



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 22: The situation in the Middle East .....	1
Agenda item 9: General debate ( <i>continued</i> ) Speech by Mr. Noman (Yemen) .....	9

*President:* Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 22

The situation in the Middle East

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): With the Assembly's permission, I shall now call on the representatives of the States which have sent the letters distributed as documents A/9190, A/9203 and A/9204 to make statements of an informative character, and thereafter we shall continue the general debate. I shall call first on the signatory of document A/9203, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

2. Mr. ISMAIL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): The day before yesterday I addressed to you, Mr. President, on instructions from my Government, a letter relating to the new and cowardly aggression of Israel against my country. As it was in practice impossible to convene the General Assembly on the same day, I requested you to be good enough to circulate my letter as an official document to all the delegations [A/9203]. Now I wish to bring to the attention of representatives additional information concerning the aggression of which my country is a victim.

3. The Israeli attack started at 1400 hours (Syrian local time) on 6 October 1973 all along the front line. Land and air forces participated in the attack. From the very outset the attack was massive and reached such proportions that it appeared unquestionable that it was part of a preconceived plan. The Syrian forces had to react and a battle is raging on land and in the air.

4. The last news from Syria informs us that the Israelis have attempted to launch an attack by sea against the harbour installations of Tartus and Latakia and came up against the resistance of our coast guards, a situation which resulted in an engagement between the two sides.

5. The simultaneous attack launched against Egypt shows unquestionably the deliberate, planned nature of the Israeli

aggression, which is designed to bring about further territorial expansion at the expense of Syria and Egypt, in order to compel them by force to accept the conditions that Israel was unable to impose upon them by any other means.

6. Israel had started to carry out its new plan of aggression before the attack of 6 October. In fact, on 13 September last, Israeli bombers penetrated Syrian air space to a depth of more than 100 kilometres, with the intention of bombing strategic and economic targets. They were prevented from doing so by our fighter aircraft following an air combat which resulted in losses on both sides. That attempted aggression provided an inkling of Israel's intentions in this respect. Since then Israel has embarked upon a massive concentration of troops on our borders and the imminent attack was expected at any moment. That is why Israel was unable this time to take advantage of a surprise attack.

7. The salient feature of this new war of aggression launched by Israel against Syria and Egypt is that it constitutes an indescribable challenge to world public opinion and the international community. It comes after resolution AHG/Res. 70 (X) adopted by the Organization of African Unity and the resolution adopted by the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held recently at Algiers [*see A/9330 and Corr. 1, pp. 34-35*]. It also comes after the resolutions of the United Nations and of its various organs and after draft resolution S/10974 presented to the Security Council by the non-aligned countries,<sup>1</sup> which was accepted by all the members of the Security Council except the United States.

8. In all of these resolutions, Israel was explicitly condemned or reproved for its aggressive and expansionist policy. These resolutions represent the censuring attitude of reproof adopted by the international community towards Israel. Thus, this new war of aggression launched by Israel may be taken as a direct challenge to the international community, as well to the international organizations which adopted the resolutions to which I have just referred. It is also a challenge flung individually at all the States which voted for these resolutions.

9. At present we are fighting to repel the aggressor. We are exercising our right of self-defence. We do not wish to bring death to anyone. We are attempting to prevent the aggressor from sowing death and destruction in our own land. We are asking that, at last, this wound, which is constantly bleeding in our region, should be treated and finally healed once and for all.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1973*.

10. We are calling for the strict application of the principles of the United Nations Charter: in other words, that an end be put to the occupation of the Arab territories usurped by force; that our territorial integrity be safeguarded; that the principle of self-determination, recognized for all peoples, including the Palestinian people, be applied as an inalienable right flowing from the United Nations Charter.

11. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel.

12. Mr. EBAN (Israel): There is not a single man or woman inside this hall or outside it who does not know, in the depths of his heart, that Egypt and Syria have dealt a heavy and sudden blow to the most cherished of all human causes, the cause of international peace. The premeditated and unprovoked assault which they launched across the cease-fire line on the Day of Atonement, 6 October 1973, will surely rank in future history as one of the basest acts for which governments have ever been responsible. It is Israel's unshakeable resolve that this assault shall be frustrated and repelled. For if it were to have any success, the hope of peace would die.

13. Let there be no doubt that this attempt to smash the cease-fire structure is a violation—a massive violation—of international law. The cease-fire is an international agreement. It was accepted by Egypt, Syria and Israel in response to a decision of the Security Council in which all three Governments concurred. Security Council resolution 233 (1967) of 6 June 1967 reads:

“The Security Council,

“... ”

“1. Calls upon the Governments concerned to take forthwith as a first step all measures for an immediate cease-fire and for a cessation of all military activities in the area”.

Israeli and Egyptian consent was soon expressed and within 30 hours the cease-fire was formalized on the ground. A few days later, in its resolution 235 (1967) the Security Council decided that “the Governments of Israel and Syria have announced their mutual acceptance of the Council's demand for a cease-fire” and demanded “that hostilities should cease forthwith”.

14. The mutual commitment by Syria and Israel has never been questioned or repudiated by either Government. Indeed, both have invoked it in complaints and demands to the Security Council.

15. The Egyptian-Israeli cease-fire was in force by mutual agreement until 1968. On that date the Egyptian Government announced that it was repudiating the cease-fire. It later explained that it proposed to wage what it called a war of attrition. By the summer of 1970, this war of attrition had achieved no result except the death of many hundreds, the devastation of large areas near the Suez Canal, and the growing involvement of the Middle East in the policies and rivalries of the Powers.

16. In the summer of 1970, Egypt and Israel, through the good offices of the United States, renewed the cease-fire, which came into effect on 7 August 1970. That was a

moment of high relief for the Middle East and for the world. It seemed to illuminate a new vision and a new hope for, together with the cease-fire, the two Governments agreed to solve their remaining disputes by negotiations on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Israel undertook that, on the establishment of peace, with secure and agreed boundaries, forces would be withdrawn to the secure boundaries which would be determined by negotiation in the peace agreement. And thus a clear international consensus emerged concerning the method of attaining peace in the Middle East.

17. The stages were clear: first, cease-fire; second, negotiation; third, agreement on the conditions of coexistence, including the boundary question; fourth, withdrawal to the agreed boundaries with the establishment of permanent peace. To this policy of maintaining the cease-fire and offering negotiations on the final settlement I pledged Israel again, to the General Assembly, on 3 October this year [2139th meeting].

18. The Syrian representative in that debate pledged his Government to a policy of unceasing war. The Egyptian Foreign Minister, probably knowing what lay ahead, prudently postponed his address from last week to the next. He knew what he was doing. The assault of 6 October must have been at a high stage of preparation.

19. Across this horizon, bleak and gray but not entirely bereft of hope, with a spark of prospect for negotiation on the horizon, across all of this came the answer from Egypt and Syria on 6 October. Their answer to the hope of peace was the squalid recourse to war. Their answer to the vision of a peaceful developing Middle East has been to fill the region, for these two or three days, with blood, much blood, and tears and rancorous passions. Anything except dialogue; anything rather than negotiation; anything except the respect of existing engagements and the quest for new agreements; anything but that.

20. I wish to inform the General Assembly of how this crisis evolved. It evolved quickly, but it did have its prelude. At 4 a.m. Israeli time, 10 in the morning in New York, six hours before the outbreak, a telegram reached me from Jerusalem telling me that authentic information, as well as the evidence on the ground, indicated that there was going to be a joint Egyptian and Syrian attack later in the day, with the aim of crossing the cease-fire line at the Suez Canal and the cease-fire line at Golan. Two hours later diplomatic representatives in Israel, beginning with the United States, which had sponsored the cease-fire, were informed of this expectation. The United States Ambassador in Israel was informed several hours before the assault that Israel would not take any pre-emptive action, would bear the sacrifice which that renunciation implied, but would, of course, repel any Egyptian or Syrian movement. His Government, and later other Governments, were invited to inform Cairo and Damascus and others accordingly. Similar exchanges were held here in New York at Foreign Minister level.

21. We know the answer. Egypt first invented an imaginary sea battle, with imaginary Israeli ships, at an imaginary place, at an imaginary time: the most dramatic non-existent battle in the history of war. This was alleged to have taken place hours after Egypt's plan of attack was revealed and

communicated by us to other Governments. Egypt and Syria have no evidence whatever to show for this falsehood—for the simple reason that it is a falsehood—by which millions of people in this country and others have been insulted.

22. After the mendacity came the aggression, an attack from north and south, with the cease-fire lines crossed in heavy force.

23. There are two circumstances here which are deeply impressed on our minds and which will be engraved in our memories whenever we come to consider what our security demands, what kind of adversaries we face. First, there is the choice of the day. There is only one day in the year on which there is a virtual paralysis of internal and external communications, on which the nation turns aside from all material concern, a day unique in the spiritual calendar of mankind, an intense celebration of reflection and of humility. The logistic effects of the Day of Atonement are that there is no communication between Israel and the outside world on any normal level, and not even within the country itself.

24. This gross mendacity about an Israeli initiative is refuted by the United Nations observers' report which reports to you specifically about Egyptian encroachments across the cease-fire line, about Syrian encroachments across the cease-fire line.<sup>2</sup> Where in that or in any other document is there the slightest reference to any Israeli encroachment across the cease-fire line? What is the independent evidence that the Foreign Ministers of Egypt and Syria are able to bring in support of their invented myth about the non-existent ship passing silently in the non-existent night?

25. There is also the evidence of normal common sense. Across the world, people must be asking themselves this question, How idiotic would a man have to be to believe that on a day when there were no communications, no activity, no radio, no ability to summon reserves, when the vast majority of our soldiers were in their homes or synagogues, when even forward posts were manned at a minimal level—that precisely on that day Israel would launch a war, on the day holiest to all those who cherish Jewish solidarities, in order to invite thousands of Egyptian and Syrian tanks to attack across a relatively undefended and totally quiescent line?

26. No, there is no doubt: Egypt and Syria exploited a physical vulnerability arising from a spiritual vocation which the Jewish people can never renounce.

27. Egypt concentrated for this assault more than 3,000 tanks, 2,000 guns, nearly 1,000 aircraft and, according to Egyptian spokesmen, 600,000 men, all armed with weapons of Soviet manufacture of the most modern type, including bombers, ground missiles and missile boats. Against them, on the first day, regular Israeli garrisons in the most defensive posture that a nation can ever dream of allowing itself in a situation of regional tension. And on the Syrian side, 1,000 tanks and corresponding numbers of weapons in the

air. Now all that brutal force crashed unprovoked across the cease-fire line.

28. We have suffered tragic losses of life and blood; Egypt and Syria have suffered much more, as the result of their leaders' cynical aggression. But President El-Sadat once told us that he would not care if a million people were killed provided that he secures his objective. I admit that the sacrilegious exploitation of the Day of Atonement and Israel's renunciation of preventive action during those critical hours have cost us dear. But the Egyptian and Syrian advantage has been and will be brief. Israeli forces are now successfully repelling the enemy on both fronts. It is vital that Egyptian and Syrian forces shall not be allowed to remain anywhere beyond the cease-fire lines. The replacement of cease-fire by mutually accepted permanent boundaries must be done by negotiation and peace, not by treacherous, unprovoked, Pearl Harbour attacks.

29. Finally, pending the further elaboration of our position at a meeting of the Security Council, which I understand has been requested, I want to say something about the lessons of this experience.

30. First, about the nature of the hostility that we face. The nature of the hostility that Israel faces is such that no security concern can be exaggerated. When President El-Sadat said in an Egyptian newspaper that he admired Hitler, all the world smiled indulgently. The Soviet Union, which had resisted Hitler, heroically but belatedly, went on supplying arms. Other nations shrugged their shoulders. When the Egyptian Prime Minister praised the murder of pilgrims and tourists at Lod, we were told, "It is only propaganda". Anti-Semitic literature abounds in Cairo, a spiritual heroin, fraught with death and decay. There is too much international indulgence for that hostility. There was indulgence for it at the Algiers Conference. There was indulgence in a speech in which a fine continental tradition of peace, fidelity, constancy and friendship was violated by the President of Zaire on this platform. There is too much indulgence of this hostility. We really must take Egyptian and Syrian statements of hostility at their face value.

31. Second, there is one nightmare that will always be in Israeli minds no matter what the future may bring. Imagine that in a mood of suicidal stupidity we had gone back to the previous armistice lines instead of negotiating boundaries in the framework of peace. If we had performed that folly, then the attacks of 6 October, springing from close at hand, at our very throats and hearts, would have done such destruction to our vital centre that perhaps Israel and all its people, and all the memories, hopes and visions which have moved our history, might now all be lost—lost, swept away in a fearful massacre.

32. How right we were to insist on negotiating with the utmost precision the boundaries of a peace settlement. How wrong were those who counselled us otherwise. For there are three things that are vital, not only to Israel's existence and security but to the peace of the Middle East: first, peace itself; second, negotiation as the pathway to peace; and third, within the framework of a negotiated peace, the establishment of secure boundaries which will give some assurance against the prospect of fatal injury to our nation arising from the kind of sudden assault that took place a few days ago.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Supplement for October, November and December 1973, document S/7930/Add.2141.

33. There are, of course, other horizons beyond this, but the immediate task, to which we are giving all our mind and heart and sacrifice, is to restore the entire structure of the cease-fire.

34. The cease-fire consists of two elements: abstention from fighting and the lines and positions agreed by the parties as the lines and positions of the cease-fire.

35. We cannot help at this very solemn and tragic hour but think back upon the waste and the anguish and the avoidable suffering of the past two decades. All our Arab neighbours together, developing countries, have spent in this period something like \$20,000 million on war. The result: nothing. The achievement: nothing. If it is said that this war is on behalf and for the sake of refugees, the tiniest fraction of that expenditure would have been sufficient to solve all the refugee problems in the Middle East 50 times over. This, then, is the lesson of the uselessness and the waste of hostility.

36. But at this moment we have a more urgent concern. It is to bring the bloodshed to a halt and the cease-fire back to its integrity by ensuring that no Egyptian or Syrian forces shall remain beyond the legitimate and agreed cease-fire lines. It is from that point, and only from that point, that we should take our further journey towards the horizons of peace.

37. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): If the representative of Saudi Arabia will allow me to do so, I should like to sum up the procedural situation as I see it. Before calling on those who have already spoken or who have not yet arrived, I asked permission of the General Assembly to interrupt the general debate, which will be resumed immediately afterwards.

38. I see that the representative of Saudi Arabia wishes to speak. If it is on a point of order, I am pleased to call on him.

39. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I will abide by the rules. Mr. President: I am not asking for privileges. But this is an extraordinary event. You have allowed two representatives to speak on this matter. It is true that the right of reply should be exercised at the end of the day—in other words at the end of the afternoon meeting. However, this subject has now been introduced in the Assembly and the right of reply should be exercised forthwith. I am talking on procedure. Furthermore, if I were to speak later, I would really be breaking the rules because once the discussion of this question of the tragic events that are taking place in the Middle East has been concluded here in the Assembly, it will be taken up in the Security Council.

40. Furthermore, Sir, I would remind you that none other than the representative of the Soviet Union asked to make a statement on another subject the other day [2138th meeting] and you allowed him to speak—and rightly so, because it was a momentous matter he wished to raise. What is good for the representative of the Soviet Union is good for the representative of a small State. You judged that it was an important matter because it involved a humanitarian question, and I shall not go into the details of that statement by the representative of the Soviet Union.

41. Therefore, Sir, basing my request on logic and on precedent, I should like to be allowed to reply to Mr. Eban. He has spoken, and no one interrupted him. We all listened very carefully to him. I believe that I stand on my right and I am ready to go into a procedural debate on the question. If you do not allow me to speak, I shall take my seat; but then I shall ask to raise another point of order. It is up to you, Sir, to take into account logic and precedent and to allow me to speak for a few minutes to refute what the representative of Israel said. May I speak, Sir? I do not wish to break the rules, but I say that what is good for the Soviet Union should be good for Baroody. May I exercise the right of reply?

42. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Saudi Arabia knows very well how much consideration and respect I have for him and his country. As far as a point of order is concerned, I would remind him that I had asked the Assembly for permission to call on three speakers. One of them, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, is now present in the hall. I would ask the representative of Saudi Arabia whether he wishes me to answer his point on his exercise of the right of reply now or after we have heard the speaker to whom I have been authorized to give the floor, the representative of Egypt, Mr. El-Zayyat.

43. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): The Foreign Minister of Egypt did not show up this morning. I do not know why he did not come to the rostrum. If the representative of Egypt wishes to speak forthwith, I will, out of courtesy to him, reply to the representative of Israel after the representative of Egypt finishes making his statement. If, on the other hand, the representative of Egypt is not available, I am not bound to suit anyone, including the representative of Egypt, in regard to the exercise of my right of reply.

44. The arrangement that you mentioned this morning, Mr. President, was that there were three speakers who wished to make statements this morning, namely, the representatives of Egypt, Syria and Israel. I do not know why the representative of Egypt did not speak, but if he wants to speak now—I do not know where he is, for that matter—I will defer the exercise of my right of reply until after he speaks. However, if he is not here, I am not bound by whatever time he chooses to speak and I stand on my right. Again, I must repeat to you, Sir, that the other day you gave the representative of the Soviet Union the right to make a statement on another subject, and you should give me the right to exercise the right of reply forthwith, unless—I repeat—the representative of Egypt chooses to speak now. Could you tell me Sir, what the situation is?

45. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I see that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, Mr. El-Zayyat, is in his seat, and as I understand that the representative of Saudi Arabia does not object to my calling on the representative of Egypt, I request him to allow me to ask the representative of Egypt to come to the rostrum.

46. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): That is agreeable to me, Sir, and I ask for the right to reply after the representative of Egypt finishes his statement.

47. Mr. PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Saudi Arabia for his courtesy. In

accordance with what we have just decided, and with the permission of the Assembly, I call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt.

48. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (EGYPT): Mr. President, I am sure that my colleagues and you understand the importance of the historic moment in which we are living and which necessitated contacts on my part with my capital that did not allow me to be here at the beginning of this meeting of the Assembly.

49. Mr. President, last Saturday, because there was no Assembly meeting, I sent you a letter in which I stated the following:

"At 6.30 hours a.m. (New York time) today, Saturday, 6 October 1973, Israeli air formations and naval units attacked Egyptian forces stationed in the areas of El Zaafarana and El Sukhna on the Gulf of Suez..." [A/9190, para. 1.]

We repelled that aggression. The pattern was familiar. A decoy of seemingly not very strong naval units attack in order that, later on, high-flying Phantoms may attack the defenders. This is what has been called the "decoy", and it happened in Syria on 13 September of this year.

50. I also informed you in that letter that:

"Egyptian forces are at present"—as indeed they are at this very moment—"engaged in military operations against the Israeli forces of aggression in the occupied territories" of Egypt and Syria.

"...

"The aggression launched today along the Egyptian and Syrian fronts is a continuation of Israel's policy of annexation and consolidation of its occupation of Arab territories beginning with Jerusalem and its insistence on the humiliation of the Arab people and the breaking of their will." [Ibid., paras. 2 and 4.]

Subsequently I added other statements to that letter, and you were kind enough, Mr. President, to have them circulated as a document of this Assembly.

51. Let me first state that the Foreign Minister of Israel has seen fit to say in the public media that these were lies. Although he was kind enough to say that, if I had said these things, they were lies, I do not choose to use the same vocabulary, out of respect for you, Mr. President, and for the Assembly—but first of all, really, out of respect for myself. However, although I am not an expert on lying, I do not want to leave this point without referring to one thing in the statement of the Foreign Minister of Israel contained in the verbatim record of the Assembly meeting on Wednesday, 3 October 1973, Mr. Eban said: "We accepted Ambassador Jarring's proposal, rejected by Egypt..." and so on [2139th meeting, para. 67]. That is perhaps not a lie, but it certainly is a gross omission and distortion. Ambassador Jarring is at the United Nations, or should be. If he is not available in person, his reports are available, and he can say—as he has indeed said—who has co-operated with him and who it is that has caused his failure to accomplish anything during the long period of his mission.

52. Secondly, in the same statement Mr. Eban said: "When four eminent Heads of African States visited our region in 1971..." [ibid.], they reported that Israel had co-operated and that Egypt had not. Of course, I shall not ask those African Presidents to reply; I would not dare to ask that. But would not Mr. Eban take it as a reply that from this rostrum one of them, President Mobutu of Zaire [2140th meeting], declared before the world the rupture of his country's relations with Israel because of Israel's lack of co-operation—lack of co-operation, not co-operation—with the African Heads of State, with the United Nations and with all efforts at peace?

53. Again, in the same statement, Mr. Eban tells the Assembly that the Israelis have abstained "from changing the political and juridical status of the administered territories and have not closed any options for a negotiated peace" [2139th meeting, para. 69]. That twofold statement calls for a twofold correction. First, Israel is indeed changing everything in the occupied territories; the United Nations has a committee which can say so. Jerusalem has been annexed and Israel declares that this question is not negotiable. Secondly, as for the closing of options, I think that it is Israeli policy to close each and every option and to declare in advance that it seeks the partitioning of Egypt, after having partitioned Palestine, and that it seeks the partitioning of Syria and of Jordan. And indeed, Israel tells the Assembly in an official document that it will never go back to the lines from which it attacked in 1967—that is, that Israel will have to get a portion of the lands of Egypt, Syria and Jordan.

54. I have said that, although it was not in my prepared statement, because if what I have reported is called a lie then I think that those who accuse me of lying should at least be beyond suspicion—and I do not think that they are.

55. I wish to inform this Assembly that Egyptian forces have now crossed to the eastern bank of the Suez Canal where they have hoisted Egypt's flag on Egyptian territory east of the Canal. Syrian forces are liberating their territory, the Golan. By this act, dedicated to the safeguarding of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab nations, the sons of Egypt and Syria are equally defending and safeguarding the fundamental principles of our Charter.

56. This act of self-defence is not an act of madness, as Mrs. Meir has said it is. It was, and is, madness to expect us and other Arabs to suffer in silence the continued occupation of our lands. It was, and is, madness to expect the world you represent here to suffer in silence while the United Nations Charter is trampled on.

57. When the General Assembly met here in the fifth emergency special session in June and July 1967, Israel asserted that it sought no territorial aggrandizement, but only the termination of belligerency and a peace agreement. We asked the Assembly to resolve that the armed forces of Israel be withdrawn immediately, fully and unconditionally.

58. Some countries, mainly Latin American countries and the United States, sought to link the withdrawal with the termination of belligerency. There was, however, never any doubt on the part of those who supported this concept as to

the absolute necessity of the withdrawal of the Israeli military forces from all the territories occupied as the result of Israel's aggression in 1967. All who supported the Latin American draft resolution<sup>3</sup> made it clear that they rejected territorial expansion and that they equally rejected retention of the territories as a means to impose territorial concessions on the victim countries.

59. No words, Mr. President, expressed this more eloquently than your own when you spoke here on behalf of Ecuador on 28 June 1967. You stated:

"... I have specific instructions from my Government to state that we absolutely reject any territorial conquest through force and the retention of occupied territories as a means of exerting pressure for later negotiations; we shall therefore vote in favour of the withdrawal of the Israel forces to the lines of the *status quo ante*."<sup>4</sup>

60. It was on the basis of that sentiment that, later on, United Nations resolutions were formulated. They all expressed the obvious and fundamental principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. We have accepted the resolutions of the General Assembly as the verdict of the international community. These resolutions sought to establish a just and lasting peace, a peace which, by necessity, rejects domination and territorial expansion.

61. Throughout the past six years Israel has sought, and sought only the perpetuation of its occupation, confident in its might, convinced of its military invincibility. Egypt, on the other hand, has co-operated fully with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Jarring. In 1968, Egypt formally proposed to him the setting up of a time-table for the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Egypt then welcomed the four-Power talks which took place at the beginning of 1969 on the initiative of France. In the summer of 1970, the United States made a proposal under which the parties would agree to carry out Security Council 242 (1967) in all its parts, appoint representatives to contact Ambassador Jarring, and observe a 90-day cease-fire.

62. Egypt accepted that initiative in full. Israel appointed Minister Eban to be its spokesman with Jarring. I was designated by my Government to enter into those discussions. However, in the first place, Mr. Eban never appeared and his deputy no sooner announced that he was entering into talks with Jarring than he in fact spoke no more. The 90-day cease-fire commenced on 7 August 1970. Israel withdrew from contacts with Ambassador Jarring on 6 September 1970. Egypt further accepted a call from the General Assembly to extend for another three months the 90-day cease-fire which was to end on 5 November 1970 [resolution 2628 (XXII)]. That period was further extended for one month by President El-Sadat in a speech that he gave on 4 February 1971. After that, there was no cease-fire.

63. However, a few days later, on 8 February 1971, came the decisive test of the intentions of the parties towards the establishment of a just and lasting peace, when the Special

Representative of the Secretary-General submitted his two identical aide-mémoires, carrying the same date of 8 February 1971.<sup>5</sup> Egypt's reply to that aide-mémoire<sup>6</sup> was positive. In its reply,<sup>7</sup> Israel refused to commit itself even to respect Egypt's historical international boundaries. Israel, indeed, formally declared instead that it would not withdraw to the positions the Israelis had occupied before 5 June 1967; and this was in reply to Ambassador Jarring's asking them to withdraw to Egypt's international border with Palestine under the British Mandate.

64. Thus we came to a third standstill. All the efforts made through 1968, 1969 and 1970, founded on the rock of Israel's policy of territorial expansion, a Zionist policy which again became apparent after Israel launched its aggression on 5 June 1967, when it declared its annexation of Jerusalem.

65. Numerous efforts have been made since 1971 to impress upon Israel that it should renounce its expansionist and annexationist policy. Africa, represented by 10 African Heads of State tried; Secretary-General U Thant made appeals; the General Assembly adopted a number of resolutions; all were aimed at convincing Israel to renounce its expansionist and annexationist policy. Israel's attitude was one of defiance and arrogance. It responded with a new phase in its policy of aggression and terrorism: the shooting down of a Libyan civilian plane in mid-air, killing more than 130 innocent civilians, was soon followed by the hijacking of another civilian aircraft and the murder of many other persons in cold blood. The attack on the south of Lebanon was soon to be followed by the lawless murders in Beirut and the consolidation of the occupation and the systematic Israelization of the conquered lands went on as a declared policy of the Government of occupation, indeed, in its electoral platform as its declared policy for the future.

66. Six years have now passed since Israel began to occupy Syrian, Egyptian and Jordanian territory, after the previous expansions in Palestine. The question our people asked and were asking was, Did the United Nations indeed intend to terminate war, belligerency and occupation, and bring about a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area could live in security? Or rather did the United Nations by action or inaction encourage the prolonging and consolidation of occupation and the maintaining of belligerency?

67. To answer that question, last May Egypt requested the Security Council to meet and to consider the situation in the Middle East. Discussions in the Council were of great importance and value. There emerged two clear positions: the one of the overwhelming majority of the members of the Council, and the other the position of Israel. The former was a position in favour of the application of the Charter principles, whereas the latter was an anti-Charter stand. Fourteen members of the Security Council out of 15 stood firmly behind the principle of non-acquisition of territory by war, of territorial integrity and of self-determination. Thirteen members supported draft resolution S/10974,

<sup>5</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10493, annex I.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, annex II.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, annex III.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, *Plenary Meetings*, 1539th meeting, para. 21.

<sup>4</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes*, agenda item 5, document A/L.523/Rev.1.

which strongly deplored Israel's lack of co-operation with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, supported his initiative taken in conformity with his mandate and contained in his aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971, and expressed the conviction that a just and peaceful solution of the problem of the Middle East could be achieved only on the basis of respect for national sovereignty, territorial integrity, the rights of all States in the area, and the rights and legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians. Changes which may obstruct a peaceful and final settlement or which may adversely affect the political and other fundamental rights of all the inhabitants in those territories should not be introduced or recognized. This is almost the text of the draft resolution which was accepted by 13—supported really by 14—and sadly only the United States of America voted against that draft resolution.

68. As a result of the failure of the Security Council to take a decision, owing to the veto of the United States, Israel escalated its arrogant policy of violence and aggression. On 13 September last, Israel committed the aggression against Syria I have just referred to. On 6 October—this month—Israel launched its aggression against Egypt. In between those dates and even before, Israel, resorting to State terrorism, tried to convey the message that it really dominated the area and there was no alternative to accepting its dictates.

69. We have been and always will be loyal to the international order which this Organization represents and which it is designed to defend collectively. It is our responsibility, sanctioned by the Charter, to try our best to repel the aggression and to put an end to the occupation of our land. The perils inherent in Israel's refusal to abide by the Charter are by no means confined to the Middle East. In these historic hours we feel tied more than ever to the great human struggle which took place on the soil of Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America—and we are inspired by its ultimate success. The history of the nations assembled here tells us that the mighty can be defeated. This history of the nations assembled here tells us that justice will overcome.

70. When I was reading from the speech of Mr. Eban, I came across a quotation from the statement by the Chancellor of Germany, Mr. Brandt. Now perhaps I may be allowed to quote from a statement just made by the Foreign Minister of France. Mr. Jobert said: "Does an attempt to set one's feet back in one's own house constitute surprise aggression"?<sup>8</sup> This is our question, If we are trying to set our feet back on our land, our home, can that be called aggression? Or can it be called an act of liberation, for which we indeed expect the Assembly's full support?

71. We know that the peoples of the world whom you represent here have willed that tyranny be eradicated, that justice be upheld and that peace prevail. We know that their will shall prevail.

72. Mr. President, I thank you for allowing me to make this statement. It is our intention that the item on the Middle East should be taken up in due course. But it is not our intention to have a debate now. I am saying this for the benefit of the friends who I know would like to support us, who indeed do support us. The time will come for that support.

73. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Saudi Arabia in exercise of his right of reply.

74. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): The battle of words goes on while innocent men lose their lives. Suffice it to say that the Zionist dream is turning into a nightmare, not only for political Zionists but possibly for the whole world, as the situation in the Middle East may sooner or later—and perhaps sooner than many of us think—trigger a world conflict.

75. Since the partition of Palestine in 1947, and especially since Israel was established in Palestine, I have time and again, beginning at Lake Success, and from this rostrum and in the Security Council, warned that there will be no peace in the Middle East as long as the political Zionists actually are considered to be and felt as a foreign element in the body social and body politic of the Arab world. This foreign element has caused an abscess which explains the higher fever from which the Middle East—nay, the whole Arab world—is suffering. I warned Mr. Eban—who hails from South Africa and whose culture, like that of most of the Zionist protagonists, is either Anglo-Saxon or Central or Eastern European, rather than Semitic—that, whoever wins this round, that will not bring peace to the Middle East.

76. Zionism has used Judaism, one of the three monotheistic religions, as a motivation for a political and economic end. Political Zionism is predicated on force. Its motto is, "Might is right". Political Zionism is a colonial movement. It did not originate amongst the Sephardic Jews, who are our brothers. The creators of political Zionism are extraneous to the Middle East. Most of them are Khazars, who hailed from the northern tier of Asia and moved southward, skirting the Caspian Sea, until they settled in the first century, in what is today southern Russia. Eight centuries later they were converted to Judaism. They are not part of the Middle East.

77. The question of who began the fight on 6 October is beside the point. But Mr. Eban should be reminded that on 13 September Israeli planes committed aggression against Syria near Latakia and Tartus, situated far in the north of Syria and not on the cease-fire line. That was when this round started, regardless of who wins it. War is the art of deception. Does Mr. Eban, after his Government sent planes to northern Syria on 13 September, expect the Syrians and their allies and brothers, the Egyptians, to tell him when they are going to retaliate?

78. Who started the massacres and terrorism in Palestine in 1923 and thereafter? I went to Jerusalem in 1925, and the situation was tense because the Zionists began to murmur that Palestine was the land of their ancestors. Likewise it was the land of the ancestors of the indigenous people of Palestine. And ironically I must tell Mr. Eban, who originally hails from South Africa, that many of the Sephardic Jews embraced Christianity and later Islam, and those colonial Zionists hailing from eastern and central Europe are fighting the original Jews and the Canaanites and the Amorites and the Nabataeans and the Aramaeans who belonged to the same Semitic family. They cannot fool us. In his statement [2139th meeting] Mr. Eban spoke about a sort of Middle East common market. Hence, I am vindicated in

<sup>8</sup> Quoted in French by the speaker.

having said repeatedly that the aim of the Zionists was to establish a clearing-house in Palestine under their aegis so that they may be brokers between three continents—the continents of Asia, Africa and Europe. The aim of the leaders of political zionism—and I say “political zionism” because we have no quarrel with spiritual zionism—is to dominate that crossroad between three continents. And they are being helped by certain Powers in order that those Powers may serve their petty national interests.

79. We, including our Jews, have been in the area for 6,000 years. And those followers of Mr. Eban, originally from South Africa, and Mrs. Meir, from Milwaukee—or was she from the Ukraine and came to Palestine by way of Milwaukee?—who should have been loyal to their country of birth or adoption are in-gathering in our midst and creating trouble for us and for the innocent Jews that have been indoctrinated and brain-washed, motivated as those innocent Jews were by religious sentiments.

80. It is immaterial how the fighting will end. As I have warned time and again, this is only one round. It is not a boxing match. It is a tragedy with many episodes, but in the long run justice will prevail and the aggressor will come to grief.

81. When I was on speaking terms with the Zionists in the 1930s I warned them that if they wanted to come to Palestine they should come as Jews motivated by religious sentiment and not with a flag, which would not be accepted. Of course the flag is hoisted over Palestine. But for how long? In the Middle Ages many European flags, not one only, but many flags, not from western Europe, but from the vassals of Urban II at that time, were hoisted over Palestine, and the people lived in fortresses. The difference between then and now is that Palestine has become a fortress for those political Zionists. But for how long? The political Zionists are living in a hornet's nest. They do not know from where they will be stung in the future.

82. And I must say as a fair warning, not to Mr. Eban alone but to those among us who support that artificial State, you may, from 6,000 miles away from Palestine, precipitate a conflict that will burn all interests—and I am not going to name those interests, because the people of the Arab world, from Morocco to the confines of Iran, from Syria down to the Sudan, are aflame. How do I know? Every year I visit the Middle East and I talk with the young. And if ever I counsel patience, they look at me askance. The Palestinian people have fermented the young of the Arab world and, I daresay, the young of Asia and Africa, who know where justice lies. Do you want a conflagration? We are here in the United Nations to bring about peace. So if Mr. Eban wants peace, let him forget about that artificial State. Let them remain as Jews, as brothers, in humanity—not under a foreign flag, but motivated as are the indigenous people of Palestine, by noble sentiments for the region that produced three monotheistic-religions. Then and only then can they survive.

83. If they want to bring the world to an end, taking Masada as an example, I think people will not follow them. Why should they manipulate the world with their mass media of information and create a Jewish problem? The Second World War took 60 million lives. It was a stiff price. Do they want the whole world to commit suicide?

84. I feel sad and grieved for the innocent lives that are being lost, whether they be of Jews or Gentiles. Do not get me wrong; we are not vindictive. In our tradition, even with our enemies, when they confess their faults, we forget the past. But there will be no peace in Palestine as long as that abscess keeps the whole area in high fever and in turmoil.

85. There will be peace only when wisdom prevails and the petty nationalism of a colonial movement fades out and the people—who are greater than any flag and more precious than a rag—settle down and live with the indigenous people of Palestine, whose rights should be restituted, in conformity with the principle of self-determination enunciated in the Charter.

86. Is the Charter a mockery, Sir? The Versailles Conference was enough of a mockery when it laid aside the principle of self-determination and put Palestine and other lands under Western Mandates, a sort of colonialism in disguise.

87. A last warning to the world from this rostrum: People of the world, if you do not take care, the political Zionists—who are only a handful compared with the rest of the people of the world—may drive you into a world conflagration.

88. I hope that the Jews—innocent Jews; Jews like the Chancellor of Austria, who said “I am an Austrian first and foremost”; many Jews in America who are my friends say, “We are Americans, we have nothing to do with political zionism”—will try to put an end to this world problem, which, as I have said, if it is not brought to an end may throw the whole world into the chasm of perdition and destruction.

89. In our area—and in Saudi Arabia in particular—we are now reaching a point from which there can be no return. I warn you; I know what the leaders and the people of Saudi Arabia—leaving aside all the other Arab people—feel; I know how worked up they are, especially the young.

90. This is a solemn warning. I sound it without hatred or rancour, hoping that my voice will carry some weight, that wisdom will prevail and that real peace will be established in the land of Palestine.

91. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to remind the Assembly that, in accordance with a decision taken at the 2123rd meeting, statements in exercise of the right of reply should be delivered as a general rule at the end of the afternoon meetings and should be limited to 10 minutes.

92. The representatives of Saudi Arabia pointed out that this was an exceptional situation. I hope, therefore, that this will not be regarded as a precedent. Henceforth I shall strictly apply the rules that we have established. In view of what has taken place this morning, I shall now call on the representative of Zaire and I repeat that what happened this morning should not be regarded as a precedent.

93. Mr. IPOTO (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): Zaire will bear in mind the decision taken by the General Assembly that statements in exercise of the right of reply should be made only at the end of afternoon meetings.

94. As was recalled a few minutes ago, our meeting this morning—which was to have started with some statements supplying information on the situation obtaining in the Middle East—has deviated from that purpose to the extent that from this rostrum we have heard a reference to the sovereign decision taken by Zaire on its diplomatic relations with the State of Israel.

95. I should like very briefly to recall one of the paragraphs of my President's statement of 4 October 1973:

“Lately, when an African country takes a sovereign decision in the Israeli-Arab conflict, the Israeli authorities declare that that decision was dictated purely and simply by the Arab countries; and, what is more, that the African leaders were paid for taking such a decision. Such allegations are serious and insulting.” [2140th meeting, para. 135.]

96. The sovereign decision of Zaire came about in quite different circumstances. Our former friend Israel knows the potentialities of my country and its independence of mind to evaluate any international problem. It has been said, by way of reaction to this decision, that the decision was an act of gross treason. As if the word “treason” alone were not enough, they had to add the adjective. We really do not see where the act of treason lies when, from this very rostrum, the President of the Republic of Zaire recalled the exact situation which, according to my country, prevails in the Middle East. From this very rostrum he recalled the difficulties that the United Nations continues to encounter in the implementation of a resolution which was accepted by the two parties to the dispute. He also touched on the difficulties which the “four wise men of Africa”, including himself, have encountered in trying to bring about the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

97. Must I expatiate on this point to remind Israel that, hard as that decision vis-à-vis Israel was, we could not continue to sacrifice objectivity to friendship? Objectivity, of course, requires that one should say to one's friends where their mistakes lie—and that is what Zaire has done. Even better, Zaire told the representatives of Israel, in Zaire itself, in New York and elsewhere, that if objectivity did not obtain in the situation in the Middle East the day would come when a decision would be taken.

98. Therefore, it was no surprise—at least so it seems to us—that a decision to break off relations with Israel should have been taken. Israel, with its force of analysis of international events, was certainly able to foresee this decision by Zaire. It did not come unexpectedly, as people venture to try to convince the Assembly. Israel knows this.

99. The President of the Republic of Zaire, before closing the section on the Middle East in his statement, which of course included the decision to break off diplomatic relations with Israel, added that as regards relations between Zaire and Israel—for Zaire recognizes the existence of the State of Israel and has never called that into question—the resumption of those relations would come about the day when Israel no longer occupied Arab lands which were conquered in the 1967 war.

100. Having said that, I think that the Israeli leaders should take account of the fact that Zaire also knows how to

react, but would never react emotionally. We must not be constrained one day—the very day the Arab territories are liberated—to maintain our opposition still. Let no one, therefore, push us to the extreme.

## AGENDA ITEM 9

### General debate (*continued*)

101. Mr. NOMAN (Yemen):<sup>9</sup> Mr. President, please permit me to express, on behalf of the delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic and on my own behalf, my great pleasure at seeing you elected President of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly. I assure you, Mr. President, that my delegation will spare no effort to co-operate with you during the term of your presidency.

102. It is also with pleasure and satisfaction that I welcome, on behalf of the delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic, the admission of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, as well as the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, to membership in the United Nations. The admission of the two German States signifies the ending of the painful sufferings to which mankind as a whole, as well as the German people themselves, were subjected when nazism appeared in the arena of world history.

103. We are convinced that the contribution of these two States to our Organization will be effective and open up new perspectives for international co-operation in building a better future for mankind, characterized by peace and progress. On this occasion I am happy to convey to the General Assembly that my Government has recognized the Government of Guinea-Bissau, which we hope will soon take its place in our Organization.

104. The explosive situation in the Middle East has imposed upon me the necessity of shortening my statement now before you, which I request be reflected in the General Assembly records. It is my conviction that our responsibilities in preserving international peace require the concentration of our attention on the developments in the Middle East, where a dangerous situation, with all its repercussions on international relations, has been created.

105. The Israeli persistence in disregard for international will to establish peace and justice in the Middle East, and the Israeli refusal to respect and to abide by General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, is to be blamed for the eruption of hostilities in the Middle East. Israel, by virtue of its technical superiority, and of the material and moral support extended to it by a super-Power represented in the flow of arms and money, is to be held responsible for the premeditated and continued aggression on Arab lands.

106. Our role should not be confined merely to delivering speeches and statements or adopting resolutions full of compassion for humanity, peace and justice. If we really want to acquire for ourselves the quality of a civilized international community and make sure that we have abandoned the law of the jungle and are willing to live as human beings in this universe, then we are bound to give this

<sup>9</sup> Mr. Noman spoke in Arabic. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

Organization an effective role in stopping aggression and putting an end to injustices inflicted on small nations by international pirates, by virtue of their might and technological superiority.

107. Our responsibilities call for a scrupulous implementation of the United Nations resolutions. In this connexion, I refer to those resolutions which condemn the acquisition of territories by force.

108. If we do not abide by the international norms which we have accepted as embodied in the Charter, if we do not respect the decisions we have adopted, if we resort, as some do, to the murder of international will by a single vote, then we will, certainly, find ourselves in the future confronted with a devastating situation, not only in the Middle East alone but in other parts of the world.

109. Justice is indivisible, legitimacy is indivisible, and if aggression is given the chance to reap its fruits and achieve victory while we watch as spectators and are satisfied with condemnation, without putting an end to it, then we are allowing the epidemic to spread indefinitely. In order to maintain a genuine and lasting peace in the area, and before trying to suppress the smoke, we should honestly seek to extinguish the source of the fire.

110. Since its inception the conflict in the Middle East has revolved around one issue: that is, the legitimate right of the people of Palestine to live as a nation in their homeland and not as refugees victims of the aggression by a Member State of the United Nations.

111. The tragedy of the people of Palestine is the main source of tension and hostility in the Middle East. The

United Nations, which played the role of the midwife in the creation of Israel, is called upon today, more than at any time before, to impose on Israel compliance with United Nations resolutions regarding the right of the Palestinians to self-determination.

112. The United Nations is in duty bound to see to it that Israel fully respects the territorial integrity of the Arab States and abandons its illegal claims of sovereignty acquired by the force of arms.

113. The great sacrifices endured by the peoples of Egypt and Syria, who had been denied justice and were forced into this battle to regain their territories, awaken every human conscience which believes in the right of every human being to live in a free and independent society. My delegation takes this opportunity to salute the heroic sacrifices and the determination of the people of Egypt and Syria. It is my duty to declare from this rostrum, on behalf of Yemen, our total support for and solidarity with the people of Egypt and Syria, who are now engaged in a legitimate struggle to liberate their territories occupied by force for so long by Israel. It is my conviction that the freedom-loving and peace-loving nations will lend their support to the legitimate rights of both Egypt and Syria, in the pursuit of peace based on justice which would put an end to Israeli aggression.

114. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before adjourning the meeting I should like to say that, in view of the very slow pace of the general debate we may perhaps have to have night meetings.

*The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.*