

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

JAN 30 1981

# 1746<sup>th</sup>

MEETING: 12 OCTOBER 1973

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1746) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 7 October 1973 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11010) .....	1

#### NOTE

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

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

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

## SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 12 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/1746)

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 5.05 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. A. E. Abdel Meguid (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 the further decisions taken at our meeting yesterday 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. O. Arikpo (Nigeria) and Mr. J. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. The PRESIDENT: The first name inscribed on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Nigeria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. ARIKPO (Nigeria): Mr. President, I want to thank you and the members of the Security Council for granting the request of Nigeria to participate in this ominous debate on the Arab-Israeli conflict. In more ways than one, your presidency of the Security Council at this critical hour is propitious. You are not only an experienced and highly respected diplomat but also the representative of a Government whose courage and commitment to international justice and peace are already having a great impact in the world. I have no doubt that in presiding over the deliberations of this Council you will be guided by those high qualities of courage and fair-mindedness which characterize your people and your Government.

5. When, on behalf of the Organization of African Unity, I participated, in the deliberations on this issue last June [1718th meeting], I made a passionate plea that every effort should be made by this Council to ensure implementation of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, which was unanimously adopted by the Council and accepted by the adversaries themselves without any reservations. The leaders of Africa warned then that time was running out for a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict. That Security Council debate ended in a rejection of the plea by Africa that morality and law should take precedence over armed might in this age of mindless violence.

6. Only a few days ago the Head of State of Nigeria, His Excellency General Yakubu Gowon, gave the prophetic warning that "reasonable men who desire nothing but peace and progress" when constantly denied their basic and legitimate rights, and when "bereft of all hope of change by an impervious and inflexible ruling class" invariably turn to the "frightful alternatives . . . of force and conflict"<sup>1</sup> He concluded his address to the Assembly on that occasion with the following statement on behalf of OAU:

"We regard it as an intolerable provocation that part of Egypt, a member State, should continue to remain under

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 2141st meeting, para. 18.*

armed occupation in spite of the unanimous expressions of international opinion against the acquisition of territory by force of arms.”<sup>2</sup>

7. Within hours of that statement, hostilities erupted in the Middle East, where Israel continues to occupy by force of arms stretches of land belonging to its Arab neighbours. The vital question at issue now is not who fired the first shot in the current war but who, in the light of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), is the more justified in resorting to the use of force to recover territories, for the present conflict is a continuation of the war which started in June 1967 when Israel launched a preemptive attack on Egypt.

8. We all know Israel's preoccupation with the question of recognized and secure borders. In his first statement after the resumption of the current hostilities [1743rd meeting], the Foreign Minister of Israel in effect claimed that the events of the last few days provide additional justification for Israel's continuing defiance of and contempt for the resolutions of the General Assembly, and in particular for resolution 242 (1967).

9. May I say, in all sincerity, that Nigeria believes that the reverse is the case. Nigeria, in common with other States Members of the United Nations, recognizes and indeed supports the right of Israel to live in peace within recognized and secure boundaries. But there should be no mistake about the fact that for as long as Israel continues to hold by force of arms one square inch of Arab land, for so long will the State of Israel know no permanent peace. That is not a happy prospect for any country which wants to provide for its peoples a full and abundant life. Let there be no mistake about this: whatever the final outcome of the battles which are now raging in the Middle East, there will be no peace until Arab lands are restored to them either on the basis of resolution 242 (1967) or by force of arms. It is for this reason that Nigeria would appeal to the super-Powers, particularly the United States, to view the conflict in the Middle East not in terms of the next quarter of a century but more realistically in the light of the geopolitics of the twenty-first century, when the short-term advantages of Israel are bound to be neutralized.

10. We in Nigeria are grieved about the inevitable loss of life in this conflict, especially those of the servants of the United Nations, who in the course of their duty of promoting international understanding, made the supreme sacrifice of losing their lives. Nigeria joins the international community in expressing its condolence to their Governments and their families. Let us hope that their sacrifice, as well as that of those who in similar circumstances passed away before them, will be a sharp reminder to the Security Council of the need to pursue more vigorously its role of maintaining international peace and security.

11. The Security Council, and in particular its permanent members, must bear in mind that, in carrying out its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Council is acting on behalf of all Members of the United Nations and not on behalf of any special interest group. I want to say that the super-Powers will not

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 38.

serve the cause of international peace if they escalate the present conflict by increasing arms supplies to the warring parties. It is for this reason that Nigeria urges the Security Council to exercise courage and to order the parties to stop fighting now and to take immediate and active steps to return to the positions they held prior to 5 June 1967 and to comply with all the other provisions of resolution 242 (1967). The Security Council cannot ask for anything less without seriously undermining its prestige and authority.

12. Let me end by repeating the closing statement of my Head of State in the General Assembly, on 5 October 1973:

“Members of OAU desire peace in the Middle East—peace based on equity; peace that does not insist on acquisition of other people's territory as a pre-condition; peace that acknowledges the right of all nations in the area to exist in security, peace that places a premium on respect for cultural diversity; peace that upholds the dignity of man and draws sustenance from the principles enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Charter of the United Nations. For all the inhabitants of the area have every right to expect that they should no longer be distracted from the urgent task of economic reconstruction and social development. They have every right to live in peace and to continue to contribute, as they have done in the past and in history, to the mainstream of human civilization.”<sup>3</sup>

13. It is the hope of my Government that both parties will heed this warning and that the Security Council will do its duty by the international community by ordering a cease-fire and pursuing the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

14. Mr. MUNGAI (Kenya): Sir, I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your accession to the high office of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. Your experience in diplomacy and the work of the United Nations assures the Council of fruitful results in its deliberations at this time. May I assure you of my delegation's support for you as you guide our work in the difficult issues before the Council.

15. I also take this opportunity to congratulate the representative of Yugoslavia for the able and dedicated manner in which he guided the work of this Council in the month of September.

16. I shall now turn to the subject before the Council. Speaking to this Council on 13 June 1973, during the discussion in the comprehensive review of the situation in the Middle East, the representative of Kenya stated that:

“The situation that now exists in the area—of ‘no peace and no war’—can hardly be expected to last for very much longer before a general conflagration erupts which would seriously threaten international peace and security not only in the Middle East but in [other areas of the] world.” [1724th meeting, para.42]

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 39.

17. It is with profound regret that we note that a shooting war is once again being waged in the Middle East. My delegation views with concern and immense grief the heavy toll of lives lost since 6 October 1973, and in particular, lives of innocent people and civilians. Kenya has already had occasion to address the Council on the loss of the United Nations and diplomatic personnel in Damascus, Syria, and will say no more on this.

18. I appeal to all the parties to this war to respect humanitarian law during the conflict. Civilians and other impermissible targets should, within the most stringent possible constraints, be spared from deliberate and wanton attacks. This is even more compelling considering that some of the disputants are parties to the Geneva Conventions of 1949.

19. This war has resulted from the hitherto frustrating non-implementation of resolution 242 (1967), which Kenya still believes remains a valid basis for negotiations among the parties. The sole question in the non-implementation of that resolution is the continued occupation of Arab territories by Israel as a result of the June 1967 war. Occupation of territories resulting from conquest in war is, of course, contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and international law. It is a fact that those whose lands are occupied cannot permanently accept that. No doubt, the British Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary was right when he observed that: "It would not be physically possible for the Arabs to go on gazing indefinitely across cease-fire lines at their own lands without the eruption of war."

20. I wish to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that the Organization of African Unity has consistently expressed itself against the occupation of a State member of that organization by any other State, wherever it may be. OAU has stated that it has been seized of the problem of the situation in the Middle East over a number of years, and a study of the resolutions and declarations adopted at the meetings of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU since its inception shows a pattern of growing concern, disappointment, disenchantment and sense of danger. This is because OAU cannot turn a blind eye to the fact that the territory of one of its founding member States has been the object of military occupation since June 1967, contrary to the purposes and principles not only of the Charter of the United Nations but also of OAU itself.

21. My delegation considers that the Council should seek to declare and enforce the following elements in the present crisis. First, an immediate cease-fire should come into effect. Such a cease-fire would obviate further unnecessary loss of life and destruction of property, which can only intensify the feelings of enmity against the people and States that have to live together in the same region. Secondly, agreement by whoever occupies the other's land to withdraw from such occupation to the pre-5 June 1967 lines. Thirdly, enter into immediate negotiations with a view to solving the other outstanding problems of the conflict, including the implementation of the principles enunciated in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), giving due attention to the rights of the Palestinian peoples.

This should also include guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area and all the other points stipulated in resolution 242 (1967).

22. My delegation will participate with other members of the Council in every possible constructive effort to bring about a normalization of relations in the Middle East, based on the elements that I have just outlined. The Council should not be seen to abdicate its primary responsibility in such a grave matter as the one before us. My delegation appeals to the parties to do their utmost to help the Security Council to this effect. Likewise, the super-Powers should exercise their utmost responsibilities to influence an end that gives credit to the role of the Security Council.

23. Kenya believes in peace in the Middle East because all Africa has to develop and the continent cannot develop unless we have conditions of peace. Africa is not one of the big Powers. We have no super-weapons for destruction and, therefore, I feel that our voice in this Council should be listened to, because we would like nothing else but peace, permanent peace, in the area.

24. The PRESIDENT: Speaking now as the representative of AUSTRALIA, I wish to place on record immediately that the renewed outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East, which has brought us together in urgent meeting around this table, has caused deep distress and concern to the Australian Government and people.

25. We in Australia wish for nothing more ardently than that the parties to this grievous dispute—now once again translated into mortal combat already exacting a fearful toll in human life and suffering—could compose the differences that divide that deeply troubled region and reach, even if only by gradual steps, a just and enduring peace settlement. Everyone everywhere will agree that it is calamitous, for the world as well as for themselves, that all these talented peoples in the Middle East are using up their energies and their human and material resources in mutual vilification and mutual destruction, instead of applying these talents and resources, in harmony and co-operation, to the betterment of life throughout the region as a whole.

26. The fact that we are gathered here is an acknowledgement of the grave responsibility that the Charter of the United Nations places on this Council as the body charged with the maintenance of international peace and security. It is no less than our duty to grasp this responsibility and to consider urgently what action we can and should take in this highly explosive and dangerous situation.

27. We are of course faced immediately with the difficulty of sifting and assessing accurately the numerous reports that reach us regarding what must be an extremely fluid situation on the ground in the Middle East—and this notwithstanding the valuable reports submitted by the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization. This does not make it any easier for us to agree on what we should immediately do. It is an incontestable fact, however, that heavy fighting is in progress and even increasing in scale, and that the fragile cease-fire that applied until 6 October has been shattered. Our first task must therefore be to try,

as an initial step, to unite in calling upon the warring parties to stop fighting.

28. This is the least that the weight of world opinion will expect us to do—and, I say again, as a first step. If the parties could be brought to accept our call, we would have provided, for the people of the Middle Eastern region as well as ourselves, a breathing space in which the arduous task of extending any areas of agreement that can be found to exist in the direction of a just and lasting peace on the basis of resolution 242 (1967) could be undertaken with renewed urgency.

29. It seems essential to my delegation that we do find this breathing space. The debates in this Council over the past few days have illustrated the very high intensity of emotion that exists at present, particularly between the parties concerned; and this, of course, does not make our task any easier. As our distinguished Secretary-General said in the moving and eloquent statement that he addressed to me as President yesterday, [1745th meeting], it is difficult for countries in conflict to turn from war to peace. It is all the more important that members of this Council, individually and collectively, should continue to consider and discuss this volatile situation in a mood and an atmosphere as calm and objective as possible. We are simply wasting our time if we join in recriminations that only seek to ascribe blame to one side or the other. We can all understand the frustrations that have increased during the past six years over the failure to build on the foundation provided by resolution 242 (1967)—frustrations which have inevitably helped to bring about the present renewal of hostilities. While we must regret lost opportunities of the past, we must look forward and not backward, as the representative of the United Kingdom said at the 1743rd meeting, on Monday.

30. I have already referred to the Secretary-General's statement of yesterday, in which he expressed his deep concern at the increasing threat to international peace and security that this situation may create, and appealed to the conflicting Governments to consider alternative courses, before it is too late, so that fighting and bloodshed may cease, and also expressed the hope that members of the Security Council, as well as other Member States, will redouble their efforts to seek an end to the fighting and an immediate and determined resumption of the quest for a just and lasting settlement.

31. This morning the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Kissinger, injected another appeal for action to be taken in an atmosphere of calm, reason and understanding. In the course of a press conference today, devoted mainly to the situation in the Middle East, Mr. Kissinger spoke of placing more stress on attempting to crystallize a consensus than in going through a battle of resolutions and counter-resolutions. In saying that the United States was not seeking opportunities for public confrontations which might harden dividing lines and make it more difficult to move towards a settlement, he defined his Government's objective as that of bringing about an end of hostilities in such a manner that it would be in contact with all of the parties as well as with the permanent members of the Security Council after hostilities are ended. This sounds to my delegation like a

responsible voice of a great Power, and I venture as President to commend it to members of the Council and all parties most closely concerned.

32. My own Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, underlined on 7 October the need for a just and durable settlement. He pledged that the Australian Government would continue to support all efforts to bring about such a settlement, and emphasized that, in the Government's belief, resolution 242 (1967) provides a sound and equitable basis for a settlement.

33. My delegation can only hope that, because time is emphatically not our ally, nor the ally of any of the peoples in the Middle East, the Council will grasp the responsibility that the Members of the United Nations and ultimately the peoples that we represent have conferred upon us and continue its efforts to end this tragic and dangerous war and to carry forward urgently the task of working towards a lasting peace in a region that has had far too little peace, not only in living memory but as a historical fact. We must bear in mind that while we are talking here people on both sides are suffering and dying; our ultimate responsibility must therefore be to the people of the Middle East, as well as to our own conscience. Let us accept it.

34. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation has at previous meetings of the Security Council quite fully set forth the position of the Soviet Union on the subject under discussion in the Council. Now, at this meeting, on behalf of the Soviet delegation I should like to acquaint the Council with a statement published today in the Soviet press by TASS in connexion with the continuance of savage air raids on non-military targets by the Israeli air force. I shall read out the full text of the statement:

“On 12 October, Israeli missile boats fired upon the Syrian port of Tartus, and a Soviet merchant vessel, the *Ilya Mechnikov*, which had arrived at that port on 5 October with equipment for a hydroelectric facility under construction on the Euphrates River, was sunk. On 9 October, Israeli aircraft dropped bombs on the Soviet cultural centre, which is situated in a section of Damascus where there are no military targets but only embassies of foreign States. There were casualties among the Soviet and Syrian citizens who were in that building.

“The piratical air raids to which the Israeli air force subjected Damascus, Homs and Latakia caused considerable material damage and destroyed residential quarters: there were many casualties among the civilian population, including women and children. In Egypt, Port Said and the suburbs of Cairo were subjected to bombing raids.

“All this testifies to the fact that the Israeli militarists are turning their deadly weapons against peaceful citizens and civilian targets, and even carrying out attacks against ships and strictly peaceful institutions of States that are not taking part in the war.

“The air raids on Syrian and Egyptian towns continue. The ruling circles in Israel are broadening their aggression

against the Arab States, particularly against Egypt and Syria, grossly flouting the decisions of the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly concerning the Middle East.

“The Arab States, which are exercising their right to self-defence and waging a just struggle for the liberation of their ancestral lands that have been occupied by Israel, are displaying tremendous fortitude and restraint. They are carrying on combat operations solely against the armed forces of the enemy and displaying feelings of humaneness towards the inhabitants of Israeli towns, thus respecting the rules of international law.

“The conscience of peace-loving mankind cannot reconcile itself to the new crimes of the Israeli aggressors, by whose will entirely innocent people are again dying in the Middle East. If the ruling circles in Israel assume that their attacks on peaceful towns and civilian targets in Syria and Egypt will remain unpunished, they are profoundly deluded. Aggression cannot remain unpunished, and the aggressor must bear severe responsibility for his actions.

“The Soviet Union vigorously condemns the savage bombings and shellings of civilian targets and peaceful populations by the Israeli armed forces. The Soviet Union cannot regard with indifference the criminal acts of the Israeli militarists, as a result of which there have also been casualties among Soviet citizens in Syria and Egypt, and it demands an immediate end to the bombing of the peaceful towns of Syria and Egypt and strict observance by Israel of the rules of international law, including those relating to freedom of navigation. The continuation of Israel’s criminal actions will lead to grave consequences for Israel itself.

“The Soviet Union believes that the basis for establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East lies in putting an end to Israeli aggression and the acts of violence carried out by Israel and in liberating the Arab territories occupied by Israel.”

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

36. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I believe that enough has been said in the course of the last few meetings regarding civilian casualties in the renewed hostilities in the area. The annals of history know no war which has not brought grief and suffering and death to civilians. This is most regrettable. However, I think that every fair-minded person will realize that responsibility for such suffering, grief and death must be placed with those who initiate the war—in the case of the present outbreak of hostilities, Egypt and Syria, which launched an attack on 6 October.

37. The representative of the Soviet Union referred to unfortunate civilian losses in the Syrian port of Tartus. He did not mention, however, that those losses occurred in the course of a naval battle which took place between Israeli and Syrian war vessels.

38. I shall not make any comments about the fact that the experience of previous meetings has shown time and again that there are discrepancies between eye witness reports and especially between reports which reach us after more considered examination of the facts, and the statements which we hear around this table. For instance, regarding the Soviet vessel in question, according to a report from Damascus, “a Soviet freighter was seriously damaged”, and not sunk. But I do not have the full facts, and therefore I shall refrain from commenting on this unfortunate procedure of placing before the Security Council charges before they have been fully investigated.

39. However, there are reports that in the course of that naval battle during the night of 11 and 12 October, there were civilian losses and other civilian ships suffered as well.

40. The spokesman of the Israel Defense Forces made the following statement today regarding this matter:

“We regret the sinking of civilian ships in the area of the part of Latakia. Since their attack against Israel six days ago, Egypt and Syria proclaimed a wide area opposite their shores as a war zone, the entry into which by foreign ships is prohibited. The port of Latakia serves as a military base for Syrian men of war which fight against Israel.”

41. I should like to add and stress that the Israeli defence forces, and in particular the pilots of the Israeli air forces, have strict orders prohibiting any action against any civilian targets.

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

43. Mr. ISMAIL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Just five minutes ago I received a telephone communication from Damascus. The Israelis, not satisfied with dropping napalm bombs, have also dropped delayed action bombs on parts of the city of Damascus, in the suburbs, where the poorer classes live, people who are not familiar with these bombs and who, consequently, fall victim to them. One of those bombs exploded in the courtyard of a hospital. Among the victims in that hospital were three war casualties, including an Israeli whom we were looking after.

44. That is not the bombing of civilian targets—according to the representative of Israel, that is not the bombing of the civilian population. Well then, what is it? Are those delayed action bombs sweets, are they chocolate bars? We do not need Israeli chocolate bars. Let them keep them and let them eat them themselves. Using napalm bombs, delayed action bombs, is not a display of courage or bravura—it is cowardice.

45. I should like to remind all the representatives here, and I should also like to remind the representative of Israel, of what I said in my statement, to which he has not replied and would not dare reply because he knows that I was speaking the truth. The correspondent of the *Agence France Presse* who was an eye witness of the scene of the bombing of Damascus told us that on 9 October the Israeli

Phantom strafed the streets. The representative of Israel, in exercising his right of reply, said that I had not mentioned the place bombed by the Phantom. I repeated to him that it was the streets. If he does not understand French, I say to him "street"; if he does not understand English, I say to him "strada"; if he doesn't understand Italian, I say to him in Turkish "sokak". I do not understand Hebrew and I cannot tell him how the word "rue" is translated into Hebrew. The bombing in the streets, among the groups of civilians who had gathered in the streets, was carried out twice by that magnificent American Phantom—I say, twice, and it fired into the crowd. This is humanitarian?

46. "War targets", "strategic targets"—what do they mean? Is a sugar refinery a war target? Is a school a war target? Is a hospital a war target? Technical errors? We can understand one or two cases but not hundreds of cases. This is a planned policy that is being followed.

47. Now they contend that the port of Latakia is a military port. Yes; there are two Latakias, one which is a military base and another, bigger, port that is a commercial port, and it is the latter that was attacked and not the former. Ships carrying civilian merchandise were attacked. One of them was a Greek ship, another was Japanese and the third was Russian; and all those ships were carrying goods for civilian use. Arrogant and boastful, Israel wished to sink them.

48. The electricity plants in Syria—are they war targets? And what the Israelis are doing now, or trying to do now, is to shatter our morale. From this table, solemnly, on behalf of my Government I wish to proclaim that the determination of the Syrian Government and army has never, ever, been as great as now to continue the battle until the invaders are all, every one of them, evicted. Not one inch, not a single inch, of our land will they occupy.

49. As usual, General Dayan, our present-day Hitler, has proclaimed that Damascus will fall in 24 hours. Well, let us see whether Damascus does fall in 24 hours. Damascus will fall in 24 hours if there is not a single Syrian left alive. Then, and only then, will Damascus fall. Let them all know that, and let everyone remember it.

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

51. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): Mr. President, I have listened very carefully and attentively to your wise words and to the words which have been spoken in this Council. We are not really fond of exercising our rights of reply, and I am going to be very brief.

52. I just want to say that "peace" is a very nice word. It is attractive. We all like it; but we must be clear as to the kind of peace we are talking about. There is also the peace of the dead, and in that kind of peace we are not interested. If we are under occupation, then we must react to that occupation. If there is acceptance, that is the peace of the dead. If there is refusal, that is resistance. If the resistance is silent, it is still going to break out one day, loudly, and that loud resistance is what is being referred to as "the outbreak of hostilities". Therefore, if you do not want hostilities

then you do not want occupation. That is a condition *sine qua non* for peace. A cease-fire in order that that peace may become a reality means that there is an intention, a determination, really to achieve peace. And with the comments I made just now, then there must be a determination to end the occupation. Without that, there can be no cease-fire.

53. I come to the last two points. One is about responsibility—who is responsible for what has happened, is happening and will happen in the future? I say it is those who thought they could rely on force and who teach that everything can be achieved by force, and who have decided to live beyond the pale of the law.

54. When we came to the Council last June we patiently pleaded for peace—a just peace. All its members, with the exception of one, have condemned the continued occupation of the territories conquered on 5 June 1967. That was in a draft resolution [S/10974], and with the permission of the delegation of China I say that it received 14 supporting voices, although it received only 13 supporting votes.

55. The responsibility for all that is happening now, for every life lost, is on those who were so convinced that they had the power to occupy and to punish without any reaction. The responsibility lies in the manner by which we were told jokes from Gohah Nasr-Eldin in answer to my pleading with the Council "What do I tell my people?"

56. I now turn to the bombing, wounding and killing of civilians. I am not going to speak about that, not one single word. I just want to know the rules of the game, and to know that the rules are going to be followed by both parties.

57. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Israel in exercise of his right of reply.

58. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I want to say just one word to answer the statement made by the Deputy Foreign Minister of Syria.

59. A naval battle in the sea on the approaches to a port became "an attack against the port". This is what happened; this is the way that foreign agencies have reported, on behalf of official spokesmen of the Syrian Government: there was a naval night battle in the vicinity of the port and apparently some of the ships in the port were hit. The position of my Government has been expressed in the communiqué which I read out.

60. The Deputy Foreign Minister of Syria referred again to air action in the Damascus area, and once again the Security Council is witnessing an attempt to put forward charges which are completely unfounded and refuted by reports coming out of Damascus, because according to an official Syrian Government communiqué, from which I read: "Israel today launched a major assault on Syrian airports in the area of Damascus"—not an attack on the city or on any civilian targets.

61. He referred to the kind of bombs that were used. I am not a military man, but I wonder whether Frog missiles,

ground-to-ground missiles each with a 500-kilo warhead, directed against civilian villages, as the Syrian army has been doing since 6 October, is less damaging, less powerful, has a lesser effect than the type of weapons to which he referred. We presented to the Security Council a list of Israeli towns and villages that found themselves under continuous bombardment with these missiles. I do not know whether a kindergarten on which such a missile fell is of lesser concern to this Security Council than a cultural centre that was, by accident also affected. And I do not know whether Jewish blood of innocent Jewish victims in these villages and towns is to be considered as lighter than the blood which unfortunately is being shed in Syria, in Egypt, of Syrian, Egyptian nationals, of foreign citizens, as a result of the aggression unleashed by these two countries against Israel on 6 October.

62. There is however one difference, and that is that only yesterday we heard the Deputy Foreign Minister of Syria admit that the artillery, the missile crews of his country's armed forces, did attack, did fire against Israeli villages. But, he added, those villages were in the Golan Heights, as if it made a difference where innocent civilians are killed. But I added that all the names of all the towns and villages upon which the Syrian armed forces rained fire and death were inside Galilee, and no rhetoric at this table is going to move them to any other part of the country, or to any other side of the armistice line of 1949 or of the cease-fire lines of 1967.

63. Now, these are the facts, and it makes very little sense for those who have provoked and brought about these hostilities, for those who have taken upon themselves the grave responsibility of engulfing the Middle East in renewed bloodshed, to come here day after day and pretend that there can be war with limited liabilities that does not affect civilians in war zones. To those who have repeatedly turned these last few meetings into spectacles which have debased the Security Council, which have brought criticism upon it and upon the United Nations from responsible international media of information, I would only say in the words of the Talmud: "The punishment of those who tell lies is that one stops believing them even when they tell the truth."

64. The Foreign Minister of Egypt spoke again—and we have heard this so many times in this chamber—of Egypt's desire for peace, of his own pleas for peace. These are nice-sounding words, but what are the facts? The facts are that since 1948 Egypt has carried on a war of aggression against Israel with the openly proclaimed objective of destroying the Jewish State. And confirmation to that effect is to be found in United Nations documents, when the Egyptian Secretary-General of the League of Arab States informed the United Nations in 1948 by telegram that they were launching an invasion in order to massacre Jews in a way that would be reminiscent of Mongolian massacres. This can be confirmed in the statements made in the General Assembly and the Security Council by consecutive Egyptian Foreign Ministers and Egyptian representatives who had no qualms about saying, even most recently, that Israel is an artificial State and that it was a crime to give the Jewish people, too, the chance to live like other nations in freedom, in independence. It was a crime to recognize the Jewish people's right to self-determination

about which we have been hearing so much. And there is confirmation of this blood-lust in statement after statement of President Nasser and President Sadat. There is no need to burden the Council with additional quotations. They are all in the records of the Security Council and of the General Assembly.

65. But not only words expressed this alleged desire on the part of Egypt for peace in the area. Actions as well. Who launched the invasion of 1948? I think that even the representative of the Soviet Union said very clearly where responsibility lay for the aggression of that year. We heard it from him in an unequivocal statement only yesterday. Egypt's desire for peace in the Middle East was expressed by the signing of an armistice agreement, to be followed by launching terror warfare against the Jewish State. Once the regular armies stopped fighting a new method of aggression was developed. The so-called *fedayeen* squads were established by the Egyptian army in Gaza and Sinai, to be followed by similar para-military squads in Syria, trained, controlled, directed by the Egyptian and Syrian Governments. And we still remember these squads penetrating into the heart of Israel in order to throw grenades into classrooms, slaughtering little children. That was all right. That was in the name of what? Liberation of territories I think we heard in the last few days. It was all right to ambush buses and murder all passengers. That was in the name of Egypt's sovereignty. It was perfectly all right to blow up houses with their inhabitants asleep in them. That too was being done on behalf of lofty ideals. This is the way Egypt expressed its aspiration for peace in the Middle East in the 1950s and in the 1960s. We still remember President Nasser proclaiming in May 1967, "Now we are strong enough in order to deal Israel a death-blow". We still remember the broadcasts over Radio Cairo, calling on the Egyptian army and other Arab armies to "kill, kill, kill, butcher the Jews". That, of course, is a desire for peace.

66. What happened in 1967, after Egypt removed the United Nations Emergency Force from Gaza and Sinai, after Egypt took the first war step by declaring a military naval blockade in the Straits of Tiran, after Egypt moved hundreds of thousands of troops to Israel's borders and poised them for attack against the Jewish State in order to implement President Nasser's promise to destroy Israel and to throw its people into the sea? What happened when Israel succeeded in repelling that aggression and in pushing back the armies of Egypt that opened fire on our towns and villages, that were ready to cut the country in two, that did not conceal at any time the desire to burn and ruin and butcher? What happened when the Security Council decided on a cease-fire between the combatants and the reaction was, "We are not going to change our policies, we are going to pursue our objectives", and the Khartoum decision was adopted by the Heads of Arab States in September 1967: "No peace, no negotiations, no agreement with Israel? "

67. That is the way in which the Government of Egypt expressed its desire to live at peace with Israel. And when the Security Council called for a peace agreement between the parties, for the establishment, for the first time in the history of the Middle East and in Israel-Arab relations, of State boundaries, of secure and recognized frontiers, what

was the reaction of the Government of Egypt? The so-called war of attrition—but that was a peaceful war, with hundreds of casualties, perhaps thousands, on the Egyptian side. That too was an expression of Egypt's hopes and aspirations for a peaceful Middle East.

68. It takes a great deal of audacity to come before the Security Council and to speak of Egypt's desire for peace—"for years", the Foreign Minister of Egypt said—in the light of these facts. It is audacity, it is an abuse of common sense and logic to come here and say that Egypt wanted peace, when Egypt refused to meet with Israel as suggested by the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring, in 1968. It is a blasphemy for the Foreign Minister of Egypt to come here and claim that his country, his Government has always desired peace and worked for peace, only a few weeks after repeated statements by his own President that the goals are the same: first of all push the Israelis back to the old military lines of 1967 and then continue the struggle until the elimination of Israel. Those statements too are on record and are to be found in the verbatim records of the Security Council and of the General Assembly. It is blasphemy to come before the Security Council and speak of the desire for peace after launching the latest aggression, on 6 October, simply because all over the world there was an atmosphere of *détente* and in all parts of the globe States were proving that, even after protracted conflicts, understanding and peace could be attained through dialogue and through negotiation.

69. This is what happened on 6 October, an escape on the part of the Government of Egypt from the need to face the possibility of entering into a serious, responsible process that would lead towards peaceful agreement with Israel.

70. In the light of it all, it is clear that what we are discussing is an attack and a blow at the prospects of peace in the area, a blow dealt by the Governments of Egypt and Syria. If there is anything about which they should be the last to speak in these circumstances, it is about an alleged desire to see peace established. If in fact they do wish to attain genuine peace with Israel, the option remains open.

71. Yesterday we heard the Foreign Minister of Egypt speaking of Israel's desire to close options. There was no way out, there was no alternative, he informed the Security Council—whose responsibility is international peace—but to strike at Israel, but to renew hostilities, but to resort to force; there was no other way. Yes, for 25 years Israel has been striving to close options—the options of war, the options of coercion, the options of imposing—*diktats*—leaving one option open: the option of peace, the option of negotiation. It still remains open, once we restore the cease-fire in the Middle East.

72. The PRESIDENT: I now call of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic in exercise of his right of reply.

73. Mr. ISMAIL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): As I foresaw in the statement which I made just now, the representative of Israel has been unable to deny the fact that civilian people were machine-gunned in

the streets of Damascus. I note this and I consider it acknowledgement of the fact. That is my first point.

74. Secondly, I also said in another statement that the Israelis used napalm bombs. He did not deny it, therefore he acknowledges it. I should like that to be taken note of. He claimed that Syrian forces are using delayed action bombs against civilian targets in Israel. In fact this claim, which is false, was denied on the very day it was made by the official spokesman of the Syrian Government. I repeat and I state here that it is false and that our targets were exclusively military, including military colonies which were called "*nahals*", and military airports which were perhaps near some villages, but what we attacked were military airports.

75. In another statement here in the Council I threw down another challenge to the representative of Israel which he has not taken up because he cannot. I ask him the following question: Why has his country not replied positively up to now to the appeal of the International Red Cross requesting the cessation of the bombing of civilian targets and civilians? Why? I demand a reply to that. But I know the answer: it is clear that Israel wants to continue bombing civilian targets. We take note of that. The Security Council should also take note of it. World public opinion should take note of it. The International Red Cross should take note of it, too. All the allies of Israel, assisting it in its military actions, should take note of it as well.

76. Why hitherto have the Israelis refused to commit themselves solemnly to respecting the Geneva Conventions? Quite often they have said in the Special Political Committee that these Conventions are not applicable in the Arab-occupied territories. Why? Are they not parts of the civilized world, and isn't Israel refusing to implement international conventions intended to alleviate the sufferings of civilians in times of war? Is it not perhaps because they intend to continue to bomb civilian targets and our civilians? I demand a reply.

77. This is another mockery before the Security Council when the representative of Israel claims that the Arabs want to eliminate the State of Israel, to eliminate the Jewish people. That might have been likely 25 years ago when there were some Arab hotheads who went around saying things like that. But today there is no one in the world who believes any such thing. At the present time this small country, this small people is playing power politics. It is the Carthage of the present day.

78. It is the Arabs who have always been and still are the victims of aggression and the Arabs who need protection from the aggressiveness of Israel. At the present time it is we who are struggling for our existence as a nation. As a nation we, too, have a right to dignity.

79. I said in my statement a few days ago that Israeli arrogance had reached such limits that it had begun to express itself by infringements of the sovereignty of the allies of Israel, including the great Powers, and that the day would come when the leaders of those States would finally realize their responsibilities and do everything in their

power to put an end to this limitless and unwonted arrogance.

80. In another statement I mentioned some resolutions of the Security Council which expressly condemned Israel for its premeditated acts of aggression against Lebanon and Jordan. When I challenged the representative of Israel to reply he remained silent. He couldn't answer me because these were resolutions of the Security Council, adopted by an overwhelming majority.

81. Naturally the Israelis were not very appreciative of these resolutions. Everybody heard Mr. Eban say: "What is the Security Council? It is an institution which proves its moral, political and juridical bankruptcy." Well, why are you here? If the Security Council is a politically, juridically and morally bankrupt institution, why are you here?

82. The representative of Israel also mentioned the facts of 1948 when, as he claims, the Arabs attempted to crush the Israeli people. But when the Israelis in Palestine began their massacre of Arabs from the beginning of 1948, the State of Israel as such did not exist. The birth of that State, which was marked on 15 May 1948, was preceded by several horrible massacres of Palestinians. Who among us does not remember Deir Yassin where the valiant members of the Stern and Irgun Zvei Leumi killed and disembowelled women? Who does not remember that?

83. We talk of civil rights here, of "enlightened nations"! This is supposed to be an enlightened nation! Look at what it did! No Arab State wants to destroy Israel and wipe out its people, the Jewish people. That is absolutely false. Our struggle aims solely—I emphasize "solely"—at liberating our territory and restoring our national dignity. And we want at the same time—I stress this—to see to it that the Arab people of Palestine as well recovers its legitimate national rights.

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

85. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I shall refer only to one point mentioned by the Deputy Foreign Minister of Syria, that is, the appeals made by the International Committee of the Red Cross—appeals because, as is customary with Syrian and other Arab representatives at this table, once again we are faced by distortion and falsehood. The International Committee of the Red Cross made appeals to all combatants—successive appeals.

86. This is Israel's response:

"On 6 October 1973, in flagrant violation of the 1967 cease-fire of the Security Council of the United Nations, the Syrian authorities launched war operations on a wide scale along the entire cease-fire line.

"From the outset of these hostilities, Syrian armed forces attacked civilian objectives, in particular, the Druse villages located on the Golan Heights: Buk'ata, Masada and Majdal Shams.

"In the course of these attacks, Syrian aircraft intensively strafed the homes of the villagers, causing the death of at least 10 civilians, including women and children. Many were wounded and much material damage was caused.

"No military objective is located in these areas.

"On 10 October Syrian forces launched some 20 ground-to-ground Frog missiles against civilian centres in the north of Israel. These deadly missiles have a range of 70 kilometres and contain 500 kilogrammes of explosives.

"As a result of this attack, considerable damage was caused in the Israeli localities of Gvat, Migdal-Haemek, in the region of Kfar Baruch and Nahalal. In Migdal-Haemek and Gvat in particular, civilians were wounded and a kindergarten, a school and many homes were destroyed.

"Other Israeli villages in Upper Galilee—Gadot, Kfar Szold, Shamir and Snir—were the targets of Syrian artillery which caused serious damage.

"On the basis of its inherent right of self-defence and in accordance with its obligations under international law, Israel took the necessary steps to put an end to the aggression and to these criminal attacks by the Syrian air force and artillery.

"The Israeli air force therefore attacked military and strategic targets in Syria, in particular the headquarters of the air force in Damascus and other purely military targets.

"The Government of Israel categorically denies the groundless accusations of the Syrian authorities."<sup>4</sup>

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

88. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from French*): I take the floor much against my will, and I shall be very brief.

89. The representative of Israel speaks of terror and terrorism while Israel has been and remains the chosen ground of State terrorism. You have all been witnesses here to the acts of terrorism committed by Israel. The condemnations that the Security Council has issued against Israel are numerous. I have yet to see one condemnation against an Arab State.

90. The representative of Israel should have avoided going into the field of terrorism, for Israel prides itself, through its Prime Minister, on what she called "glorious exploits" when innocent victims are assassinated in their homes and on the streets, and this not only in Arab countries but also in foreign countries far removed from the area of conflict, such as the recent assassination of a Moroccan national in Oslo, Norway.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted in French by the speaker.

91. The Israeli leaders prided themselves and still pride themselves on their long reach and on the claim that they can strike and punish anywhere they wish. Boundless arrogance and cynicism. Well, that hand must be and will be cut off. The time has come for Israel to realize that gangrene is not confined to the hand but can spread to the whole body.

92. The representative of Israel speaks of a desire for peace. My only answer is that peace cannot be established unless Israel withdraws from the occupied Arab territories—simply and without going into any other consideration.

*The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.*