

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

III 5 1980

UN/SA COLLECTION

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

1751st MEETING: 26 OCTOBER 1973

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1751)	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 FIFTY-FIRST MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 26 October 1973, at 4.30 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/1751)

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 5.45 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. M. Z. Ismail (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 my list of speakers is that of the representative of Egypt, on whom I now call.

4. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): I apologize to the members of the Council and to you, Mr. President, for requesting the convening of the Security Council at this time, which certainly is not the most convenient time. But since the Council is to assert its responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security and since it has been our unwavering stand that we believe in the Security Council, in the United Nations and in its Charter, we felt bound to come to the Council in order not only to speak about a breach of peace, but also to warn of a grave danger not merely threatening our region but certainly threatening to go beyond it.

5. A Cairo telephone communication at 1400 hours local time tells us again that new hostilities have begun and that air and land fighting has been going on against our soldiers and against our cities on the Suez and Sinai fronts. It is better to try to be very concise and to look at what has happened until now, what is happening now and what is going to happen in the future.

6. What has happened until now—and I speak only about the last episode—is this. The Council was convened on Sunday by two permanent member States, the United States and the Soviet Union, and a draft resolution carrying their names and their weight was put to the Council. I do not hesitate to say that I had not seen that draft resolution much in advance. I saw it for the first time in the hands of our colleague, the representative of China, who had an unofficial copy of it, a few hours before the Council met.

7. The reason we did not object to that draft resolution—and, I am sure, the reason members of the Council did not object to it but adopted it without any member dissenting—was, first, that we and they put great faith in the two permanent members of the Security Council, feeling that if they were asking the Council to take action, they were really doing so in order to be faithful to their responsibilities and to the responsibilities of the Council for the safeguarding of world peace and security.

8. That draft resolution, which later became resolution 338 (1973), was indeed an ambitious piece of paper, looking across what is happening now towards a future in which the region could live in peace and in which the world could live with one headache fewer, one danger fewer and one more hope for a better life for all the world in peace and justice.

9. That resolution was simple: the war and the fighting must stop. A reasonable time was given—12 hours. After that there was to be a cease-fire, which literally meant that all firing must cease and that all troops must stop where they were. It was the hope of the two sponsors, and indeed the hope of the Council, that if that happened then some machinery would be set up and talks would be held in order to reach the basis of a just settlement, which is our hope and the hope of the members of the Council, a settlement which the Council has been trying to bring about in the Middle East for the last six years and longer—to put an end to the war which began on 5 June 1967.

10. Having adopted that resolution, the Council met again and clearly took note of the fact that its order of 22 October 1973 was not complied with, because in its resolutions 339 (1973) and 340 (1973) it asked that the forces return to the places at which they should have stopped 12 hours after the adoption of its resolution of 22 October 1973. The Council, using its diplomatic language, did not say which forces were not in their places, but I think there is very little to say about which forces did not obey the Council and which forces tried to use the cease-fire to make territorial gains. Commentators like Mr. Middleton in *The New York Times* made this amply clear. And the Secretary of State of the United States, in his press conference, indeed admitted that it was Israel that made territorial gains after the cease-fire. Not only were there territorial gains, but in these tragic hours other gains are shortsightedly sought—gains in the sense that perhaps our soldiers in Sinai can be cut off and pressured into surrendering, or that they may die of thirst or hunger, or that they may behave in a completely disorderly manner because they are cut off from their supply lines. But those supply lines were intact at the time when the cease-fire was to take effect 12 hours after the adoption of the first Security Council resolution.

11. I told the Council—regardless of the replies, the accusations and the insults—that the port of Adabiah had fallen into the hands of the Israelis and that the town of Suez was under attack. Two days ago I said that the gallant soldiers and inhabitants were repelling the attacks. They are still repelling the attacks to this hour, and Adabiah is still in the hands of the Israelis to this hour.

12. But we have heard today from the propaganda organs of Israel unfounded accusations, fabrications and indeed lies about our breaking the cease-fire. The soldiers marooned and encircled in Sinai are of course returning the fire of those who are attacking them from the air. The inhabitants of Suez and the soldiers in Suez are of course returning the fire of those who are attacking by tanks and from the air. But we expect that a few hours from now, perhaps at dawn in the Middle East, there will be another major offensive. We did not want to wait until the offensive took place, because we thought the Council should be warned of it now, as we have been warned.

13. In this Council I put a question to the representative of Israel in order to dismiss these accusations of lies and all this other language which we have heard here but which I am not going to use now or ever. I put the question: “Do the Israelis intend to comply with the Security Council’s

demand in resolution 340 (1973), ‘that immediate and complete cease-fire be observed and that the parties return to the positions occupied by them at 1650 hours GMT on 22 October 1973?’ ” I did not expect and indeed I did not get a reply. But at the same meeting I put a question to the representative of the United States: “Is it the intention of the United States Government to respect its signature of the Charter and its sponsorship of the two draft resolutions, and is it going to join the Council in demanding that ‘immediate and complete cease-fire be observed and that the parties return to the positions occupied by them at 1650 hours GMT on 22 October 1973?’ ” I do not expect the Israelis to reply but I do expect a reply from the representative of the United States, because—and here we are looking to the future—the historic resolution adopted by this Council, without much examination, without much objection and without a very broad analysis of what was in it, was adopted on the basis of the faith that we and, I am sure, the members of this Council had in the two sponsors. If the first paragraph, asking for the cease-fire at a given time—which means at a given place—is respected, then the key to respect for the other paragraphs is there. We do not need any prisoners of war. We do not need any territorial gains. We do not covet an inch of any land except our own historic land. I am sure the same is true of Syria or of any other country. If we do not get that, if the foundation and the cornerstone of our hopes for a just peace are indeed blown up by bombardments from the air and from the ground by Israeli tanks and airplanes, of course there will be no basis for any other development. There will only be the question: who is putting these arms in the hands of those who are shattering all hopes for peace and security in the region and perhaps in a zone much larger than the region?

14. Reading today that the spokesman for the State Department in Washington addressed himself to the allies of the United States in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and told them that they should give their facilities for the airlift that the United States is still operating to Israel up to this time, one has a very clear answer to the question who is putting these weapons in the hands of those who are shattering peace. It may be that this is not the intention, and that the intention, as again the spokesman for the State Department says, is to obtain peace in the area. But I am sure that this is the wrong method. I am sure that any reasonable thinking would lead to the conclusion I have drawn.

15. The United Nations Emergency Force was set up by this Council with a specific function and a specific purpose. We have heard that the first contingent of that Force arrived in Cairo today. The Commander of the Force decided it was better for them to stay in Cairo overnight. We should have preferred them to proceed to the area immediately, but that was the decision. I trust that in future the action will be faster, but tomorrow morning they will be in their places, I hope. I must say that our experience so far with other international bodies has been very disappointing, as regards the Israeli reaction and lack of co-operation. The observers have given the Secretariat information—and I am sure that it now has even later reports—about the lack of co-operation of the Israelis with them. Leaving that aside, let us look at what the Inter-

national Red Cross says. Mr. Boissard, the representative of the International Red Cross, told us today that the Israeli forces had prevented Red Cross vehicles carrying plasma, water, food and medicine from going to our soldiers in Sinai. Finally, after he had reported to his headquarters in Geneva and after Geneva had got in touch with Israel, we received very belated approval from Israel—but on two conditions: the first, that the Israelis must inspect the convoy—and this we accepted—and the second, that the drivers must be presumed to be spies and that Israeli drivers must take these convoys on. The second condition was found to be completely impractical and impossible. Therefore the Red Cross convoy is now on its way back to Cairo.

16. This action—I am not going to describe it as inhuman or barbaric; I am not going to use such adjectives—was taken at the same time for purposes of useless propaganda about transfusions of Israeli blood being given to Egyptians who were on their feet. The Egyptians who need this blood are not on their feet; and they need the blood from their own country, and through international operations such as the Red Cross. This Council should condemn the Israeli authorities for these intentional obstructions.

17. But all these are details, it seems. It is a detail to tell you that right now the town of Suez is being bombarded by air and by land, that our positions west of the Canal also are being bombarded, that we are expecting a very heavy onslaught on Suez at any time, and especially before the United Nations Emergency Force is allowed to reach these areas.

18. To me—and this is my excuse for asking the Council to meet—it is a question whether we are proceeding now towards peace and hope or towards real despair and the actions emanating from despair. We are not going to go on our knees. Israel should have learned by now that its policy which was described in 1967 as waiting for us to “come crawling on our bellies”, of waiting by the telephone for our cry of surrender, is not going to succeed. No policy is going to succeed that is dictated by tanks, Phantom aircraft, laser-guided missiles—or whatever they have or whatever may be brought to them from the arsenal of the United States.

19. A glimpse of the road to peace appeared in this Council late Sunday evening. It is up to those who gave us that glimpse to keep it alive.

20. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Zambia to the United Nations containing a request that he be allowed to participate in the Council's discussion of the item inscribed on the agenda, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provision of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. As I hear no objection, I take it that the Council agrees to invite the representative of Zambia to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. P. J. F. Lusaka (Zambia) took the place reserved for him in the Council chamber.

21. The PRESIDENT: Since the representative of Zambia is the next speaker, I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

22. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia): Mr. President, since this is the first opportunity I have had to participate in the discussion on the Middle East question, I should like first of all to congratulate you on your assumption of the high office of President of the Council for this month.

23. The Government of the Republic of Zambia has been following with great concern the developments in the Middle East since the outbreak of war on 6 October this year. My Government condemns violence in all its forms and long-drawn-out wars which cause considerable loss of human life, thereby reducing prospects for peace.

24. My Government believes that what led to the current crisis in the Middle East was the provocation from Israel through its intransigence about acceding to Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Israel has been contemptuous of the United Nations resolution calling upon it to withdraw to the pre-June 1967 borders. Zambia feels that peace in the area will be assured only if Israel withdraws from all Arab territories which it has occupied since the 1967 war.

25. It is the view of my Government, further, that there is great need for others concerned to have an understanding and appreciation of the conditions requisite for a just and durable peace, if indeed such peace is to be effectively brought about in the Middle East. Israel does not appear to have this understanding and appreciation, as can be judged by a series of violations of the cease-fire and the continuing tension in the area, as just reported by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt.

26. It is against that background that my Government has today, 26 October 1973, broken off diplomatic relations with Israel.

27. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Israel.

28. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Since the adoption of Security Council resolution 338 (1973) of 22 October which, *inter alia*, called for an immediate cessation of fighting, Egypt appears to have employed two stratagems in relation to the cease-fire. The first is to violate the cease-fire by attacks against Israeli forces while at the same time claiming that Israel is attacking and violating the cease-fire, and, of course, continuing to accuse Israel of cease-fire violations when our forces react to the Egyptian assaults. This is what happened on 22 October when the Egyptian forces continued to fight even after the hour set for the commencement of the cease-fire, thus preventing the cease-fire from becoming effective.

29. The second stratagem is to allege that fighting has broken out when, in fact, no fighting is going on at all, and to accuse Israel of attacks in breach of the cease-fire when there is calm. This stratagem seems to serve two purposes. Firstly, it creates an atmosphere which strengthens hostility and bloodlust, an atmosphere propitious to calumny and

acrimony; and this, after all, is a central objective of Egyptian policy at this stage.

30. When there were opportunities to talk with Israel, Egypt chose on 6 October to shoot. Now, when all endeavours should have been directed towards strengthening the cease-fire and starting immediately and concurrently peace negotiations in accordance with resolution 338 (1973), Egypt continues to undermine the cease-fire and to fan further the flames of belligerency. This is what happened the other evening when the Foreign Minister of Egypt announced to the Security Council and to the entire world that a whole new war has broken out in the Middle East on 23 October, while not a shot was being fired in the area and the cease-fire agreed upon that day by Egypt and Israel, through the good offices of General Siilasvuo, had in fact entered into force.

31. It was apparently of little concern to the Egyptian Government that as a result of these false charges that a new war had broken out, the world was brought to the brink of global confrontation. Is it too much to expect of a Government at war—even if it is a war of aggression unleashed by it—to display an attitude of greater responsibility towards the safety and security of the entire world?

32. The second purpose of this stratagem of claiming that fighting is taking place while in reality tranquillity prevails is, of course, to prepare the ground for again initiating attacks. This is what happened yesterday. Throughout the day all news agencies with correspondents on the front were reporting quiet in all sectors. At the same time in Cairo the Egyptian Government made a concerted effort to mislead the world and to create the impression that fighting was in progress and that Israeli forces were attacking. Ashraf Gorbali, President Sadat's press adviser, called the press together for a conference and disseminated stories of alleged attacks on the city of Suez, along the Canal, even claiming Israeli air raids were continuing on Port Said at the time of the press conference.

33. All this was completely unfounded—as an identical claim which we have just heard from the Foreign Minister of Egypt this evening is also baseless. All this was completely fabricated. There was no corroboration of these allegations from any other source. One of the more interesting aspects of this propaganda exercise in falsehood was that Mr. Gorbali's claims were dispatched abroad, but not given publicity in Egypt itself. The purpose became clear this morning when the Egyptian forces opened fire in several sectors. Yesterday's propaganda acrobatics, including a baseless charge that Israeli forces had sunk a Greek vessel, were nothing but a preparation for today's events.

34. Early this morning I dispatched the following letter to the Secretary-General:

“On instructions from my Government I draw your urgent attention to the flagrant violations of the cease-fire perpetrated today by Egypt. On 26 October 1973 at 0830 hours local time, Egyptian forces opened tank, artillery and small-arms fire in the southern sector of the Suez Canal. On the same day at 0900 hours local time, the Liberian tanker *Sirius*, sailing from Eilat, was attacked

by Egyptian forces while passing through the Guvad Straits at the entrance to the Gulf of Suez. The tanker was hit.” [It was later ascertained that this was due to an explosion of a mine laid by the Egyptian forces.] “In this connexion I should like to refer to the letter addressed to you by the permanent representative of Egypt yesterday, 25 October 1973, alleging an Israeli attack on the Greek tanker *Mimismids*. No such attack by Israeli forces had taken place, and the false charge was evidently a propaganda preparation for today's aggression by Egypt.”¹

35. Several hours later I addressed another complaint to the Secretary-General. It read:

“On instructions from my Government and further to my letter to you of this morning I regret to inform you that Egyptian forces have continued today to violate the cease-fire. At 1400 hours local time, Egyptian forces opened fire on the outskirts of the town of Suez. At 1605 hours local time, Egyptian forces started an infantry attack on Israeli forces in the area of kilometre 152 of the Suez Canal”.²

36. There is no secret about what is happening in the southern part of the Suez Canal area. It is natural for an encircled army to try to break out of encirclement. It should not do it, however, if it wishes to abide by the cease-fire, and when it does it surely cannot expect the Israeli forces not to return fire. This is what has occurred today. The Egyptian attacks in violation of the cease-fire have been contained, and again the front is quiet. I have had contact with Jerusalem at 2330 hours which confirms this fact. I can reiterate with full authority that the Israeli forces have strict orders not to open fire, and they are observing the cease-fire. If any shooting occurs it is only when the Egyptian forces initiate it. In any event there seems to be a marked discrepancy between the Egyptian charges voiced here in the Security Council and the statements of Egyptian Government spokesmen in Cairo.

37. A late evening report from Cairo reads as follows:

“From the Egyptian side there are no reports of fighting today. But an Egyptian military spokesman denied Israeli reports that the encircled Third Army on the eastern side of the Suez Canal had launched attacks on the Israelis.”

I leave it to members of the Security Council to draw conclusions from these two brief sentences in an official Egyptian statement made only a short while ago in Cairo.

38. So that the members of the Council should not be tempted to accept the Egyptian exaggerations regarding the developments of today in the area of the Third Egyptian Army, I should like to read from the following telegram sent by Reuter:

“Israel today delivered 200 portions of plasma and 200 containers of blood to Egyptian front lines on the East

¹ Subsequently circulated as document S/11051.

² Subsequently circulated as document S/11053.

Bank of the Suez Canal in compliance with an urgent request from Cairo, a military spokesman said here tonight. Colonel Nachman Karimi said the blood and plasma had been flown by Israeli planes to a point near Rusahadsudar on the Gulf of Suez, and was then taken by Israeli vehicles, with an International Red Cross escort, to the Egyptian lines at the southern end of the hundred-mile long waterway. The handover took place at the same time as parts of the Egyptian Third Army were trying to break out of their lines to the West Bank of the Canal, according to the Israelis. But the handover went off smoothly. The request for the blood supplies came from Cairo through the International Red Cross Committee Thursday, apparently because the Egyptians found it difficult to get them through to the beleaguered Third Army on the narrow strip on the East Bank of the Canal. A representative of the Red Cross in Tel Aviv confirmed the successful transfer of the blood."

39. At this very moment I have been handed another report—this time from Geneva—dispatched by Reuter as well, which reads:

"A helicopter carrying International Red Cross supplies of blood and plasma landed today in the Sinai Desert to help the wounded in the Egyptian Third Army, an International Red Cross Committee spokesman said tonight. The helicopter put at the disposition of the International Committee of the Red Cross by the Israeli Government carried 440 pounds of blood and 440 pounds of plasma to the Egyptians who are cut off by Israeli forces on the East Bank of the Suez Canal. A convoy of 14 trucks due to leave Cairo today with Red Cross supplies of blood plasma and medicines for the town of Suez was delayed."

The end of the report concerns the question of prisoners and not the problem which we are discussing right now.

40. It is in the light of these clear facts inevitable to ask: How is it possible that Egypt should have been able to act as it has in one meeting of the Council after another, to make false charges, to heap unfounded slanders, to increase tension, to create an international crisis of global danger, without anyone calling Egypt's representatives to order, without anyone remonstrating with them, without anyone restraining them and their Government, without anyone trying to influence them and to convince them that the time has come for Egypt to change its destructive course—at least now, at least after all the bloodshed and tragedy that Egypt and Syria have brought again upon the Middle East?

41. The fact that that has not been done is undoubtedly rooted in the well-known inability—regrettable inability—of the Council to address itself to matters concerning the Middle East in an equitable manner. This has been demonstrated over and over again when representatives of States—among them a member of the Security Council, the Sudan—which are actively participating in the Arab war of aggression against Israel and have till this very day refrained from accepting the Security Council cease-fire, come here to give Israel, to give the United Nations, to give the world lessons in respect for international peace.

42. It may not be surprising that the aggressor of 6 October should be able to appear here in the mask of innocence when a State permanent member of the Council which has for years and years stood condemned as an aggressor and a violator of the rights of small nations should play the role of the God of justice and wrath. True, our world is far from being perfect; hypocrisy, mendacity, calumny and blind hatred are not unusual in it. All this, however, does not mean that Israel should follow this path or be impressed by the views of those who follow it.

43. The people of Israel are fighting for their lives, the life of the Jewish nation, the life of the Jewish State. Thank God that for 25 years Israel has succeeded to defend its independence, the freedom of its people, and that it has succeeded again in repelling the blood-thirsty onslaught of the forces which on 6 October, the Day of Atonement, set out to destroy us and to annihilate the people of Israel. This success throughout the two and a half decades, this success in the last few weeks does not change the aggressor States of 1948, of the 1950s, of 1967, of 1969 and of 1973 into peace-loving States. This success of Israel's does not make Israel defending its basic right to live like all other nations in peace and security an attacker.

44. But the time is not for argumentation; the time is not for polemics; the time is for constructive contribution towards progress, towards understanding, agreement and peace. The time has come when we should at least make the first steps in that direction.

45. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Saudi Arabia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

46. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I wish to assure the Council and you, Sir, as its President that I shall refrain from using such terms as "hypocrisy", "mendacity" and "calumny", as members heard Mr. Tekoah use them a few moments ago to malign the Arab world. The Arab people will not gain anything by trading such expressions with Mr. Tekoah.

47. I shall address myself precisely to this new development, namely, that the Egyptian troops in the Suez area are encircled by Israeli troops and segregated from any aid that might be conveyed to them by the Red Cross. It looks to me, after checking with non-Arab sources, as if Israel is intent on making 15,000 or 20,000 men in the Suez area either surrender or be destroyed. I say that because it insisted yesterday on having the convoy manned by Israeli personnel, which is, to say the least, unfair and impractical, and there is no tradition for this method, this approach, being used by the Red Cross. The International Red Cross has always asked, in similar conflicts, that the personnel manning the convoys should not be from any of the parties to the conflict. I am not talking now as an Arab; I am talking objectively, since I had occasion to deal with the International Red Cross in regard to another conflict many years ago. But Israel insisted, at least until yesterday, that the personnel that would man the convoy should be Israelis, so we conclude that Israel wants to change the practice of the International Red Cross in order to gain a

military advantage, either to compel the Egyptians who are in that Suez area to surrender or, if not, perhaps to destroy them if it can.

48. As the Foreign Minister of Egypt rightly said, the cease-fire—or should I say the first resolution that this Council recently adopted on a cease-fire—was initiated by the two super-Powers; therefore, I think the two super-Powers should be responsible for providing the staff for the convoy, or they could nominate staff from neutral countries to that end. But if the negotiations on this question are protracted, what will this meeting be but an academic exercise of accusations and recriminations and rebuttals which will not benefit anyone but will make the conflict more bitter? But the United States excluded the three other permanent members of the Council from participation in bringing about peace in the region.

49. The Soviet Union did not express itself on that point, merely because the United States seems to want to have a monopoly, not only in order to help Israel but also in order to crush the Arab people.

50. It is unthinkable that we should deviate from what is clearly enunciated in the Charter on this point. Of course, the Council, like the General Assembly, is the master of its own procedures and the eight-Power resolution, which was adopted, could not have been adopted if the reservation insisted on by the United States had not been included. It might have vetoed the resolution. Is it any wonder that the eight-Power resolution had to be tailored to meet the wishes of the United States, which the Arab people consider as abetting their enemy? Has the United States forgotten? The United States is very articulate outside this chamber but ominously silent when anyone puts a question to it. Of course, it is its privilege to remain silent, but it can wax long. Yesterday Mr. Kissinger held a press conference. It happened to be dialling my radio yesterday evening at 9 o'clock, when I heard what Mr. Kissinger had said about the conflict, answering as best he could the American correspondents who had put questions to him. No answer was straightforward or clear. He always parried the question and made it appear—made it appear; he did not say this—as if the Soviet Union was going to pounce on the United States, and that is why the Pentagon had alerted its armed forces everywhere, and especially in the Middle East.

51. In other words, he had couched warnings, not only to the Arabs but to the other super-Power with which Mr. Kissinger had allegedly had the euphoria of reaching a détente by having gone to Moscow many times before that détente was declared something of a reality. And we now find that either it is a reality or it is not a reality. Why should the Soviet Union bow down to the other super-Power when it said, “We wish to participate in the Emergency Force or be mere observers”? Why? I am not a Communist, but I admit that the Soviet Union is one of the major Powers—and super-Powers, for that matter. We want to know the truth; they owe it to us. They cannot engage in secret diplomacy while we are kept in the dark.

52. Was there a real threat from the Soviet Union as in the days of the late President Kennedy? We had to work behind the scenes on the Cuban crisis. We are not here as

false witnesses to what the two super-Powers do; we demand to be told the truth, and not to have to rely on dispatches that are tailored to suit one of those super-Powers, namely, the United States of America.

53. You owe it to us. Keep silent if you want to. But 20,000 men are being besieged, and you sit and laugh and joke. Naturally, you are not being burned; you are not being killed in the United States. But precious blood is being spilled, including Jewish blood. The Jews there have mothers and fathers; we do not discriminate against them in humanity. But you, Government of the United States, you have a very articulate—or so it seems, when he so chooses—Secretary of State, who never gives a direct answer to the correspondents. Is that the new approach to American diplomacy? If it is, then we have to assume what your answers are. You cannot fool us any more; you cannot fool the world any more. Even your allies are complaining of your high-handed methods. We are not impressed by your power: we have one life to live.

54. When I put a question to our colleague from the Soviet Union, he answers as best he can; but when a Foreign Minister, who happens to be Arab—none other than the Foreign Minister of Egypt—or when I, who am not a foreign minister but the representative of a sovereign State, and a signatory of the Charter, ask you questions outside this chamber as well as inside, about the rumour of your sending massive arms supplies so that we may be able to advise our Governments on what is going on, you begin to scurry away when you see me from a distance. For three days you scurried away from me. All right: that is your privilege; we cannot force you to come and give us an answer.

55. And then, when I cornered one of the members of the United States delegation, he said: “We still have no answer from Washington.” For three or four days you were sending massive military aid to Israel; and, for your information, I was adamant, and you knew it, because you have all those rooms where, I think, having such electronic devices as you do, you were probably listening to what I said in one of the conference rooms here: that we should maintain our dignity, and not send four Arab ministers to see Mr. Nixon, because your answer had already come to us in the newspapers: you are sending massive aid.

56. You probably say: “Well, you are no better than the American people: we do not tell them what we do, so why should you be better?” But we are representatives of sovereign States, and you called us a friendly country—Saudi Arabia—as if His Majesty the King were always at your beck and call. His Majesty the King has been patient with you since 1947; and what do you do? You leave us in the dark; you leave your people in the dark—until we find out what is happening. Of course, Dr. Kissinger says this is for security, that it is a security measure. Whose security: that of the United States, or the security of a client of the United States? And I do not know whether Israel is a client of the United States or whether you are a client of the Zionists.

57. Keep silent if you will; but we cannot be complacent about these things. Monopolize the United Nations to suit

your purposes. But you will have to account to the American people, just as our Governments would have to account to the Arab people if we remained silent and submissive to your policies. Have you swallowed your tongues, members of the United States delegation? I do not think so, because once you leave that door you become very articulate and you dish out to the correspondents what you want the American people to believe.

58. We are accountable not only to our Governments but to our peoples, and if we err as governments, let the young bring us down and trample on our bodies to save their dignity and their freedom from a major Power that created that usurping State in order to police us.

59. Now we go to the humanitarian question. Did you not know, Government of the United States, that between 15 and 20,000 troops have been besieged because Israel did not obey or observe the cease-fire? You sit smugly here. There are no personal differences between you as persons in other matters pertaining to power politics and spheres of influence and lording it over other people at a distance of 6,000 miles from your homeland.

60. Mr. President, as a friend you always advise me, not directly but indirectly, not to take the floor so often perhaps. Some well-meaning friends have advised me in the same sense. But what are we here for—to be spectators and false witnesses to what the United States is doing, to the havoc that has been created by the United States Government in subscribing to the fiction that God gave Palestine to Israel and that therefore they are all so religious. The United States people are fundamentalists. They believe every letter in the Bible, but they take out of context from the Bible those passages that suit Israel and suit them.

61. It seems that God did not give the Red Indians this continent; otherwise, since you support Israel, you should by the same token return this continent to the Red Indians. What have you done instead? You besieged them at Wounded Knee. You almost starved them because they were asking for one millionth of their rights. Why do you not return this hemisphere to the Red Indians?

62. You support the usurping State of Israel because allegedly some Jews lived there 2,000 years ago. These Zionists—I am not talking about our Jews—have formulated and elaborated an ideology that has used Judaism as a motivation for dominating the area, for exploiting Africa, Western Asia and Eastern Europe. “God gave Palestine”—or, as it was called, the land of Canaan—“to the Zionists.” That is a Central and Eastern European ideology and not a Sephardim ideology. The Sephardim Jews were Arabs who lived amongst us, in culture, origin and race. And you, the torchbearers of political Zionism, were converted to Judaism eight centuries after Christ. I repeat this time and again for those who do not have the benefit of knowing that they are colonizers under a fictitious religious ideology.

63. I cited the Crusades the other day. We finished with the Crusades, and now we have an ideology predicated on a fiction that God parcels out land to various people. This is why I take the floor often. People are dying there. Negotiations will be fruitless, and all you have done is

laudable only to save lives, but there will be another round and another round and another round. Innocent Jews and innocent Arabs will be killed so that the usurping State of Israel may prevail by the grace and might of the United States Government.

64. Again and again and again I have asked the United States Government: What have we done to you—from Morocco on the Atlantic to the Gulf, the Arabian peninsula and the whole Middle East to the whole of North Africa, which happens to be Arab? You acted for humanitarian purposes? Why in 1945 and 1946 did you not open the gates of immigration to the Jews, the poor Jews that were in displaced persons camps in Europe? Why did not your Senate pass a bill to allow them to come here and be settled amongst you? And we would have taken Jews without a flag.

65. And now what will happen? Nothing will happen. As my colleagues from China rightly said, these were scraps of paper, because in essence they will not resolve the conflict. How do I know they will not resolve the conflict? Because Israel wants land and more land, because Israel considers itself as filled with people that are the chosen people of God. What discrimination.

66. I have a map here. I will show it to you, since I got it from the best of sources but I cannot disclose the name because of the confidence that was placed in me. This is why I took the floor—and it was not until I had that map which shows how the Israelis, to say the least, rationalize, leave aside and falsify the facts.

67. Again I want to address my colleagues from the United States, who always seem to have a conference when I speak. “Who is that Baroody to tell us anything?” They are a mighty nation. “Who is that Baroody?” Baroody is a human being like you, my dear Ambassador Scali and that fellow who said that the American people are tired of me, that fellow who is sitting behind you. My secretary brought me 150 letters; 20 of them maligned me and 130 were from Americans saying “Thank you Baroody for opening our eyes to what our Government is doing to your people”. And some of them said again, “See to it that the mass media of information do not engage in static or do not abridge what you tell us.” They are tired of me, are they? You stooge. You will be torn—not physically, I hope, because I will defend you—but your policy will be torn by the people of the United States like I am tearing these papers. I have forgotten how you spell your name.

68. Thank you, Mr. President. I ask you to kindly give me permission to speak after one of the sphinxes of the world opens its mouth. I thought the sphinx was in Egypt—the enigma. I shall be all ears if the second sphinx that is now sitting there in the seat of the United States will open his mouth. I stand to be corrected if what I say is wrong, namely, that it is not in the interests of the United States to be committed to Israel, because Israel may push the whole world into a suicidal war that will be the end of the human species on the face of this planet.

69. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Security Council has again been convened urgently to consider the question of yet another act of aggression by Israel and yet another instance

of Israeli disregard of a Security Council decision—the third—calling for a cease-fire and the cessation of all military operations.

70. The Egyptian Mission to the United Nations requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council. Unfortunately, there was considerable delay in convening the meeting. It is true that, thanks to the efforts of a majority of the members of the Council, it was possible to call the Council together at least three and a half hours sooner than was anticipated. This in itself represents a positive result of the Council's prompt response to an urgent appeal from the Mission of a country which has once again become the victim of a treacherous attack by an aggressor—in this case, once again, by Israel. We have listened carefully to the statement by the Egyptian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. El-Zayyat. Specific, convincing facts were cited. In his statement Mr. El-Zayyat also drew attention to the fact that the Soviet Union and the United States of America jointly introduced the first draft resolution calling for a cease-fire and that they bear the responsibility for taking action to ensure that the Council's decision on their joint draft resolution is implemented. He also reminded us that Mr. Kissinger visited Tel Aviv on his way back from Moscow. The whole world knows that. What was talked about there? By the logic of honourable people and honourable politicians, they should have talked about the implementation by Madame Golda Meir and the Israeli firebrand, General Dayan, of the Security Council resolution which will be adopted on the joint proposal of the USSR and the United States. The United States and its Secretary of State must fulfil their obligations in this important matter of war and peace. But what actually happened and is happening? Who is tricking whom? Is Golda Meir tricking Kissinger? If so, the United States should bring pressure to bear on Israel. In one of my previous statements, I asked whether it would be possible to find in the whole world one reasonable person who could believe that the United States is powerless to exert influence on Israel to implement Security Council resolutions adopted by the Council on the initiative of the United States as one of the sponsors. That is the question. History and the development of the international situation today pose the question in those terms. That is why, when Mr. Baroody, who spoke before me, puts the question and says that an answer is required, the Security Council must be given an answer. An answer to the question: when will measures be taken, by those who can do so in relation to Israel, to put an end to international banditry and gangsterism, to ensure compliance with and strict observance of Security Council decisions, to bring about a total cease-fire and put an end to all military operations instead of taking advantage of the situation that has been created when the other side is fully implementing the Security Council's decisions? Indeed, the fact that Israel has violated the Council's decisions has been officially admitted by the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Kissinger. I have before me the stenographic record of his press conference: "On the first day—that is, Tuesday [23 October]—of the implementation of the cease-fire, there was a breakdown of the cease-fire which led to certain Israeli territorial gains."³ Those are not my words; they are

³ Quoted in English by the speaker.

Mr. Kissinger's. And any person endowed with common sense, particularly the members of the Security Council, who reads this official admission by the Secretary of State of the United States is bound to ask what the United States has done to prevent this and to ensure that Israel implements the Security Council decisions.

71. The Council has a right to be concerned with this issue. I have quoted an official document—an official statement by the Secretary of State of the United States, who admitted in effect that Israel violated the Security Council's decision and seized additional territory after the cease-fire. On what basis? This is international banditry, aggression, gangsterism and disregard of world public opinion. You may laugh, Mr. Tekoah, but this is no laughing matter. The time will come when you will be laughing with tears in your eyes because of the acts of gangsterism of your Government and your country.

72. What is being done instead of bringing pressure to bear on Israel? According to the latest official information, there is an unending, uninterrupted flow of arms from the United States to replenish Israel's military stockpiles. I am not going to quote from the papers, but I have two pages from American newspapers on the subject.

73. I shall now refer briefly to what was said here by the Israeli representative. We all know his ability to distort facts and present the true situation to the Security Council in a false light. He has been telling us stories. He has been beclouding the issue by informing us that Israel is so kind that it is even giving Egyptian soldiers and officers blood. That is what the Israeli representative says. But here is what UPI reported at 5.17 p.m. today. The latest news from where? From Tel Aviv. Who was speaking? A military spokesman in Tel Aviv. What did he say? Here is the report:

"A military spokesman on the Israeli side, referring to donations of plasma and blood to the International Red Cross for Egyptian soldiers captured by Israeli forces in the Sinai, said: 'The transfer took place during heavy fighting in the area.' By way of explanation he said, 'This is the Middle East. This is a Jewish-Arab war.'"³

74. That report of 5.17 this afternoon is not from a communist newspaper, Mr. Tekoah. You are always referring to the fact that communist newspapers are the only ones that write about Israeli aggression. Yes, they write that Israel is an aggressor. Your country is an aggressor and is engaged in international gangsterism. And the communist press is right when it unmasks and exposes Israeli and Zionist imperialism.

75. But look what UPI says—your favourite United States news agency, which you so often quote. Look what an official spokesman says, one who admits that a war is going on after the adoption of the Security Council's third decision calling for a cease-fire. What do you call that? Who is guilty? The aggressor, who has made aggression and the seizure of foreign territory the cardinal principle of his policy. No one will justify such acts.

76. The next report, at 6.57 this evening, reads:

“On the arrival of the United Nations Forces, Israelis began carrying out concentrated air strikes against the Egyptian forces in the western sector of the Suez Canal.”³

Now your lies stand exposed.

77. My respected friend, Mr. Barody, says that he did not want to use strong words like “lies”, “calumny” and so forth. I agree with him. But when you are dealing with liars and counterfeiters, you have to call things by their real names. When we hear mendacious statements by the representative of Israel, they have to be exposed. And here we have concrete documentary evidence from a United States news agency, UPI, which exposes the lies that the Israeli representative has just told today at the meeting of the Security Council. Such are the facts, such are the words of the Israeli representative, and such is reality. The Security Council must certainly draw the appropriate conclusions—urgently and without delay.

78. My respected friend, Mr. Barody, has accused two Powers of assuming the initiative and submitting a cease-fire proposal in the Security Council. That can be interpreted and viewed in various ways, but he knows that the world approved of this action. It is another matter that the aggressor remains intractable and that the Security Council has to take steps to curb him—steps that my delegation has insisted on, is insisting on, and will continue to insist on. Mr. Barody said that the five Powers must take part, that they are excluded by decision of the Council from being part of the armed forces of the United Nations, and so on. But, Mr. Barody, you are perfectly well acquainted with the situation; either you do not know or you are not speaking the truth here. I do not suspect you of saying anything that is not true; it seems that you have simply forgotten. What is the real situation? There were consultations on the Middle East among four of the permanent members of the Security Council more than two years ago. The United States—to be frank—wrecked those talks. That was before the restoration of the lawful rights of China in the United Nations, for which we had been fighting for more than 20 years and in which we were finally successful together with you—but no, I think you, Mr. Barody, were against that. We were asking all the time for the consultations to be resumed. The Americans told us, “Once China comes in we shall be together.” So we agreed and were very anxious to have China take part in the consultations. The Chinese arrived, after the well-known decision by the General Assembly, and began their activities in the United Nations. It is true that their activities included slandering the Soviet Union, but that is another matter and is of little concern to us in this case. However, when the question arose in the Security Council, on numerous occasions, of resuming consultations among the five permanent members of the Council, with the participation of China, China refused, and it is continuing to refuse. You know that, Mr. Barody. And the Americans say, “If the Chinese do not want to take part, we cannot resume the consultations.” In other words, the Americans are using the Chinese attitude in this matter as an excuse.

79. If I am mistaken, my respected colleague and friend, the representative of France, Ambassador de Guiringaud, will correct me, but I think that he has agreed to participate in resumed five-Power consultations.

80. I have not spoken about this yet to my neighbour on the left, the representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Donald Maitland, but his predecessors stated that they were prepared to resume consultations among the five permanent members in order to assume the responsibility resting with the permanent members of the Security Council under the Charter.

81. So we have three in favour, one against and one refusing to participate, and the one who is against uses as his excuse the attitude of the one who is refusing to participate. That is the situation. I am telling you that this is in fact the state of affairs. That is why the five permanent members of the Security Council cannot act in concert in this important international matter. And what is more, experience has shown that one of them does not even take part in the voting on these questions; it merely accuses others without doing anything itself. The easiest thing is to adopt that kind of position.

82. In conclusion, I should like to bring to the attention of the Security Council and its members the statement made on the Middle East today, 26 October 1973, by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, at a meeting of the World Congress of Peace-Loving Forces:

“The struggle of the Arab peoples to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression is at the same time a struggle to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

“The centre of tension in that region has now set off a war for the fourth time. Military operations this month have attained unheard-of intensity and have claimed numerous victims on both sides, including the civilian victims of the barbarous bombing of peaceful towns and villages in Egypt and Syria”—and I emphasize, barbarous bombing by the Israeli armed forces. “The most recent events demonstrated in a particularly graphic way to the whole world the dangerous nature of the situation that has arisen in the Middle East and the urgent need to change it.

“The actual course of events is, of course, well known to you. I should therefore like to discuss at this time the basic questions of principle. What are the root causes of the military conflicts that have occurred periodically in that region, including the present war? The answer, from our point of view, is clear. Those reasons are: Israel’s seizure of Arab lands as a result of the aggression it has committed, the stubborn unwillingness of Tel Aviv to take into account the lawful rights of the Arab peoples, and the support given to Israel’s aggressive policy by those forces in the capitalist world which are trying to prevent the free and independent development of the progressive Arab States.

“In recent years, the Soviet Union has repeatedly warned that the situation in the Middle East is explosive.

Our policy on this matter is clear and consistent from beginning to end. Guided by the general principles of socialist foreign policy and having regard to the fact that the Middle East is just a short distance from our frontiers, we are interested in seeing a truly just and lasting peace established in the Middle East and in seeing the security of all the countries and peoples of that region guaranteed as well as their right to arrange their lives in peace as they see fit. That is why the Soviet Union has always insisted that the lands occupied by Israel should be returned to the Arab States and that the Palestinian people should receive justice. The Soviet Union has pursued this policy and will continue to pursue it in the future.

"Since the resumption of military operations in the Middle East at the beginning of this month, the Soviet Union has maintained close contact with friendly Arab States and has taken all the political measures in its power to help bring the war to an end and establish conditions in which peace in the Middle East will be truly lasting for all the States in that region.

"As you are aware, on 22 and 23 October, on a proposal by the Soviet Union and the United States of America, the Security Council took two decisions calling for an immediate cease-fire. On both occasions, Israel, while paying lip service to compliance with the Council's decisions, in fact treacherously violated them by continuing its aggressive acts against Egypt. In seizing more and more of the latter's territory, Israel was completely disregarding the Security Council's demands for the withdrawal of troops to the positions occupied by them on the evening of 22 October.

"It is difficult to understand what the rulers of Israel are hoping for when they pursue this adventurist course, flouting the decisions of the Security Council and defying world public opinion. Outside protection is obviously playing a role here. However, this policy on the part of the Israeli Government is costing the Israeli people dearly. That Government's attempt to ensure peace and security for the State of Israel by forcibly seizing and holding foreign territory is madness and is doomed to failure. Such a course will bring Israel neither peace nor security. It will merely lead to greater international isolation for Israel and will arouse still greater hatred of it by its neighbours."

83. I might note—leaving the text for a moment—that my respected colleague, the representative of Zambia, demonstrated to us all and underscored in his statement today how isolated Israel is internationally as a result of its adventurist, aggressive policy. Zambia has severed diplomatic relations with Israel. One African country after another is severing diplomatic relations with Israel as a sign of protest against its international gangsterism and against its aggression and its attack on the Arab States.

84. I shall continue with my quotation from Mr. Brezhnev's statement:

"The valiant struggle of the Arabs and the growing solidarity of the Arab States demonstrates convincingly that they will never reconcile themselves to Israeli

aggression and will never give up their lawful rights. The Soviet Union firmly and consistently supports the just demands of the Arab peoples.

"The collective will of those who demand the establishment of peace in the Middle East must triumph over the recklessness of those who are breaking the peace. The experience of the last few days requires us to be vigilant. Urgent and decisive measures are needed to ensure that the decisions calling for a cease-fire and the withdrawal of troops are implemented.

"President Sadat of Egypt requested the Soviet Union and the United States of America to send their representatives to the scene of hostilities in order to supervise the implementation of the Security Council decision concerning the cease-fire. We have expressed our readiness to comply with Egypt's request and have already sent such representatives. We hope that the United States Government will act likewise. At the same time, we are considering other possible measures which may be made necessary by the circumstances.

"In connexion with the continuing violations of the cease-fire of 25 October, the Security Council adopted a decision to set up immediately a United Nations Emergency Force, to be sent to the scene of hostilities. We consider that this is a useful decision, and we hope that it will contribute to the normalization of the situation.

"The Soviet Union is prepared to co-operate with all countries concerned with a view to the normalization of the situation in the Middle East. However, such co-operation cannot, of course, be helped by measures such as those taken recently in certain circles in NATO countries, involving the artificial fomenting of passions through the dissemination of a variety of fantastic fabrications as to the intentions of the Soviet Union in the Middle East.

"In the present situation, in our view, a more responsible, honest and constructive approach would be appropriate.

"I should like to emphasize that the Security Council decision of 22 October provides not only for a cease-fire, but also for the adoption of important steps towards eliminating the very causes of the war. Herein lies its great value. The parties concerned must immediately begin the practical implementation, in full, of the Security Council resolution on the Middle East adopted on 22 November 1967.

"Let me recall that that resolution emphasizes 'the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war'. It provides for the withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied during the 1967 conflict. It calls for respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace. It speaks also of the necessity for achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem—in other words, guarantees for the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

"It is not difficult to see that if all these provisions adopted in 1967 had been put into effect at that time.

there would have been lasting peace in the Middle East for six years by now. However, that did not happen, because of the continued short-sighted and adventurist policy of the ruling circles in Israel, encouraged by outside forces.

“Following the spirit and the letter of the Security Council decision adopted on Monday, 22 October, the parties concerned should immediately begin negotiations under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East. The significance of such talks cannot be over-estimated. Their participants bear historic responsibility. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, I can say that it is ready to make, and will make, a constructive contribution in this regard. We firmly advocate that all—I repeat, all—States and peoples in the Middle East must be guaranteed peace, security and the inviolability of their borders. The Soviet Union is ready to take part in the corresponding guarantees.

“In our view, one of the most urgent tasks facing all partisans of peace, all peace-loving forces in the present circumstances is to strive for the immediate and total implementation of the Security Council decision of 22 October 1973. This is essential for the free and independent development of all States and peoples in the Middle East. This is in keeping with the interests of many States in Europe and Asia, Africa and America, for which the normalization of political and economic life in that important area of the world is of considerable significance. Finally, the urgency of the situation which has recently arisen in the Middle East and the risk that the conflict may spread show with great clarity how important it is to solve this problem in the interests of strengthening universal peace.”

85. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Secretary-General, who wishes to make a statement.

86. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I wish to inform the Council briefly of the developments so far in connexion with the interim arrangements which I proposed yesterday to the Council.

87. General Siilasvuo has set up a provisional headquarters in Cairo.

88. The first aircraft took off from Cyprus for Cairo at 1432 hours New York time, that is, 2032 hours local time, with 30 members of the Finnish contingent, including its Commander. Further flights are leaving at forty-five-minute intervals, carrying 30 to 40 men and two vehicles each. All these aircraft are Hercules transport aircraft made available by the Government of the United Kingdom. Flights of VC-10 aircraft, each carrying 130 men, will also be taking off shortly from Cyprus. That means that the first elements of the Force have already arrived in Egypt.

89. The entire group of the contingents of Austria, Finland and Sweden should have arrived in Cairo by tomorrow morning, 27 October. All contingents are being dispatched with a basic scale of vehicles, personal weapons and essential equipment, including radios, tents and rations.

90. I have instructed General Siilasvuo to move advance elements of the Force, namely, those advance elements which have arrived in the meantime—forward with the maximum possible speed.

91. The situation regarding the deployment of UNTSO observers is as follows: There are at present nine United Nations patrols on the Egyptian side and six on Israeli-held territory. Those patrols are now in the vicinity of the forward positions of the respective forces.

92. The reports from those patrols are still sketchy. The two patrols near the Suez City area observed three firing incidents and an air attack in that area on 26 October. The observers could not determine the nationality of the aircraft owing to darkness.

93. That is the information which we have received from General Siilasvuo up to now. I shall be able to report further to the Council tomorrow after having received a report from General Siilasvuo on the exact situation of the Emergency Force.

94. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Egypt.

95. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from French*): I shall be very brief. This is a grave and serious moment.

96. We have heard a series of distortions of fact from the representative of Israel. That is usual for him and we are sure that the Council is also accustomed to it.

97. First of all, I take the liberty of recalling that Egypt did not commit any aggression on 6 October. Egypt only exercised its right to legitimate defence, a right conferred upon it by the Charter and international law, in an endeavour to place its own feet again where they should be.

98. Another distortion was the contention that Israel had sent blood plasma and medicine to civilians in Suez and to our troops in Sinai. The representative of Israel read out a Reuters dispatch, one that had been handed to him during the meeting. Probably, he read it rather hastily. I have that same dispatch before me and I shall read it out.

“A convoy of 14 trucks due to leave Cairo today with Red Cross supplies of blood plasma and medicines for the town of Suez was delayed because of conditions placed by the Israelis on its passage. The spokesman said there was still no list of prisoners of war held by the Egyptians and the Syrians.”³

99. What we can gather from this dispatch is that a convoy of 14 trucks did in fact head towards Suez but it was delayed because of the conditions imposed by Israeli authorities, which are that the list of Israeli prisoners captured by Egypt and Syria has not been submitted. Therefore, the Israelis have imposed conditions on their assistance to the victims and the wounded.

100. That is the truth. Let the representative of Israel and his country stop pretending that they are the saviours and benefactors of mankind.

101. I feel constrained to say that this war being waged by the Israelis is contrary to all moral laws and legal tenets and that they will pay for it dearly.

102. I also wish to tell the representative of Israel that they shall not destroy Egypt, nor the Egyptians. Egypt has survived for thousands of years. It has overcome many crises, even graver ones than this that is imposed upon us by Israel. If the Israelis wish to live in that region, it is not through slaughter and genocide that they can ensure their place in the area.

103. Before I conclude, and since I have the floor, I wish to welcome the noble attitude of Zambia, a sister African nation, on its decision to sever diplomatic relations with Israel.

104. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, in exercise of his right of reply.

105. Mr. ISMAIL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): The allegations of the representative of Israel regarding the refusal by Syrian forces to respect the cease-fire on the Suez front are so tenuous and so easy to rebut that it would appear superfluous to answer them. However, history is very rich in its many teachings, and we must learn from it.

106. We all know what Israel's manoeuvres were during the 1967 war in Syria. At that time the Security Council adopted resolution 235 (1967), ordering a cease-fire. Israel did not respect that resolution. Its forces launched their offensive against Syria. Then the Security Council adopted a second resolution, 236 (1967), again ordering a cease-fire and a return of the forces to the positions they occupied on 9 June 1967. That same resolution 236 (1967) in its preamble stated that the two parties—that is, Syria and Israel—had officially notified the Security Council that they accepted the cease-fire. But despite that, Israel again failed to respect the cease-fire and, instead of withdrawing to the positions of 9 June, its forces continued the offensive on Syrian soil until 12 June 1967. Those facts were confirmed by General Elazar, the present Chief of Staff of Israel who, in 1967, was the Commander of the Israeli forces on the Syrian front.

107. In an article published in the Israeli newspaper *Aharon*, General Elazar relates how, on orders from General Dayan, he launched his attack on Syria on 9 June 1967; in other words after Israel had notified the Security Council of its acceptance of the cease-fire.

108. It is through the successive violations of the cease-fire that in 1967 Israel occupied parts of the Golan Heights in Syria, but I have told the Council of this in my statement. However, what I did not say, and what I must now say for the enlightenment of members of the Council as well as public opinion in the United States and elsewhere, is that the representative of Israel in June of 1967 constantly reiterated to the Security Council that the Israeli forces were not violating the cease-fire and were not advancing in Syria, and that the allegations of the representative of Syria to this effect were false and slanderous against the little

country of Israel that only wanted to live peacefully, safe from the attacks of its neighbours.

109. In 1967 the conduct of the representative of Israel in the Council was a sorry comedy which became a sad tragedy leading to the expulsion of hundreds of thousands of Syrians from their territory in the Golan Heights, chased out by Israeli troops.

110. This time we are watching a repetition of the 1967 Israeli comedy. But there is this variation, that today the goal is not merely to gain a few yards of territory, but over and above all to kill tens of thousands of people by withholding water, food and medicine. I do not dare seek words to describe what is occurring, and I would not call it a comedy. I must call it a tragedy, or a comedy intended to disguise the tragedy. The comedy is taking place here before all our eyes, acted out by the representative of Israel, and the tragedy is taking place there, on the Suez Canal. Are we to allow this Israeli hypocrisy to go unchecked and the plan to commit unprecedented genocide to succeed?

111. Can each and every one of us not rise in indignation, disdain and contempt at the efforts made by the representative of Israel to lead us to believe them and thus mock our intelligence?

112. Of course, Israel is going to go on denying this violation of the cease-fire as it did in 1967, until its pre-established plan of the Generals has been carried out. But are we going to allow them to repeat their 1967 tactics, or does the Security Council intend to face its responsibilities? We are pressed for time, and if the Council does not act as speedily as possible it will be too late, and it will be no good weeping over the victim. History will have no meaning as a source of lessons to man.

113. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Sudan in exercise of his right of reply.

114. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): I had not planned to take the floor tonight after the presentation of the present violation of the cease-fire—indeed, the aggression of Israel against Egyptian civilians and troops this morning—but there are certain remarks I ought to make about the statement of Mr. Tekoah, in which he mentioned the Sudan. It is known that when the opportunity is given to a non-member of the Council to address the Council we expect him to heed the rules of decency and respect for members of this august body. Members of the Council are entrusted with a crucial task, in the performance of which they should be helped by whoever takes a seat at this table.

115. The performance of the representative of Israel today, although similar to his customary manner, was most exceptionally irrelevant and improper. His special reference to my country did not help him in the least in what he was trying to convey to us—if he was trying to convey anything at all. The Sudan is not here to give lessons to others, as the representative of Israel thought we were. Our mission in the Council—and my country is a mandated member of the Council—is a mission of peace and a mandate to promote the cause of justice for those to whom injustice is done: I repeat, to those to whom injustice is done.

116. Egypt and Syria are but two examples of the victims of Israeli aggression. Their case we shall always defend, and not their case alone but also the case of the people whose land the Israelis have taken, namely the Palestinian people.

117. But if the Sudan has to speak at all about the Israeli aggression, it is not alone in this case. Virtually everybody in this Council, I would say, is against Israel and against its aggression, and they have various reasons for being so, not least that of defending the case of Member States whose countries have been occupied and peoples whose rights have been denied by Israel.

118. There are other reasons for the Sudan to oppose Israel. The Sudan lies on the Red Sea and is in the vicinity of the countries which Israel plans to take, but it is not the Sudan alone that is on the Red Sea: there are the countries of Europe, of Africa, of Asia, whose living and welfare are built on the Suez Canal, and it is Israel which has caused the closing of that Canal. There are others who have reasons, even right now, to suffer because of Israel's aggression and they also, I am sure, will speak and speak loudly about the Israeli aggression. I am not going to quote any names, regions or countries, but it is well known to Israel that there are countries which have strong reasons for opposing its policy. As for Africa, Africa has spoken. Even to the last minute, Africa is completely against Israeli aggression and Israeli occupation of the territory of other countries.

119. Mr. Tekoah should at least realize that if we are fighting—and we are fighting in the Sudan, and so is Israel—we are fighting for two different reasons. Israel is fighting to occupy and to deny the rights of other peoples, but we are fighting to give peoples their rights which God has given. I repeat, which God has given, in their own lands and their own territories.

120. Mr. President, I beg you to excuse me for addressing myself to Mr. Tekoah, contrary to my habit as a member of the Council in addressing Council members. And I am not playing to the gallery, because I have no gallery here to listen to me. Mr. Tekoah, as we know, is always playing to the gallery and the Zionist-oriented information media of this country. That is not what I am doing. I am trying to argue a case, and a just case.

121. Leaving Mr. Tekoah alone, allow me to go into the subject of today, which has been presented by Mr. El-Zayyat. However, this is not the first time we are listening to reports of new violations and new aggressions by Israel after a resolution of this Council on the cease-fire at 1650 hours GMT on 22 October, but right here, on the second day, when Israel committed its first breach of the cease-fire, my delegation warned the Council that what Israel had done in 1967 and was doing on the first day of the cease-fire was bound to be repeated again, again and again. So today is not the end of it. Israel will go on with it, because it is part and parcel of its policy. I must say it is taking advantage rather dishonourably of a situation where there should not be war, where this Council is trying its best to bring about an effective cease-fire and after that to move towards a permanent and durable peace.

122. What Israel is trying, and trying very hard, to do now really approaches brutal genocide under the protection of a cease-fire called for by this Council, so whatever sort of pretexts or nonsense that we might hear from Mr. Tekoah is but camouflage under which Israel can go ahead with its cynical and disastrous plans, which have no consideration at all for human beings.

123. Let us remember that what Israel is doing now is bombarding the cities of Ismailia and Suez, which are inhabited by civilians, in the hope that those two cities which stand between them and the Egyptian army on the other side will fall and they will then encircle the army and starve it. Israel's aim is starvation, and the example of its stopping the Red Cross from carrying provisions and medical supplies to the army on the other side is just one example. So the Council must be careful about designs which could be carried out at any time, indeed, at dawn tomorrow.

124. The Council is faced with an immense responsibility which falls not only on the Council as a whole but principally on only two members. I do not call them the super-Powers, but they are the two big Powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which have a special responsibility in the present conflict. Indeed, one of those two Powers is still providing Israel with arms, weapons and ammunition with which Israel is continuing its aggression, right up to the present day, in the Middle East. We all know, even non-soldiers like myself, that without ammunition and without being resupplied with military equipment Israel could not have carried on the war—indeed, by its own estimation and estimates made in this country—for six days had it not been for the resupply which has been carried out, up to 9,000 tons in 10 days, and which is still going on.

125. Let me say that we have admitted making a mistake right from the beginning, in that we accepted in good faith the draft resolution which was presented to us, but quite rightly, too, we were under the impression that certain discussions had taken place as a result of which the cease-fire proposal was brought to us here in the Council in order that we might adopt a resolution, and we did adopt it. We realized from the beginning that the draft resolution did not come with the special machinery which was going to control the cease-fire—to the advantage of whom we do not know. But, at the same time, we must admit that we have ourselves delayed in placing the observers and eventually the Emergency Force in place and in time, because of the objection of Mr. Dayan and instructions by the Israeli armed forces west of the Canal to the United Nations observers, and through continuous bombardments of Egyptian cities and the scaring of United Nations observers. The idea is more delay, hence more aggression.

126. I would suggest to this Council that we have reached a situation where we are faced with two or three alternatives, and I must say that two of them are rather cynical to think of. The best of them is that the Council should really bring about immediately an effective cease-fire in place and the other, the Israeli one, which I do not really believe, is that the balance of military power should be replaced.

127. In other words, if we want these people to kill each other, let us give them an even chance of being fairly and squarely armed. That is sinister and disastrous, and I am sure nobody would believe in that. But then the alternative is that this Council, and indeed the countries which are responsible for peace and security in that area because of the events to which they were parties, should take an effective part. But I know for certain that one of them is expressing its wish deliberately in this Council. I know the other has the power to make Israel accept a cease-fire and, from there, to move to a consideration of peace, which is what we are all looking for.

128. I have more to say, but perhaps I should not take any more time. I wish only to finish by saying again to Mr. Tekoah that my country is not trying to pursue a policy of war. It is a policy of peace—but a peace which is based on the complete withdrawal of the Israeli occupation armies from the territories occupied since June 1967 and restoration of the Palestinian rights, which we always have to remember.

129. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the United States of America, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

130. Mr. SCALI (United States of America): Let me reaffirm once again what I have said repeatedly here before: In word and deed the United States stands for strict observance of the cease-fire.

131. In the view of my delegation, the most constructive contribution we in this chamber can make at this stage is to proceed systematically, as quickly as possible, on our mission of ending the fighting and beginning peace negotiations. We cannot accomplish anything by repeatedly resorting in this chamber to exchanges of unverifiable charges and counter-charges when objective, unchallengeable facts are needed. We do not need more reckless accusations: we need responsible action. We can proceed to implement resolution 340 (1973), which was sponsored by eight non-aligned members of the Security Council, and which, if carried out, can put us on the road to real peace.

132. I have heard Ambassador Malik's one-sided version of history before, and I will not reply in kind, because our two Governments have a special responsibility to lead the way to peace, and the moment is too grave for that kind of talk. I must take exception, however, to Ambassador Malik's resort to the habit of selecting a phrase from the Secretary of State's press conference and reading it out of context. I should perhaps express resentment over such a debater's trick, but instead I will thank the Ambassador for advertising Mr. Kissinger's statements. I have sent a complete text of Mr. Kissinger's news conference remarks to each of the United Nations Missions in New York, because I thought objective readers would be impressed with the Secretary's fair-minded description of events and American policy at this period of history.

133. If you have found Ambassador Malik's sample titillating, dear colleagues, let me suggest that you will find Mr. Kissinger's statements, taken in their entirety, even more interesting and far more balanced than some of the remarks that you have heard this evening.

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

135. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): I did not originally intend to take the floor today, but after hearing the statements made by the Foreign Minister of Egypt and the Deputy Foreign Minister of Syria, we feel that the Security Council must seriously deal with the grave situation that has arisen, and strongly condemn Israel for its criminal act of continuing to expand its aggression—a criminal act which is inseparable from the two super-Powers, for which they bear unshirkable responsibility.

136. Moreover, Mr. Malik once again has used the Council as a forum in which to engage in unwarranted slander and attack against China. I am therefore compelled to say a few more words in that connexion.

137. Mr. Malik mentioned consultations among the five Powers—namely, the five permanent members of the Security Council. But there never existed in the Council any such so-called five-Power consultations. In the past there were so-called four-Power consultations among the four permanent members of the Security Council, but those were outside the United Nations, not in the Security Council; moreover, no one—neither the Security Council nor the General Assembly—had authorized them to carry out such consultations. Even those so-called four-Power consultations had broken down long before China came to the United Nations. It was because of your failure, Mr. Malik, to make a deal in the consultations between you and the United States that you fell out and broke up that partnership. That is the inglorious historical background of the so-called five-Power consultations.

138. Mr. Malik accused China of refusing to take part in his proposed five-Power consultations. That is indeed true. China refuses and will refuse to take part in the so-called five-Power consultations. The reasons are very simple: we have all along been opposed to a big Power striking political deals behind the backs of the Palestinians and other Arab peoples.

139. The two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, for their respective interests and at the expense of the interests of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples, have recently made dirty deals behind the scenes and tried to impose the so-called agreement between them on the Security Council. That is a most recent example. Members of the Security Council present here, with the exception of you two, have all been kept in the dark. Many delegations have said that up to now they are not yet clear as to the total content of the political deal made by you in Moscow.

140. How can you expect China to participate in such criminal and ugly activities? China will never participate in, and is firmly opposed to, such activities, because they betray and sell out the interests of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples.

141. Mr. Malik has always assumed the air of a benefactor, as if the People's Republic of China owed the restoration of its lawful rights in the United Nations entirely to Mr. Malik

and the Soviet Union. He seizes every opportunity to boast about the "merits" of the Soviet Union in this regard. However, many representatives in the United Nations know how painful it was for the Soviet delegation to see the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. Your own people said that it was a "bitter victory".

142. Mr. Malik has another bad habit. He thinks that since it was due to the merits and benevolence of the Soviet Union that China was able to come to the United Nations, then after the entry of China in the United Nations China should act according to the direction of the baton of the Soviet Union. You are wrong again, Mr. Malik. You are totally wrong. You have made the wrong choice, and you have picked the wrong place. You have forgotten that China is a sovereign State. It will follow no one's baton, including yours, Mr. Malik. Perhaps you are accustomed to bossing around in your own home, and probably also in your so-called "community". However, this is neither your own house nor your "community". This is the United Nations, consisting of 135 sovereign States. Your ways won't work here. It is not possible for one super-Power to order the United Nations about at will, nor is it possible for you to do so even if you are tied up with another super-Power. Such are the facts.

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

144. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Mr. President, I did not realize when I asked to speak that I would be following the representative of China. By tradition I respond to his comments regarding the Middle East situation with ancient Chinese stories or proverbs filled with the wisdom of the Chinese people. Today I should like, however, simply to give him one assurance. As he has on a number of occasions alleged that the Soviet Union is an ally of Israel, I should like to dispel his apprehensions and calm his fears. Were the Soviet Union an ally of Israel it would not have been following the kind of policy that it is following in the Middle East. It would have supported peace and not aggression and it would not have, for years, been sending offensive weapons which made the present hostilities possible. I have expressed this assurance to the representative of China in the modest hope that perhaps it might contribute to some degree, at least, to greater understanding between the great Powers, the permanent members of the Security Council. Much of the trouble and suffering in the Middle East is due to the misunderstandings and the confrontation between the great Powers.

145. As for the statement which we heard from the representative of the Soviet Union, it really does not deserve another answer. We are accustomed by now to the Stalinist lexicon from which he has not been able to free himself despite the passage of time. But I think that everyone who listened to me and then heard his comments realized that he was using the customary method which he has employed here for years, that is, to take a point, to distort it, to set it up as a point of departure and then draw conclusions. He has read out to us a number of cables from UPI reporting the fighting that went on at certain times during today, and on the basis of the claim that I said that

the entire day passed in tranquillity, he resorted to the usual abuse and slander and malice.

146. Now I said nothing of the kind. On the contrary, I drew the attention of the Council to two complaints which I submitted earlier today to the Secretary-General regarding Egyptian violations of the cease-fire. I simply pointed out that no one, not even the representative of the Soviet Union, should expect the Israeli forces to remain passive while being attacked by the Egyptian forces and to refrain from returning fire.

147. I have been for some years in the United Nations, and, as I listened to the representative of the Soviet Union today again speaking of the support his country has been giving to Arab aggression by sending arms to the Arab States, I could not but feel that we were all witnessing a second landmark in the Soviet Union's contribution to the history of the United Nations. The first one, I think—a memorable one, an unforgettable one—happened when Premier Khrushchev took off his shoe and beat it on the General Assembly table as a contribution to international friendship and comity, and the second one came at yesterday's meeting and at today's meeting and at several previous meetings in the course of this debate in the Security Council, when the representative of a Member State, a permanent member of the Security Council, openly and unashamedly gloated over the bloodshed occurring today in the Middle East as a result of the arms which have been supplied by his Government through the years—arms which have brought about renewed aggression instead of making it possible to try to build jointly, calmly, constructively, peace in the region.

148. However, that was not the purpose of my intervention. I agree with those who feel that there has been all too much acrimony, polemics and phraseology, too many meaningless slogans thrown across this table. I think it is time to look at facts, and the best way to be able to deal with them correctly is to try to avoid distorting them. Therefore I should like to refer very briefly to the statements made by the representatives of three peace-loving Arab States, all three participating in the renewed aggression that has been taking place for three weeks in the Middle East. Peace-loving States: two of them, the Sudan and Syria, officially, publicly, proclaiming that Israel, another State Member of the United Nations, has no right to exist as a sovereign independent nation and that the Jewish people have no right to freedom and self-determination as other peoples of the world have; and the third one, Egypt, striving year after year, action after action, by aggression with irregular forces and by support for terror warfare, to achieve the same objective openly proclaimed by the other two partners, namely the destruction of the Jewish State and the annihilation of the Jewish people.

149. As I listened to the representative of the Sudan preaching to us—it is difficult to apply a different term to what we heard from him—I decided that I should not reiterate the grave responsibility which rests with his Government for having joined in a campaign of aggression that is still raging today and is the direct cause of the suffering of which he and his colleagues have been complaining here today. I thought I should also not recall

to the representative who spoke of human rights and even resorted to the term "genocide" the genocide by his Government of half a million of his own citizens in the south of Sudan. I felt I should refer only to one thing, and that is his claim that the Sudan brings to this Organization a message of peace. In the Middle East the Sudan has in fact brought a very special message, and the name of its capital, Khartoum, will for ever remain inscribed in the annals of peace and war. The message of Khartoum is the infamous resolution adopted in September 1967 by the Heads of Arab States, which declared: "No peace, no negotiations, no agreement with Israel". This is the message of peace which seems to be still guiding his Government, the Government of Syria, the Government of Egypt and all the others that have joined them in the vicious aggression of the Day of Atonement.

150. The representatives of Syria in the United Nations have only one story to tell and one argument to put forward when it comes to discussing the history of the last few years, and that is the allegation that in 1967 Israel violated a United Nations cease-fire resolution. Let us recall what happened in 1967. Have all the United Nations records been burnt? All the verbatim records of Security Council debates in which one complaint after another against aggression from Syrian territory launched against peaceful Israeli villages and towns in the Jordan Valley has been discussed—are all these forgotten? Has history simply erased the fact that for a number of years, reaching a climax in the first few months of 1967, there were continuous armed attacks perpetrated from Syrian territory against Israel, against Israeli territory, against the Israeli population; that it was that fact that constituted a direct element in bringing about the outbreak of hostilities in June of that year?

151. But let me once and for all put on record what we have been continuously trying to point out when we have to face the empty falsehoods being hurled at Members of the United Nations by the Arab representatives.

152. On what is based this argument that Israel violated the cease-fire? Of course, it is perfectly all right to forget what preceded the hostilities of 1967. It is all right to forget that for years Syria proclaimed openly that its aim is to shatter the existence of the State of Israel and worked in that direction. But what happened in those days of June 1967?

153. We heard the Deputy Foreign Minister of a State Member of the United Nations come here, throw charges, accusations, calumnies, at others and then say, "Now let me prove to you by quoting from a Security Council resolution." Before doing so, he said: "I shall prove to you how Israel violated the cease-fire, how Israel was registered as being the attacker and the aggressor in 1967"—a tale which we hear again and again, here, in Committees of the General Assembly and elsewhere.

154. And then he read out the first preambular paragraph of that resolution:

"Noting that the Governments of Israel and Syria have announced their mutual acceptance of the Council's demand for a cease-fire," [resolution 235 (1967).]

And then the Deputy Foreign Minister proceeded, as the verbatim record will show, to say: "But Israel, despite this, was found to have been guilty of attack." Nothing of the kind. He stopped at that very point in citing the resolution and continued in his own words, baseless and completely unfounded, because the resolution refers to both sides, because the resolution calls on both sides to put an end to the hostilities, hostilities that continued because Syria continued to attack the Israeli towns and villages which it dominated from the Golan Heights.

155. And finally, one brief word about the statement which the representative of Egypt found it necessary, advisable, to make before this Council. He referred to the question of humanitarian supplies which are being transported to the encircled Egyptian forces with the assistance of the Israeli authorities and of the Israeli forces. He quoted from a cablegram which had arrived from Geneva. He omitted entirely the first part, which I placed on record and which speaks, in the words of a spokesman of the International Red Cross Committee in Geneva, of supplies, of medicine, of plasma, being flown to the Egyptian lines by Israelis in an Israeli helicopter and transferred to the Egyptians by the Red Cross. He omitted that completely though it was part of the same cable from which he read. And he read the following sentence—and I should like to repeat it and request the members of the Council to pay attention to it and to the conclusion deduced from it:

"A convoy of 14 trucks due to leave Cairo today with Red Cross supplies of blood plasma and medicines for the town of Suez was delayed because of conditions placed by the Israelis on its passage. The spokesman said there was still no list of prisoners of war held by the Egyptians and Syrians."

156. As I brought to the attention of the Security Council the other day, three weeks have elapsed since the opening of the Egyptian-Syrian aggression. Up to this very day, Egypt and Syria have not transmitted, in accordance with the Geneva Conventions, lists of Israeli prisoners of war held by them, with the exception of the 48 men to whom I referred in my letter to the Secretary-General. Now, I am ready to agree that one condition was placed on the transfer of Egyptian supplies through Israeli lines, under the auspices of the International Red Cross Committee, to encircled Egyptian troops—and that condition was that the Egyptian Government, the Egyptian armed forces should be humane, should act as human beings, as Israel is acting, that Egypt should apply the Geneva Conventions and should observe the humanitarian international obligations imposed on it.

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

158. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I provided information in response to a question put by Mr. Baroody concerning the attitude of the five permanent members of the Security Council to the Middle East question, the five permanent members of the Security Council being those which bear primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with the Charter and United Nations practice.

159. My statement accurately and truthfully reflects the position of the five permanent members with regard to this question, and especially with regard to consultations and voting on the resolutions. It is not surprising that, as a Russian proverb has it, truth pricks the eye. The truth has pricked the eye of the Chinese representative. Since he is not in a position to refute the truth, he has resorted to his usual routine, hackneyed methods and has brought out his standard quota of slanders against the Soviet Union. He also began to bully the United Nations and its members with talk of a *diktat* or an imposition. There is another Russian proverb which states "If the mother-in-law is a bad woman, she will not even believe her own daughter-in-law".

160. From this very malicious reply, only one conclusion can be drawn, and that is quite an obvious one: China and its representative in the United Nations do not wish to promote a settlement in the Middle East. They would prefer the Suez Canal to be in the hands of Israel, rather than those of Egypt. They would prefer Israeli forces to remain in the occupied territories. That is where the essence of their policy lies; their objective is quite obvious.

161. As for the slanders, there is a total alliance between zionism and "Chinaism", and they are competing with each other to see which will take first prize in slandering the Soviet Union. In individual cases I am prepared to give the first prize to the Chinese representative, and not to my "ally", as the Chinese representative calls him, the representative of zionism. This is a joke; it is monstrous! To what unthinkable limits will the Chinese representative go with his fabrications?

162. I should like to refer to what I said at our last meeting. I said that the delegation of the USSR will ignore the standard quota of slanderous fabrications made by the Chinese representative, and that it does not consider it necessary to react to them. I repeat that in confirmation of my position. The slanders and fabrications are so monstrous that they do not even require refutation.

163. As for the Israeli representative, I would advise him to put an end to his practice of using slanders against members of the Security Council in order to conceal Israel's aggression and international brigandage. It will not convince anyone, and will not help anyone. That is your tactic—to slander members of the Security Council and anyone else and thus to divert attention from the substance of the matter under discussion. Set aside your slanders and answer questions: when will Israel put a stop to its shooting, and when will it begin to withdraw its troops to the line of 22 October? That is what is being asked of you. And no slanders against the members of the Security Council will help you to conceal the aggression and international brigandage carried out by Israel and its disregard, its violation of three Security Council resolutions. Consequently, when you resort to slanders, you place yourself in a ridiculous position. It convinces no one. It is not a serious approach. It is merely an attempt to find something to say to cover up Israel's policy of aggression.

164. Now I should like to say a few words to Mr. Scali. I have accurately reproduced what was said by Mr. Kissinger and I am entitled, as the representative of the Soviet Union,

to ask a question. Mr. Kissinger noted the fact that Israel had violated a Security Council decision—the resolution which you and I, Mr. Scali, introduced in the Security Council and defended. I am entitled to ask: what has Mr. Kissinger done, after having noted the violation and the seizure of additional Egyptian territory, in order to ensure that Israel implements that resolution? I am entitled to ask that question. I did not in any way distort what was said by Mr. Kissinger, and the idea of doing that had not even occurred to me. But I am entitled to ask that question.

165. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Egypt who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

166. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt): I regret that I must speak again but I must make it clear to the Council that my quotation from the Reuter dispatch was meant to prove that there were conditions put before the convoy could proceed from Cairo. This was my only point in presenting what was very clearly stated in this dispatch. I did not fabricate it. I just mentioned that a convoy of 14 trucks was supposed to proceed to the city of Suez with medical supplies and plasma, and it has been delayed by conditions imposed by Israel on the arrival of these supplies to their destination. This was my point.

167. The second one is on the attitude of the Government of Israel regarding the application of the Geneva Convention. I should like to place on record in the Security Council this official press release from the International Committee of the Red Cross, which I have before me. This official communiqué of the International Committee of the Red Cross is dated 20 October 1973, published under press release number 1176B, and it is entitled "Negative Reply by Israel to ICRC Proposal". It reads as follows:

"Geneva, ICRC

"After the Governments of Syria, Iraq and Egypt had sent in their replies accepting the proposal put forward by the International Committee of the Red Cross, that articles 46, 47 and 50 of Part IV—"Civilian Population"—of the draft additional protocol to the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 relating to the protection of victims of international armed conflicts, should forthwith be observed, the Government of Israel replied on 19 October stating its position as follows:

"In response to the ICRC appeal, the Government of Israel states that it has strictly respected and will continue to respect the provisions of public international law which prohibits attacks on civilians and civilian objects'.

"The ICRC considers that the Government of Israel's communication is tantamount to a negative answer to its proposal."—

I repeat—

"... that the Government of Israel's communication is tantamount to a negative answer to its proposal. This is all the more deplored by the ICRC since its proposal was intended precisely to ensure for the civilian population of the Middle East a more efficacious protection than that

provided by existing public international law, the texts of which in respect of the subject go back to 1907 and consequently do no longer correspond to situations to be found in modern warfare."

This is the end of the special communiqué published by the International Red Cross.

168. The only conclusion to be drawn from this attitude is that Israel intends to deprive the city of Suez of our supplies of medical equipment. Israel resolves to fabricate pretexts and allegations in order to deny the wounded personnel such vital supplies as blood and medical equipment.

169. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel in exercise of the right of reply.

170. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I shall be very brief. Indeed, I did not intend to respond to the statement made by the representative of Egypt because I think that, as all members of the Council must have realized when listening to him, he simply did not understand the point I made about a humanitarian condition being put by an officer in the field, or perhaps some representative of the Israeli authorities, for allowing Egyptian medical supplies to be transported through Israeli military lines to encircled Egyptian troops.

171. I should like simply to put on record a brief clarification regarding the second point which he made, quite dramatically. He simply omitted—and this is unusual—a statement of what the proposal was, namely, that the Government of Israel should commit itself to several draft articles of a draft protocol which is at present non-existent, which is going to be discussed in half a year's time at an international conference.

172. The Israeli Government happens to be a democratic Government. That constitutes a difficulty, apparently, in the eyes of the representative of Egypt. Apparently, in Egypt there is somebody who can say "yes" to whatever he so desires to, and it really does not matter whether he says "yes" but really means "no". Throughout the years, after all, we have been witnessing Egyptian protestations of loyalty to the Charter of the United Nations at the very time when Egyptian leaders used to proclaim publicly that their objective was to destroy a Member of the United Nations. We have all watched Egyptian aggression at the very time when Egypt was saying that it was a peace-loving country.

173. But in Israel, as in all democratic countries and Governments, it so happens that in order to ratify a convention, an international protocol, two conditions are necessary. The first is that one should know what one is ratifying; one should have some formulation, some international instrument to agree to ratify. Now, that does not exist in this case. Every one of us who has some knowledge of international law will understand the difficulty. The second condition is that, as I already said, in a democratic Government there is a process of ratification; there is a parliament; there is a Government. You do not have a single person who simply puts a stamp on a document and says: "I promise to love peace"—and then goes out to make war.

You have to go through a certain parliamentary democratic process.

174. Under these circumstances, in conditions of war imposed on us by the Egyptian-Syrian aggression, the Government of Israel responded to the suggestion by saying: "Of course we have abided and we will continue to abide by the letter and the spirit and ensure the purpose of these articles of the draft protocols"—that is, refrain from hitting civilian targets. The only difference between our attitude and the attitude of the Arab Governments on this point is that they, as I explained, for constitutional reasons have no difficulty at all about saying: "Yes, of course. Suggest just about anything. It does not matter that it does not exist and is not binding yet. We say 'yes' to everything and we act in exactly the opposite way. We agree to any formulation which restricts air actions or land actions. But we do hit civilian villages; we do launch missiles against towns and inhabited localities."

175. The Israeli Government took a more responsible view and said: "Yes, of course. We are acting exactly as required and suggested." That is why our formulation is of a more general nature and does not refer to articles 47, 48 and I think, 50—which still do not exist—of a non-existing additional protocol which still has to be discussed by an international conference.

176. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Sudan in exercise of the right of reply.

177. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): I was very reluctant to respond to the ungracious remarks of Mr. Tekoah about my country, but I feel that the record must be set straight.

178. We are all familiar with Mr. Tekoah's method of using notes and making points which are often off the record or points with which he plays up to the gallery. I think this one is completely off the record, and is therefore for the benefit of the gallery because he used a very big lie in referring to my statement. I never mentioned the Jews in my statement. I never mentioned what he has been saying about the Jews. But that is the usual record which he plays in order to get more millions of tax-free dollars from the American citizens. To what purpose? To continue this war of aggression. That is exactly what he is always trying to do.

179. Now, he is wrong in quoting me as having said anything about the Jewish people—whether they are in Israel or outside Israel. But, in any case, why should he talk about the Jews who are citizens of other countries? Why should he address them? What right does he or Israel have over Jews outside Israel? I ask him.

180. At any rate, they are not our concern here. Our concern here is the Zionists of Israel who have been waging war there and breaking peace whenever peace was in view.

181. Another point he spoke about was human rights and genocide in southern Sudan. I am glad in a way that Mr. Tekoah has given me this platform. Quite modestly and humbly, we have not referred here to the peaceful solution of the southern Sudanese question. Mr. Tekoah knows—if

he knows any history—that it was no creation of the Sudanese people. It was a historical problem which we inherited and which, to our credit, we have been able to solve in a most peaceful and exemplary manner. If there was any killing, Mr. Tekoah might tell this Council whether or not Israel had a hand in it. If there should be any doubt remaining in this Council, we shall be very pleased to furnish the proof of Israeli weapons which have been smuggled into the Sudan.

182. That is a normal Israeli routine in Africa, and it is the reason why they have been dismissed from most parts of Africa. With each minute that passes, other African countries are severing diplomatic relations with Israel because now they know the real story.

183. However, that is not my point. My point is that the Sudan has never practised genocide. There was a conflict inside the Sudan, which ultimately we settled. To our great pride we settled it peacefully. It has been an exemplary solution, praised all over the world. I know that to him that was a bad thing to have happened; it was not his wish. We know how his wish goes. I ask him: What did they do in Deir Yassin; what did they do in the King David Hotel; what did they do with the Libyan plane; what did they do in Europe? All those things are Zionist works, which the world knows. What did they do to the Palestinian people which had been in Palestine before them? Ninety-three per cent of the population living there was Palestinian and they owned almost the same percentage of the land. What did they do with them? They sent them away destitute and homeless, and they still deny them the right to come back, despite a decision of this Organization, to which Israel has not yet replied.

184. I mentioned something about the Khartoum message. The Khartoum message was correct, because it was dictated by Israel itself, through its aggression on the Arab territories, against the Arab people and the Palestinian people, and they are still continuing that aggression. So the Khartoum message was a message of resistance, a message of fighting aggression, and that still holds good.

185. Mr. Tekoah has told these stories in order to get off the hook in the Council, and I should like to return him to the hook and ask him questions which he should answer.

186. Mr. Tekoah has been presented today with certain questions. He has been asked whether Israel is to comply with our resolution 338 (1973) immediately, and go back to the lines of 1650 hours GMT on 22 October. He did not speak on that. He still has to let us know whether the Red Cross can pass and whether the Egyptian authorities can pass food and medicine to people in cities and outside the cities.

187. I will ask him the last question: What does Israel intend to do between now and dawn? Is it going to go on breaking the cease-fire? Is it going to go on with its plan of genocide—and I repeat the word—genocide? These are questions to which I should like Mr. Tekoah to reply if possible, properly and adequately, but not to pick the wrong paper from his files.

188. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt in exercise of his right of reply.

189. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt): Egypt will always be ready to say yes to a humanitarian move and Egypt will always say no to massacre, aggression and genocide. Let the representative of Israel remember that. He could not refute what was in this official communiqué of the International Red Cross. He said that these are just draft articles, and as a democratic State they will have to look for the acceptance of such draft articles—as if other countries as democratic as Israel, in accepting them, have committed a breach of democracy.

190. If the representative of Israel is referring to this draft convention, let me, Mr. President, put through you a question to him: how about the Fourth Geneva Convention, relative to the protection of civilian populations in time of war, to which Israel is a party by signature and ratification? Is he ready to declare here that his country would respect this Convention in all its parts?

191. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Saudi Arabia wishes to exercise his right of reply. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and I appeal to him again, always, as an old colleague and friend, to be brief.

192. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, I will be as brief as it is humanly possible for me to be, but for heaven's sake, I think you are on good terms with Ambassador Malik—please, next time appeal to him also to be brief. I am very interested in what he says, you see. I am all ears. And please appeal to some others, but because you appealed to me as a friend and not as a President I will be as brief as possible. I think Ambassador Malik is a friend of yours; I see you chuckling and laughing with him.

193. I take exception to what Mr. Tekoah said about democracy. He cannot fool anybody with platitudes about democracy. Democracy has been reduced to a ritual, especially since the beginning of the First World War, when many crimes were committed in the name of democracy.

194. I have lived for over 40 years in so-called democratic countries. They were in western Europe and the United States of America, and I saw with my own eyes the deterioration of democracy. The kernel of democracy has shrivelled or has been devoured by the worm of greed and of ambition for power.

195. The First World War was waged allegedly to save the world for democracy. Everybody knows that that war was fought with the motivation on the part of the western Powers that Kaiser Wilhelm and Germany were militarists. England was the biggest naval Power at that time and France had one of the greatest armies. The First World War was not waged to save the world for democracy; it was not waged against German militarism; it was waged against German mercantilism, and the people of Europe were sent to the slaughter-houses in the name of democracy.

196. In 1917 the Zionists railroaded the United States into the First World War. This was a democracy, the United States, before it entangled itself in the affairs of Europe. I

really was moved to see the crosses in Verdun in the 1920s, of the flower of youth who were duped and lost their lives in the name of sham democracy, to which this gentleman on my left refers.

197. Then democracy deteriorated further in between the two world wars and finally its death knell was sounded in the Second World War. Again the war was against Germany because Hitler challenged the Western Powers. There was secret democracy. I was living in England in 1938 when in September Mr. Neville Chamberlain and Mr. Daladier had to go to Munich. When he was asked by reporters, Mr. Chamberlain evaded the issue. All he said at Hendon airport when he returned from Munich was, "I brought peace to our generation". Then when he was asked by correspondents again "What happened about Czechoslovakia?" he said "My lips are sealed." No wonder Mr. Scali's lips are sealed; he is like Mr. Chamberlain. But I am sure Mr. Scali acts upon instructions from his Government. I see that Mr. Kissinger's lips are not sealed, but I could gather nothing from his press conference or from the press release which Mr. Scali was generous enough to send to us.

198. Democracy? In the name of democracy, Dresden, which was not a military target, was wiped off the earth. Mr. Tekoah says "We are a democratic society. We have a parliament." So did the Western Powers have parliaments. Did those responsible in the West take a plebiscite of the people, whether or not to destroy Dresden?

199. And then the great President Harry Truman, did he poll, through the democratic process, the American people before wiping out Nagasaki and Hiroshima in the name of democracy? When I asked Mr. Telford Taylor in the State of Washington in 1946 when he addressed the Rotary Club and I had addressed the Kiwanis Club the day before—he had come from Tokyo, where he had acted as prosecutor in the tribunal which tried the Japanese General Yamashita—he made a mistake: he probably thought that all those present were Americans; I happened to be the only Arab—I asked Mr. Taylor, "Did the Japanese defence adduce what Mr. Truman"—he was then President—"did? Yamashita was a good family man, as no doubt was President Truman; Truman loved his family, he was open with all his friends. With all due respect to his being President, did he not commit a worse crime than Yamashita at Bataan? Did he poll the United States people about wiping out Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in the name of—what, democracy?" And Mr. Telford Taylor, the blood drained from his face and he said "It was a necessary surgical operation to shorten the war and to save American lives." That is democracy. The American people were not consulted through the democratic process. Everything is done in secret, because the security of the State imposes that. That secrecy, I will not let anybody get away again with that narcotic of decadent democracy, whether it is practiced in Israel or in any other country in the world, including Arab States that sometimes in demagoguery pretend, like other States, big and small, that they are democracies. The ritual is with us.

200. In replying to the representative of the Sudan, Mr. Tekoah resorted to the open society—

201. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of France on a point of order.

202. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): At the request of Egypt this meeting was convened this evening with a sense of urgency, because we were told by the representative of Egypt that there were violations of the cease-fire in the Middle East, that cities were in danger and peace itself was in danger.

203. We have been listening to speeches for three hours. Is it necessary, Sir, for us to listen now to a lecture on democracy and the origins of the First World War? I have the greatest admiration for the erudition of Mr. Baroody and I should be happy to listen to him at some other opportunity, but at the moment we have to consider the Secretary-General's report, and if we listen to speeches for another few hours none of us will be able to study that report. There is a certain urgency, and I would ask Mr. Baroody to postpone his historical disquisition on the First World War and his theories on democracy to some other time and allow us now to conclude our consideration of the question put before us by the representative of Egypt.

204. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Saudi Arabia has heard the proposal—what I would call the appeal—of the representative of France. It is a proposal with which I find myself, I have to confess, in a great deal of agreement. I have no desire to limit the right of the representative of Saudi Arabia to address this Council, but what the representative of France has said is, I believe, very cogent. The hour is very late, and I still intend, after this meeting is adjourned, to invite my colleagues on the Council to join me in informal consultations in pursuance of our work. And I have to agree with the representative of France that the remarks which the representative of Saudi Arabia is now addressing to us are not relevant to the subject that we are pursuing.

205. Might I appeal, as I have done already, to the representative of Saudi Arabia to conclude his remarks; otherwise, I fear, in response to the point of order—

206. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Don't threaten me.

207. The PRESIDENT:—of the representative of France, I shall have to rule the representative of Saudi Arabia out of order.

208. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Okay. I will be brief. But I want to comment in a democratic way. We are talking about democracy now. May I comment?

209. The PRESIDENT: May I remind the representative of Saudi Arabia—

210. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): You don't allow me to explain.

211. The PRESIDENT: I ask the representative of Saudi Arabia to respect the Chair for one moment. May I remind him that a great deal has been said already this evening about democracy. If he would agree to speak for only one minute more, I shall allow him to proceed.

212. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): In deference to my colleague from France I will leave what I was going to say on democracy for another occasion. But that was only the preface, and I will not now speak on democracy, in deference to you, Sir, and my colleague from France, as I say. But, incidentally, I touched on the Second World War, not only the First World War; so he was napping or not listening.

213. Now, this is directed to you, Sir, as President, not as a friend: Was the interchange of rights of reply between our colleagues from China and the Soviet Union relevant to the question, or allowable just because they are great Powers? You keep silent when they speak, but when I—who represent a small Power—talk, you use your friendship for and the irritation of some friends of mine such as—I hope he is my friend—Ambassador de Guiringaud to muzzle me.

214. I am not talking about democracy. Treat me like everybody else. Did Ambassador Huang and Ambassador Malik always speak relevantly to the subject, or were they just, so to speak, as the Americans would say, “washing their linen in public”? I will not say “dirty linen”, because I have no right to say whether it is dirty or not. I will not speak on democracy, but I have the right to speak, just like others whom you have allowed to speak, Sir; and, for heaven’s sake, know that Baroody will not be muzzled by any President—unless you want to make a ruling; and I will not challenge the ruling, because I am not a member of the Council. But I have had occasion to challenge rulings every place else. And God help me.

215. I will not speak on democracy at this time, although I have a lot to say on democracy and it would be a dissertation. But I will speak for a couple of minutes on how—there is a war in our region—on how, with all the good intentions that I believe the so-called super-Powers have, to stop the fighting.

216. Now I want to reply to what Mr. Tekoah said regarding Khartoum. Why do I reply rather than the representative of the Sudan? Because His Majesty King Faisal attended the Conference of Khartoum. And this gentleman tried to besmirch the Arab people because their Chiefs of State congregated in Khartoum to see that the Zionists do not conspire with other Powers. Do you follow me? This is not about democracy. I am explaining to Mr. Tekoah and the Council why they met in Khartoum. And the spirit of Khartoum is not dead—certainly not among the chiefs of Arab States; nor is it dead in the hearts of Arab youth. And I have my thumb on their pulse, and I dare any one to challenge me.

217. From Morocco, throughout North Africa, Syria, Iraq, the Sudan, all the Arab world has been fermented by the Palestinians. And this gentleman casts doubts about the future. That is why I have been repeatedly telling his predecessors before he was here that there will be no peace in the Arab world, Khartoum or no Khartoum, as long as Arab youth, to whom the next generation belongs, challenge their leaders if they give in to Zionist aggression, abetted as it is by the United States of America—for whose people we have the greatest friendship.

218. If this gentleman, Ambassador Scali, casts off his official garb, do you think we have anything against him? He becomes part and parcel of the American people, who are generous and good-hearted; but they may one day be driven into another slaughter—it was in this context that I was discussing the First World War and touched on the Second World War—if they are manipulated by those Zionists who seem to inspire United States policy—although I believe the noble American people will stand as one and refuse to let their Government plunge them into another slaughter-house.

219. Mr. Tekoah knows very well there can be no survival of Arab or Jew, American or Russian—or perhaps of the whole human species—unless the political Zionists come to their senses and stop making zionism a world problem.

220. That is my answer, Sir; and just remember how long the other representatives spoke before you or any one else try to interfere with my statement.

221. The last point is this: I warn the United States, as someone who has seen things happen in Europe and here for more than four decades, to beware lest this time, with the nuclear arsenals filled as they are, they might by mistake create a situation that will annihilate the human species.

222. We would rather die, as even nations die—not fighting to shed blood, but die to defend justice, rather than bow down to the rule of force. That is my message to the major Powers; that is my message through you, Sir, to Mr. Tekoah, who wantonly makes fun of the Arabs, some of whom need not have a wooden box and a sheet of paper to develop so-called modern and decadent democracy.

223. Thank you, Sir, for your kindness and indulgence. I will ask again for the floor if someone challenges what I said.

224. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

225. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): A question was put to me by the representative of Egypt, and I would like to reply to him. Before I do that, however, after listening for 15 minutes to a Saudi Arabian definition of what zionism is—you heard from me the other day what the historical definition of zionism is, but apparently some members of the Council do share the views expressed by the representative of Saudi Arabia, who preceded me—I should like to give a very precise and concise definition of what, according to the King of Saudi Arabia, zionism is.

226. In an interview with Amir Taheri, King Faisal of Saudi Arabia was quoted in an Iranian newspaper, *Kayhan International*, on 18 March 1972 as follows:

“The Zionists were responsible for unleashing upon mankind the torrential invasions of the Mongols. Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin were all Jews and Zionists.”

227. I hope the representative of the Soviet Union listened very carefully. I sometimes suspect that he shares Ambassador Baroody’s views on what zionism is.

228. In answer to the question by the representative of Egypt whether Israel agrees to abide by the Fourth Geneva Convention, the answer is "yes", and the answer was given on 8 October, two days after the Egyptian-Syrian aggression, to the International Committee of the Red Cross, and on 19 October the President of the Security Council was informed likewise.

229. One question, however, put by me—put by all mankind to the Governments of Egypt and Syria—still remains unanswered: when will those two Governments abide by the Geneva Convention, by fundamental principles of humanity and morality, and transmit through the International Red Cross the lists of Israeli prisoners of war in their hands?

230. The PRESIDENT: I allow two minutes to the representative of Saudi Arabia in the exercise of his right of reply.

231. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): In reply to the interview that allegedly someone, a journalist in Iran, has printed after his talk with Prince Faisal, I wish to state that I do not have the text of that with me now. But since the hour is late I want to tell Mr. Tekoah that a good percentage of the European Jews who were not Sephardim came from the northern tier of Asia where the ancient Mongols were. They belonged to what is known as the Chazars, who converted to Judaism in the eighth century, in what today is southern Russia. If King Faisal mentioned the Mongols, he was talking about the Mongol waves of the tenth and twelfth centuries, maybe the cousins, if not the ancestors, of this gentleman. But the Mongols of today are no longer the Mongols of ancient time. Their country is a progressive country. If he wants to confuse the issue, I can tell him that what the Israelis are doing to the Palestinians far surpasses what the Mongols of the Middle Ages did in the Middle East and also farther to the west, until Europe trembled before them. But the Mongols of today are different. His Majesty the King was referring to the Mongols of yore, at whose hands not only the Arabs suffered, but the Seljuks, the Ottomans and the people of the Balkans. They were chastened by the abuse of power, and today they are a country to be lauded. The Mongols live not only in a progressive country, but also a peace-loving country.

232. Mr. SEN (India): This is not an hour for levity or for intellectual exercise, however profitable that may be on other occasions. With the greatest of effort, I restrained myself from commenting on the day-to-day developments, both in the Council and also in the Middle East and elsewhere, for nearly three weeks now. I wish that I would not have any opportunity of making such comments, but I fear that I may have.

233. We are now confronted with a situation of utmost gravity and, in spite of the Council debating the problem practically continually for the last few days and in spite of the fact that the Council has taken several measures to bring about a degree of sanity, we have failed to introduce any appreciable measure of calm in the area of conflict. And our search for a just and durable peace promises to be indefinite.

234. However, the moment has come when we should take whatever practical steps we can. Because of this, we requested the Secretary-General to send us his report on the United Nations Emergency Force within 24 hours. That report has been with us for nearly seven hours, and we are still to pass on it.

235. While waiting to do so at the earliest possible moment, we have all been most seriously concerned with the deteriorating situation in the Middle East. Before we can control the situation by adequate measures, including the stationing of observers and the Emergency Force, it is necessary to take some urgent action if we are to ensure with a degree of certainty that the situation will not become worse within the next few hours while we consider the Secretary-General's report, perhaps tomorrow morning.

236. After much consultation with all the members of the Council, I would suggest that, first, the Secretary-General be authorized, as we authorized him yesterday, to send additional men from Cyprus, should he consider that such a step is necessary as an interim measure. In deciding how many men can be dispatched in addition to those already sent he would clearly depend on a number of factors. But I am quite certain that the Council would like to leave discretion to the Secretary-General and to strengthen his hand to the greatest extent possible in this present emergency.

237. My second proposal is that both the Secretary-General and our President should immediately and simultaneously send telegraphic appeals to the parties to cooperate fully and effectively with the International Red Cross for the proper discharge of its humanitarian task. The Secretary-General, we would hope, would extend, as he had done in several instances in the past, such practical co-operation as may be necessary.

238. As soon as the Council has approved these two proposals, as I hope it will, we can leave it to the President to decide at what hour we should meet tomorrow and when we should consult among ourselves, under the President's guidance, to decide how we might deal with the Secretary-General's report received this afternoon. This is entirely the President's prerogative, but since he has unfailingly and courteously consulted us on these matters, I have made bold to convey to you the general feelings of the Council on this important matter of the time-table as well. But this was some time ago and since then we have listened to several long exchanges, inevitably using up some time and bringing us to this late hour.

239. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): After the long debate this afternoon and this evening, I do not intend to make any statement. I simply wish to join in supporting the two proposals just made by the representative of India. His first proposal takes into account both important elements with which we are faced in considering the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolution 340 (1973), that is, first, the need for speedy consideration of the report and for speedy measures and activities to set up the United Nations Emergency Force and dispatch it to the area in sufficient strength to fulfil its mandate, and secondly, the need for members of the

Security Council to have enough time to study the report, which contains many important proposals, and for members of the Council to have time to consult with their respective Governments.

240. That is why I support his proposal that we need to consider the report of the Secretary-General as soon as possible and not later than tomorrow morning. I also support whole-heartedly the second proposal of the representative of India, which is guided by highly humanitarian considerations. I sincerely hope that the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council will use their authority to issue an urgent appeal for full co-operation with the International Red Cross for speedy arrangements for sending to the area a supply of medicines and necessary provisions in order to avoid further loss of human life and suffering.

241. The PRESIDENT: The representative of India, now supported by the representative of Yugoslavia, has put forward two proposals. The first is that the Secretary-General be authorized to send an additional Force from Cyprus, as an interim measure, should he consider it necessary. That is perhaps a shortened version of what the representative of India has proposed, but I believe it represents reasonably accurately his proposal.

242. The second proposal is that the Secretary-General and the President of the Council should appeal to the parties to co-operate fully and effectively with the International Red Cross.

243. May I ask whether any member of the Council sees any objection to both or either of those proposals? Since I hear no objection, I shall regard the proposals made by the representatives of India and Yugoslavia as approved by the Council.

244. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I have only one remark. As I listened to Mr. Sen, my impression was that he used the words "interim measure".

245. The PRESIDENT: If I did not use the word "interim", it was an omission on my part. I think I did.

246. I now call on the Secretary-General, who would like to make a statement.

247. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I shall be very brief. I have noted the proposal of the representative of India, supported by the representative of Yugoslavia, that additional troops from Cyprus might be sent, as an interim measure, to reinforce the elements of the Emergency Force now in Egypt, if I consider it necessary. I shall most certainly actively consider this proposal, having in mind of course the task of the Force in Cyprus and the number of troops available there.

248. As regards the second proposal, I shall consult with the President about the necessary steps. I should like to inform the Council in this connexion that I have been in touch with the International Committee of the Red Cross in Geneva in the past 24 hours and have been kept informed of its efforts. I shall continue to do all I can to be of assistance in these efforts.

249. The PRESIDENT: Unless any other representative wishes to take the floor I propose now to adjourn this meeting. Following consultations with members and in accordance with the proposal of the representatives of India and Yugoslavia, I propose that the next meeting of the Council should take place tomorrow, Saturday, at 10.30 a.m. to consider the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolution 340 (1973) [S/11052].

250. On the question of consultations, I should like to say that, as we all know, we had intended to have informal consultations on the subject of the Secretary-General's report at an earlier point this afternoon, but other events have supervened, and we have had so far to postpone those informal consultations. A suggestion—indeed a proposal—had been made that, following the adjournment of this meeting, I might invite the members of the Council to join me in informal consultations on the Secretary-General's report. The hour is rather late, but I would still invite members of the Council to join me at least for a short meeting in my office, where members can exchange views on the desirability of further informal consultations and the possible timing of such consultations—whether they should be held tonight or tomorrow morning before the meeting.

The meeting rose at 10 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.
