address you in a friendly manner. If you want to reply, you can do so. If you do not want to reply, your silence will be ominous.

177. When I asked Ambassador Bennett, when there were rumours, whether it was true that your country was sending arms to Israel, every member of the United States delegation avoided me. They said they would determine what was going on in Washington. I was avoided for three days. I had asked for that information because I am responsible to my Government to tell it what is going on in the United Nations. And finally you made it official. You were doing it surreptitiously, clandestinely—thinking you could get away with it, blaming the Soviet Union, saying they had sent arms to the Arabs.

178. So here you had your client. Or are you a client of Israel? You were the client of Israel, or Israel was your client. Because the Soviet Union was allegedly sending arms to the Arabs, you began to send Israel your most sophisticated arms to preserve what your senators claim to be the only democracy in the Middle East.

179. You have a monopoly on democracy, have you? That democracy is by subscription and contribution, and I want to tell you how it is by subscription and contribution. A few years ago an American friend went to an Arab ambassador to Washington and said, “You people do not know what the power of lobbying is in this country”. He thought, maybe, that we did not know. We know, but we

do not know as much as you do. So he said, "Why don't you brief certain Senators who do not have too many Jewish constituents and maybe they will see your point of view". Well, that was quite reasonable. So four Arab ambassadors—and I am not going to mention their names—were taken by that alleged friend to that Senator and they briefed him on the Arab point of view. After 10 days or so another meeting took place, and the gist of the Senator's statement was, in a not-too-low voice, "Now listen, the Jews contribute \$60,000 to my election campaign. How much are you Arabs willing to contribute?" They were flabbergasted. This was democracy by subscription and contribution, and I say to our American friends—using the term loosely, because in international affairs, unfortunately, when interests are in harmony then people call each other friends; and when they are in disharmony they are no longer friends—you want to establish a democracy? Demos' bones would shake in his grave about what is taking place nowadays with the false motivation of democracy.

180. The First World War was fought to save the world for democracy, not to preserve the empires against the imperialistic incursions of the Germans of the Kaiser. But the motivation was to save the world for democracy, and after the First World War there was less democracy all over the world than before it. So your motivation is wrong and you cannot dupe anyone.

181. And you, my good friend, Sir Laurence: you should have taken into account when I pleaded with you to allow me to speak earlier than usual. You seem to have forgotten that we are a party to this struggle. Our oil has been cut off. Not from Russia; Russia has a lot of oil. You know from whom. And Mr. Laird is shown in a cartoon asking the people to sew sweaters; they will shiver. We do not want to make you shiver. We lived without air-conditioning in the desert of Saudi Arabia since the dawn of history. You can do without the oil. Do not mix issues. Do not rattle your weapons. You are not yet 200 years old—1776 to 1973—three more years to go. You are a young nation drunk with power. You left the shores of Europe so that you would not be conscripted—drafted, as they call it here—and in order to find opportunities. It was a laudable goal to pursue. And then the Zionists railroaded you into the First World War and you have been in trouble ever since. You grew to be a mighty power.

182. Phantoms—God knows what else you are trying to invent of diabolical weapons. You want to emulate the Soviet Union, which also has weapons of mass destruction. Maybe you are genuinely afraid of each other. The Soviet Union—wrongly, in your estimation—is trying to support some Arab States which have been dealing with it. What went on over that "hot line" between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Brezhnev—or, perhaps, through Mr. Dobrynin, who, I remember, used to sit over there? He was the Under-Secretary for Political Affairs, a very capable and quiet man.

183. Have you told the Soviet Union: Put your cards on the table and we shall put ours? Why should we destroy one another? Well, if I were the Soviet Union, I might act to save themselves from a world conflict, but why at the expense of the people of the Middle East? Now I am

talking to both of you, why at the expense of the people of the Middle East? You mighty Powers, could you not have at least stopped the usurping State of Israel from occupation? Any one of you could have. But I remember one incident, and this is for history because it should be written and made known not just to the American people but to the whole world. In 1956—and I think that my good friend and colleague, Ambassador de Guiringaud of France, may bear me out or refute what I say, or keep silent—there was a conflict in the Middle East and the French and the British sent their troops and planes to the area allegedly in order to separate the troops of Israel from those of Egypt. It was then found out that there was collusion with Israel. I am glad that both those States now see the light. Do you think that the self-righteous, sanctimonious Mr. Dulles, the expert on brinkmanship, did not know? But the Russian Defence Minister, Mr. Bulganin—of course, upon instructions from Mr. Krushchev—said: If you Western Powers continue your bombardment of Port Said, remember that Russian missiles can reach Paris and London.

184. I am not taking old skeletons out of closets, but I can tell you that for two years I researched whether there was an understanding by the United States with the Governments of Britain and France of those days.

185. After Mr. Bulganin—of course upon instructions, I repeat, from Mr. Khrushchev—gave his warning, the holier-than-thou Mr. Dulles said that he was flabbergasted and sent a warning to Britain and France to withdraw from the soil of Egypt. He acted as if Britain and France had not consulted the United States before that adventure. Can you imagine that Britain and France, members of NATO with the United States, would have done that without the, if not connivance, approval of the United States? I found out in France and Britain—from the French and the British, not from Arabs in Port Said, who were killed—that the United States knew of the adventure. And finally, assessing the situation, the Governments of France and Britain came to the conclusion that it would be better to withdraw, because, suppose—as some of them thought—Russia was not bluffing? Then you would not have to throw missiles at Paris and London; a mere bomb, in those days, would have been enough to drive the French and British people to lynch their own Governments, after they had had five years of war.

186. Why am I recalling this? I myself, you know, thought the Soviet Union did very well then by the Arabs. And Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge finally came with two draft resolutions, one after the other, to liquidate the Palestine question and see to it that Israel would become invulnerable. The Arabs, well known for their good hearts, were duped, just as they may be duped now. I think the Foreign Minister of Egypt, Mr. El-Zayyat, is beginning to sense that they are being duped, judging by the last statement he made. This is in our tradition. Saladin when he laid his hand on Richard the Lion-Hearted—who came from a distance of 3,000 miles to slaughter the indigenous people of Palestine on the pretext that the Western Europeans of that time were going to wrest the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidels—Saladin could have killed him. But he reprieved him. Every time he fought battles with him after that, he sent him fruits. This is all in our tradition. We are

sometimes too credulous. That tradition comes from—I am not going into the sociology of the area—from the tribes. They used to set up games, and later these flowered in Western Europe in the codes of chivalry which they had brought from the Middle East.

187. I am going to make you listen, my dear Sir—I know how difficult a task has been given to you—because you are my Secretary-General. Listen to this. And what assurance do we have now that these two resolutions, adopted on 22 October and today, are not a sort of trap? Because they are so ambiguous—worse than resolution 242 (1967). As we say in Arabic, everything that is built on something that is unjust is also unjust—of course, I am paraphrasing in translation. But mark my words, there will be no peace, because these resolutions are traps designed to weaken the Arab people.

188. It is the acme of cynicism that the two super-Powers should meet in secret and concoct, as if in collusion, draft resolutions, and keep us all in the dark—unless the two super-Powers have taken their allies into their confidence. I say this in view of the fact that Mr. Kissinger passed through London and briefed Sir Alec Home, the British Foreign Minister on the situation and on what he had done with Mr. Brezhnev. I do not know whether any emissaries were sent to France to disclose the Kissinger-Brezhnev plan; but I think that if Mr. Kissinger had sent messengers to France, he would have been discriminating. France should be treated on an equal basis, to say the least, with Britain. Kissinger goes to Sir Alec Home. Incidentally, it is written H-O-M-E, but he is a Scotsman, so it is pronounced “Hume”. Home, who when Layla Khalid, a highly-educated Palestinian, tried to hijack a plane and did not succeed, stood on the podium and called it “a barbaric act”—I am paraphrasing—“of those Palestinians”. He forgot what Balfour had done to the Palestinians. Then I immediately took the floor. And nobody, Sir, delayed me so long from taking the floor. The President immediately gave me the floor for my right of reply. Today I had to wait three hours to take the floor. When I took the floor then, I saw Sir Alec Home, from the podium, making a bee-line toward the exit. I said, “You go away, Mr. Alec Home. They will tell you what I have said.” I said, “The frustrated Layla Khalid hijacked that plane. We do not condone hijacking, but she was frustrated, like all the Palestinians. They have no army, nobody heeds them. You call her act a barbaric act, but you hijacked a whole Empire—the whole Empire you hijacked—and that is a blessed act.” Poor Sir Alec Douglas-Home: he is *passé*; the man in the street knows how *passé* such statements are.

189. Is the détente between the two super-Powers based on expediency and mutual accommodation, my good friend Ambassador Malik? I would also put that question to our good friend Scali, but I do not see him here. Is the détente between the two super-Powers based on expediency and mutual accommodation?

190. We know that the stakes are high in the Middle East, not only because oil—or petrol, as some call it—and other natural resources happen to be in great abundance, but also because of the strategic position of the Middle East, lying as it does at the crossroads of three continents.

191. You correct me if I am wrong, my good colleague from the United States: We had been told that we were to appear here at 12 o'clock; yet all the time we were kept in the dark about what was being concocted. I took a glance and found Ambassador Scali huddled with Ambassador Malik—not in the Council President's room but in the secretary's room: it seems there were certain articles or commas that had been left out, or something. And then I heard—and correct me if I am wrong—the United States representative ask that the meeting be delayed until 4 o'clock. I may be wrong. But again we go by our proverbs, which all come from experience. We have an Arabic proverb which translated into English is: suspicion is sinful; but, in some circumstances, suspicion is an indication of a quick mind. In that case, since you were all concerned about the Arab people, why did you postpone this meeting for four hours and not give our colleague from China the chance to take the floor? You wanted to vote, you say.

192. Somebody told me: “You have no representation in China”. I said: “But I support China in its request because it is elementary justice that they should express their views”. And I thought China was a permanent member of the Security Council. But they were brushed aside, and you know what happened. I will not go into the details.

193. I think the President made amends finally by allowing China to take the floor before the vote. He acted rightly, but he was confused. You cannot blame a confused man when there are so many pressures upon him. It was the United States, I heard, that asked for the postponement so that the Israelis, who keep harking back to Yom Kippur, may have a rationalized stand and say, “They deceived us, so now it is time we deceived them”. Let us put things in their proper perspective.

194. Beware: we Arabs—and, I presume, non-Arabs—refuse to be the stooges, marionettes and lackeys of the super-Powers. The last two resolutions are like salads: hurriedly prepared, perhaps without washing the ingredients, and dressed with a combined Russian-American sauce. I do not know whether they conflict or not: I know there is a French dressing, which everybody likes; there is an Italian dressing—vinegar and olive oil—but I have not heard of a sauce made up of Russian dressing mixed up with American dressing. It may be bitter, it may be sweet, but they would not even give the representative of China a chance to see it or taste it.

195. That is arbitrary action, my good friend Ambassador Malik. I think this time you were outmatched by Mr. Scali: he kept silent as a mouse and made you do the talking. He was very happy. Yes, laugh: it eases the tension; we should laugh, yes.

196. Incidentally, for your information, a Jewish lady—I can reply to her now—sent me a telegram because I sometimes relieve the tension with a joke. Here it is:

“Representative Saudi Arabia, UN Council, 42nd Street and First Avenue. Sir:—at least she is polite—“You must be the comedian of the century. I have been chuckling ever since you spoke. If you believe and wrote all that

stuff"—she is suspicious that I am like Mr. Tekoah, whose words are all prefabricated and handed to him; I speak from my notes, but she was suspicious—"if you believe and wrote all that stuff, go out and shoot yourself"—yes, you would be happy if I shot myself; there would be no Baroody to reply to you—"If a subordinate wrote it, shoot him. Your State has oil and has education"—I could not put those two words together myself—and it is signed "Elizabeth Waldman".

I am replying to you, Elizabeth Waldman. I stand on your freedom to express yourself, although you might have been hysterical at the time you sent this telegram. You live at 15 Dexter Road, Westport, Connecticut. Got my message? I am not going to read you the 50 letters I have received from non-Jews—and a few from Jews—thanking me for briefing the American people on the situation, because it would be patting myself on the back to do so.

197. The policy of "no war, no peace" has backfired, but that policy is still being pursued, I am afraid, to serve the national interests of certain Powers. The major States—or the super States, as they have rightly been called by our Chinese colleagues since we began to hear their voice in the United Nations—have been resorting to secret diplomacy. What do we have the United Nations for? Let us scrap the United Nations Charter and engage in secret diplomacy on a bilateral basis. And then they come with all kinds of solutions and impose them even on a permanent member of the Security Council, a member that represents 700 million to 800 million people. "Who are those Chinese?", they ask. They still have that colour complex, I am afraid. I do not think this is true of the Russians, because they are mixed up with the Mongols and things like that, but it is true of those who came down from the Anglo-Saxons. "Who are those Chinese? Who are those Arabs? Who are those Africans?" We know you.

198. I shall translate an Arab proverb for the benefit of those who do not know Arabic: "If ever you see the prominent teeth of the lion, never believe that the lion is smiling at you—he may be ready to pounce on you." There are ways of pouncing on us. By secret diplomacy they pounce. They are not lions, they are human beings, but that is what it means.

199. After they lost their empire, they smiled at us; they became agreeable. I am not talking of the common people. The common people are sheep, they are sent to the slaughter in wars.

200. Why, then, have the United Nations? Have you forgotten what happened to the League of Nations? Those of you who are old enough—as old as I am, and I observed the League of Nations *ex-officio*—will remember the Emperor of Ethiopia warned the League of Nations that it was giving the green light to Mussolini to invade Ethiopia and to continue his adventure in Africa.

201. And to brief members of the Council on how diplomacy has been conducted—and I believe we have not changed very much—I happened to be in London between 1929 and 1939 and I was involved in Arab and Asian affairs. I had a very good friend none other than the

Ambassador of Ethiopia, and we met to see what we could do to counteract Mussolini's invasion and his designs on Africa. I finally spotted some arms in Greece, and we thought we would have those arms sent from Greece to Ethiopia, and we almost chartered a ship. And while the Conservative Government of the United Kingdom and the press were maligning Mussolini and saying that he was a Fascist, none other than Dame Sylvia Pankhurst, who was a rabid socialist—I am using the word "rabid"; I learned it in England—when I appeared with her on a platform near Russell Square in order to have money collected for the Ethiopian Red Cross, and I was one of the speakers—said, "Do you know what is happening?" I said, "No, I don't know what is happening." She said, "Neville is sending Austen." I said, "Who is Neville?" She said, "Neville Chamberlain. His brother Austen is being sent secretly to Mussolini to tell him that he can go and grab all he wants in Ethiopia and elsewhere provided he does not ally himself with Hitler." The green light for Mussolini to conquer and subjugate Ethiopia. From one corner of their mouths those imperialists talked about the freedom of peoples and from the other corner of their mouths they abetted in subjugating them. What assurance do we have that this is still not taking place in a different form?

202. Having addressed the United States, I hope my good friend Mr. Malik, whom I have admired and respected since 1948, will bear with me. What about the influx of Jews from the Soviet Union into Palestine? I have tried and tried to find the facts of that mass immigration. To us, it was mass immigration. Of course there are 3 million Soviet Jews, I am told, who are allegedly maltreated in the Soviet Union. My analysis is as follows.

203. The Zionist mass information media seem to have succeeded in tarnishing the Soviet Union in the Western world and the United States of America. Otherwise, why should there be 78 Senators in the United States who seem to be servilely propitiating the Zionists by bringing pressure to bear on the United States Government to allow those immigrants to flock into Palestine? I thought this was an internal matter for the Soviet Union. Those Jews are Soviet citizens. Of course, Mr. Tekoah considers every Jew, not only in the Christian but also in the atheist world, a national of Israel, because that is the philosophy of Zionism.

204. Secondly, the Zionists have by various means influenced the legislative bodies of the United States and that is why conditions are set for trade between the United States and the Soviet Union.

205. Thirdly, I think the Zionist plan may be—though I may be wrong—to see to it that many Jews come from the Soviet Union and when the Soviet Union behaves according to their code, the Zionist code, then there will be a sort of bridge between the Jews of Israel and the Jews of the Soviet Union. And remember, my good friend Mr. Malik, how the Zionists turned their backs on the Soviet Union. When they saw the Zionists turn their backs, the Soviet Union began to work with some of the Arabs. Not with Saudi Arabia. We do not have representation there, but we are on good terms with you as diplomats.

206. Do you have the assurance, United States of America, that the Zionists will not turn their back on you and begin to work their way through with the Soviet Union? Because they are skilful, those Zionists. Don't think we are napping. This is what they will do. So they will make the two super-Powers do their bidding. They will do it little by little. There is a saying: the dance begins by a few steps. Are you sure some steps are not being taken so that they might work through the Soviet Union once they have squeezed all the Jews from the United States? They are serving their own interests.

207. All of you have referred to resolution 242 (1967). The record speaks for itself. I was a dissenter of resolution 242 in 1967 because I thought it was a fraud, like these two resolutions before you—and I hope I am wrong—the resolutions passed on 22 October and today. At least I have someone of the same opinion. It is the delegation of China. They are not my cousins. We have no ambassador in Peking, but you should give them credit. Someone, in order to drive a wedge between the Chinese and me said, "But you don't recognize them". I said, "But if they are right, we recognize that they are right". See how mischievous people can be. They want to sow trouble between the Chinese and me. Baroody stands for right. This is why, Mr. President, I asked you to please let the representative of China speak before the vote, because he was right. And although it suited the Arabs—some Arabs, not all of the Arabs, because I have no right to speak for all of them—that an immediate vote be taken, but the Chinese were right. I am glad, Sir, that you saw the light.

208. We Arab people stand against the manipulation of outside forces. We are not imposing our will on others and we refuse that others should impose their will upon us, whether they be super-Powers or any Power for that matter. After all, we have occupied the area for centuries, from the Atlantic to the Gulf, the confines of Iran, and from Syria to the Sudan. We will survive all these conflicts, as we have done in the past, even before some of us were Arabized. Because Arabism is not something of blood or race. It is a culture, a way of life, a common interest and a common language. Above all, common interests.

209. And don't think, United States, you can intimidate us, as you have done in our area. I am talking of the CIA role in Iran. I witnessed what happened. There was a gentleman who is the grandson of Theodore Roosevelt. His name is Mr. Kermit Roosevelt. When I met him at receptions I would say, "How are you, Mr. Roosevelt?" He was a member of the Government of the United States. He always was sympathetic and receptive to certain remarks I made about this sad conflict between us and the Zionists. One day I said, "How are you doing?" He said, "I am no longer with the Government." I said, "Why? There is a tradition among the Roosevelts, not only your grandfather but President Franklin Roosevelt too, of service to the people of the United States." He said, "Well, I took a job with one of the oil companies." "Ah, they pay better." "Yes," he said, "they pay better." After all, he is human, looking after his interests.

210. Then when Mossadegh came on the scene and I met Mossadegh, we found that Mr. Kermit Roosevelt was sent

to Iran, and he began to negotiate for what was later known as the oil consortium. And all of a sudden Mr. Mossadegh fled from Iran. Later we heard that this oil man was a CIA man. We are not impressed by the CIA and the terrorism they use and the coups d'état they resort to. I am talking about the CIA, Mr. Malik, not about the KGB. They won't tell you anything, the KGB. The Americans like to write books after they leave the CIA.

211. I was talking about Kermit Roosevelt who left the Government because perhaps they did not pay enough of a salary and joined the oil consortium and went to negotiate with Mr. Mossadegh, you remember, who nationalized the oil. He was the precursor of nationalization of resources in our area. Incidentally, I saw Mr. Kermit Roosevelt in Saudi Arabia at the airport. I said, "Why are you coming?" He said, "I am a public relations man." I said, "Are you sure?" That is all I said.

212. Look at the budget of the CIA. It is legitimate for any intelligence agency to gather information from other States, States which they think might have hostile designs upon them. That was the classical role of intelligence agencies. What are the big intelligence agencies doing now but resorting to terrorism, coups d'état, bribery. But now the CIA and other intelligence agencies will not succeed because they cannot subdue the peoples of the world who rise against them. By your CIA you have alienated many peoples of the world. So don't try any mischief again.

213. You may buy some people here and there, but you will not succeed because you have alienated yourself—the Government of the United States—from our people. We did not alienate ourselves, you alienated yourself from us.

214. Concerning the KGB, the Russians are very secretive and they do not publish books by authors, so I cannot comment.

215. My dear Ambassador Malik, you warned Israel shortly about not obeying the cease-fire, and said that it better do that. Well, I am sure you said that sincerely. But are you sure your Government will do it, or will the Government or Mr. Scali bring pressure on your Government not to do it? That is the question. I believe you when you say something, but after all, like everyone of us, you implement the policy of your Government. And many of us believe now that there is collusion between the Soviet Union and the United States. I hope I am wrong, because we have to pay the price. As the Arabic proverb says: "When the wind quarrels with the sea, it is the sailor in the boat that pays the price." And we are the sailors in the boat. I hope that we will not suffer as the result of such alleged collusion.

216. The cease-fire is tantamount to a fait accompli in order further to weaken the Arab armies so that they can be more easily manipulated by the United States.

217. And here, from the bottom of my heart, I want to repeat what I have been saying again and again, in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, that the Zionist hierarchy unwittingly and inadvertently may push things so far that the people of the United States and the

Western world may get fed up with this Arab-Israeli question, to the extent that if anything goes wrong in the United States they will pick on the innocent Jews who are loyal American citizens, and the leaders of the Zionists here will take to their heels. And I should not like to see anyone made a scapegoat, whether he be Jew or gentile, belonging to a minority as the Jews do, constituting only 3 per cent of the population.

218. I am not the enemy of anyone, I hope, as a person. Believe me, I harbour no hatred or rancour, even against those who hurt us. I may be angry. The Arab people may be angry. We are human. But as one who has worked for 26 years in this very Organization for the sanctity of the human person, as it is spelt out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and subsequently in the provisions of the International Covenant on Human Rights, I would be saddened to see—and perhaps many of us would stand to defend—any Jew who might be persecuted by this mighty nation, the United States. The writing on the wall has begun to appear. You Zionists, do not push the United States too far. Inadvertently, unwittingly—

219. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Mr. President, I beg your indulgence—

220. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I never interrupted this gentleman—

221. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I must appeal that this forum which is being watched now by millions of people—

222. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Shut up—

223. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel):—should not be turned into an anti-Semitic market place—

224. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): You are anti-Semitic, you are against the Arabs.

225. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): It is a shame and a disgrace that no one interrupts the representative who is speaking here—

226. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): If you not stop that man, I will stop him. Oh, shut up.

227. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel):—and I ask you, Mr. President, to put an end to this disgrace.

228. The PRESIDENT: Order.

229. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Order. Why does he create disorder? I am not anti-Semitic. I am a Semite. He said yesterday I was supporting the Hitlerites. Will you stop him and not appeal to me? I never interrupt him. What kind of interpretation is this?

230. The PRESIDENT: I must call the representative of Saudi Arabia to order. I have a great temptation to suspend this meeting again. But please—

231. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I must insist on my right not to be interrupted.

232. The PRESIDENT: Can I ask the representative of Saudi Arabia to proceed. How far has he still got to go?

233. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): With all due respect to you, you never ask Mr. Malik: "How far have you got to go?" when he makes his speech. You do not ask the Vice-Foreign Minister of China? Why do you ask me? If you are taking advantage of my friendship with you, I will yield. But if you are speaking as President, I will not take it. I think it is an unwarranted criticism because I must be treated equally. And I can take the floor more than the others because you always ask me to yield to certain requests to let others speak—and I do. And when I patiently wait for two, three hours, you are suggesting diplomatically that I should cut my statement short. I am going to finish. It is uncalled for, with all due respect. Please address these remarks to others: "How long are you going to speak?"

234. The United States and the Soviet Union exercise power. If they speak two words or they speak 2,000 words, it is they who exercise power. But we, who do not exercise power, should be given the right, each one in his style, to express what he has to say on behalf of his Government. For Heaven's sake, Sir, you remember I told you: "Ask this gentleman not to interrupt me because I never interrupted him." And now he is up to his tricks. He is afraid that my words might have some effect. Why do you not tell him something? I am waiting to see what you tell him. Ask him not to interrupt me.

235. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): You are resorting to anti-Semitism—it is a disgrace for all of us to be listening to it.

236. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Why do you not ask him now? Am I resorting to anti-Semitism? I am a Semite. Why do you not ask him? Why do you not appeal to him? You appeal to me. Do not take advantage. Are you giving him the floor, Sir, or what? Please, I will abide by what you say. I warned him the other day, through you, not to interrupt me, and he drives himself—he is hurt to the quick, and then he begins to interrupt me while I am sitting next to him. I never say anything when he is speaking, although I think many of the things he says are distortions. He has the right to make them. But I do not say that they are distortions until he has finished. If I want to say it, I say it after he has finished. He has maligned the Arabs; he has maligned the Egyptians; he has maligned the Palestinians. He speaks of barbarians, and this and that. Why did not the representative of the United Kingdom interrupt me when I was referring to certain historical facts? Because he is polite. Ask Mr. Tekoah to be a little more polite and then I will not have to say "shut up". Do you think I relish telling him to shut up? But you cannot shut him up. Who will shut him up? You are our President. Please appeal to him to wait until I finish. Let him kindly be patient. May I proceed? Will you kindly appeal to him not to interrupt. Why do you appeal to me only? Appeal to him and then I will proceed. If you want to tell me to shut up, I will shut up. Appeal to him.

237. The PRESIDENT: I ask the representative of Saudi Arabia to proceed with his speech. He responded, if I may say so, very gallantly and well to an appeal that I addressed to him at a meeting a few nights ago and I think that

everybody in the Council felt that his response was admirable at that time. All I ask now is that he proceed with his statement.

238. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): If you do not want to appeal to him in public, send him one of your aides to tell him not to interrupt me. I really feel sorry to have to resort to such terms as "shut up", but while I am getting my thoughts together he begins to interrupt me and he says that I am an anti-Semite. Good Lord, many Jews are personal friends of mine, but they are the Jews of our part of the world. Anyway, I predict that it will not be long before innocent Jews—and their number is legion—may become scapegoats, and wrongly so, because they are pushing the super-Powers too far.

239. My last words—and this is in order to respond to your appeal, Mr. President; I have another sheaf of notes which I will not use—are these: The Arab peoples—and I am talking now as one of the earliest Pan-Arabs; that is why I have the right to speak on behalf of the Arab peoples, as a Pan-Arab—will be generous if the Zionists relinquish their dream of domination and restore the rights of the Palestine people. And, ironically, many of them had been Jews and embraced Christianity, while some embraced Islam. Should they curb their imperial plans and wish to abide amongst us, whether they be the Semitic Jews of our area or the Khazars who adopted a Semitic religion, they will be welcome. And there would be no need to talk of cease-fire, and there would be no need to let the super-Powers interfere in our area. I am not talking about today or a year or two from today; I am talking about the longer-range future.

240. I appeal to the super-Powers to take into account what I have said today. I appeal to the Jews of the world not to be impressed by the Zionist doctrine, but rather to prevail on the political Zionists to come to their senses so that they, the Zionists, as Jews, and the Jews of our area may live in that region in peace, without interference from outside.

241. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Kenya, who wishes to explain his vote on the draft resolution.

242. Mr. MUNGAI (Kenya): We voted affirmatively for the draft resolution which the Council has just adopted because of our concern about the lives that are being lost in the Middle East and the large-scale destruction of property that is being caused. We did not speak before the vote in order to save time, because time is of the essence. However, we cannot fail to notice the manner in which the super-Powers submitted these two draft resolutions.

243. Last Sunday, 21 October 1973, the Council was urgently summoned and presented with a draft resolution worked out by the United States and the Soviet Union. Today, we have had a similar experience. Eleven days ago in this Council—that is, on 12 October 1973—I said that the Council should enforce the following elements:

"First, an immediate cease-fire should come into effect. Such a cease-fire would obviate further unnecessary loss

of life and destruction of property, which can only intensify the feelings of enmity against the people and States that have to live together in the same region . . . enter into immediate negotiations with a view to solving the other outstanding problems of the conflict, including the implementation of the principles enunciated in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), giving due attention to the rights of the Palestinian peoples. This should also include guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area and all the other points stipulated in resolution 242 (1967)." [1746th meeting, para. 21.]

244. The points contained in our proposal are reflected in resolution 338 (1973), which was brought to us 10 days later. Instead of the super-Powers taking heed at that time and acting on those two points, they stepped up arms supplies, worth billions of roubles and billions of dollars, to the Middle East, supplies which have been used and are currently being used to inflict large-scale death and destruction and untold suffering, and also to cause bitterness among people who are destined to live together in that area. It appears as if the super-Powers took action only when their détente was threatened.

245. The world looks to the Security Council to bring about peace in the Middle East. The world is also blaming the Council for failure to do so. Under the Charter the Council is charged with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. This responsibility is a collective one and Kenya would like to see proper consultations held in future among all members of the Council; otherwise, this Council will be reduced to a membership of only two.

246. Resolution 338 (1973) has not been implemented because of the lack of enforcement machinery. We therefore join hands with those who have asked for an increase in the strength of the United Nations observer corps to be placed at the disposal of the Secretary-General to enable him to carry out effectively the decision of the Security Council. He must be given the tools.

247. My delegation trusts that the Council will not fail the peoples of the Middle East, who must be yearning for a genuine and lasting peace in their area.

248. Finally, may I appeal to the parties and the negotiating machinery, when set in motion, to concentrate their efforts on the substance and not the form or the mechanics of how to get started on the substance. It will be regrettable and tragic if once again in the future we have to come before this Council to discuss war and peace in the Middle East because of further frustrations among parties resulting from non-implementation of this and other decisions of the Security Council.

249. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the Secretary-General, who wishes to make a statement.

250. The SECRETARY-GENERAL (*interpretation from French*): I have just received a communication dated 23 October 1973 from the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Syria, who has asked me to inform

the Council as soon as possible of its contents. This communication refers to the resolution which the Security Council adopted yesterday. It reads as follows:

[The Secretary-General read out the text of the communication contained in document S/11040.]

[The Secretary-General continued in English.]

251. Since I have the floor I wish to inform the Council of a report which I have just received from the Chief of Staff of UNTSO, General Siilasvuo. It is as follows.

252. As a first step, General Siilasvuo has instructed the officer in charge of the Control Centre at Ismailia, in co-operation with the Egyptian authorities, to deploy immediately three observation teams: one in the northern sector, one in the central sector, and one in the southern sector of the Suez Canal area. The Israeli military authorities have been informed of this and the Chief of Staff is discussing with them a similar observation operation based on the Kantara Control Centre on the eastern side of the Canal.

253. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union in exercise of his right of reply.

254. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I have asked to speak to make a point clear. The distinguished representative of Saudi Arabia, my old friend Mr. Baroody, expressed doubts on whether I have instructions to utter a stern warning to Israel. Not only do I have such instructions but I received the text of an official declaration, made by the Soviet Government on 23 October which I brought to the notice of the Security Council and its members. I shall repeat part of it for Mr. Baroody's information. "The Soviet Government warns the Government of Israel of the serious consequences involved in the continuation of its aggressive actions against the Egyptian Arab Republic and the Syrian Arab Republic." I hope this piece of information will dispel Mr. Baroody's doubts.

255. Obviously, the Chinese representative is in need of some information as well. He stated that I was slandering China's position. That was not slander, but simply a reply to slander.

256. Who was it who delayed the entire meeting? The Chinese representative should check his facts before attacking the Soviet Union with his slander. The fact that I requested the immediate convening of the Security Council to adopt a resolution can be borne out by our distinguished President of the Security Council. Mr. Baroody, too, has explained who delayed the convening of the Council. Unfortunately, there was little time, and we could not delay. We heeded the request made by the Egyptian delegation, which required an urgent meeting of the Security Council at 12 noon and the adoption of a decision, and we were guided by the most honourable motives, namely to help our Arab friends and not to hold up a decision by the Security Council. Any delay would have been inadmissible. But if there had been more time, would the policy of China have changed? We all recall quite well

our discussion of the situation in the Middle East in June and July, on that occasion, too, at the initiative of Egypt and its Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. El-Zayyat. There was a great deal of time in June and July. Eight non-permanent members of the Security Council, representatives of the third world, submitted a good draft resolution which is contained in document S/10974. Mr. El-Zayyat said it reflected the public opinion of the whole world. Eight non-permanent members submitted this draft resolution which was supported by the Soviet delegation. Consultations went on for a long time. Unfortunately, one of the permanent members of the Security Council vetoed this draft resolution, thereby bearing the responsibility and guilt for its non-adoption.

257. And what did another permanent member do? It hid its hands under the table as at today's meeting. On this occasion there was little time. There was some reason, some pretext for hiding its hands under the table and not voting—that is, voting neither for nor against nor abstaining, as is the normal procedure in the Security Council. But at that time the draft resolution was an excellent one. The entire third world not only supported it, but had in fact worked out and prepared it. It was acceptable to the Arab side, it condemned the aggressor and it upheld the victims of the aggression. And once again I should like to emphasize that our friend Mr. El-Zayyat then stated that that draft resolution was a reflection of world public opinion since it condemned the aggressor and supported the victims of the aggression. But how did China vote? It again hid its hands under the table, despite the consultations that had taken place, despite the fact that it had been able to study the draft resolution for a long time in detail and to apply for instructions from Peking. But the situation then was just the same. At that time the draft resolution was sponsored by eight countries, while this resolution was sponsored by two, but China's position remains the same, so that this is not a question of either time or consultations. The hands remain under the table.

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

259. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): From the statements of many members of the Council, I think everyone can see clearly who is creating confusion in the Security Council, who is trying to impose on the Security Council a draft resolution concocted by the two of them.

260. With regard to the draft resolution submitted at the June meeting of the Security Council, the Chinese delegation acted in accordance with its position of principle and did not participate in the voting. The Chinese delegation long ago made an explanation of its position. Mr. Malik is trying to use that to distort China's position and sow discord in the relations between China and Egypt and other Arab countries as well as the third world. He will never succeed.

261. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

262. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I have nothing to add to what I said about the position of the Chinese delegation. Everything is quite clear.

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

264. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I am speaking in exercise of my right of reply and to seek a clarification in view of what my good friend Ambassador Malik said in regard to the warning that emanated from his Government, which he kindly read to us—specifically, the warning to Israel. Since he was kind enough to tell us that he is of course acting on instructions from his Government, I want to ask him to clarify—not necessarily now, but at a later date—what will happen if Israel, as in the past, does not heed the warning of the Soviet Union? What will the Soviet Union be able to do, when it knows perfectly well that the United States can neutralize such a warning? And what if the United States threatened the Soviet Union if it took action—just action—to implement that warning? These warnings have been treated wantonly by Israel—not only now, but for the last twenty years or so. So what comfort does the warning just read by our good colleague from the Soviet Union bring the Arabs, when the United States, with which the Soviet Union has a *détente*, still pursues a policy of seeing to it that Israel expands at the expense of the Arab peoples?

265. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

266. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I think that Egypt and Syria know clearly what the position of the Soviet Union is and what the possibilities open to the Soviet Union are, more so than Saudi Arabia.

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

268. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I want to inform my good friend and colleague Ambassador Malik that Saudi Arabia, as he knows, is part and parcel of the struggle. I was addressing him as my colleague. To help only Syria and Egypt and bypass us would be strange, because we are all in the struggle against the usurpers from Eastern and Western Europe under the banner of *zionism*.

269. I think the Soviet Union is to be praised for all the aid it has extended to Egypt and Syria. But what about the avalanche of aid, the massive aid that is still being sent by the United States through Portugal—or rather the Azores, which is a Portuguese Territory, where it has a base. Spain refused it a base. What if the United States persists in sending another 2 or 3 billion dollars-worth of lethal sophisticated weapons of mass destruction to Israel? Is the Soviet Union ready to contest the injustice of United States action, or would the warning subside and resolve itself into words without implementation?

270. I am saying this sincerely to my friend from the Soviet Union. The United States has been doing this since the days of Mrs. Roosevelt—who used to tell me, “Whether you like it or not, Arabs, Israel is there to stay.” And who was Mrs. Roosevelt to be the arbiter of our fate? But that is a fact.

271. So if the United States wants to stay mum because it has no answer, that is its business. But is Ambassador Malik in a position to clarify how the warning can be translated into action in view of the United States standing adamantly on its aid to what we consider our foe? All we have here is words, words, words. And I think we are entitled to know. But if for some reason we should not know, of course we cannot force any one of our colleagues to say anything for which he might be considered responsible.

272. The PRESIDENT: I now propose to adjourn this meeting. The Security Council will continue to give this situation its closest attention and will remain ready to be convened immediately, as circumstances demand.

The meeting rose at 9.15 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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