

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

1744th MEETING: 9 OCTOBER 1973 AUG 2 7 190)

UN LIBRARY

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1744)	_ 1
Adoption of the agenda	
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-FOURTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 9 October 1973, at 3.30 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/1744)

- 1. Adoption of the agenda.
- 2. The situation in the Middle East:

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

The meeting was called to order at 4 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 a decision taken at our meeting yesterday, 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: I wish to draw attention to a letter dated 9 October 1973, from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council [S/11014], conveying a message received by the Secretary-General from the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Ali Bhutto.
- 3. Mr. MINIĆ (Yugoslavia): We have heard with indignation the news of the heavy bombing of Damascus and

1 Mr. Minić spoke in Serbo-Croatian. The English version of his

other inhabited areas. While the Security Council, the organ of the United Nations entrusted with primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security is again trying to solve this crisis, the Israeli aggressor, violating most brutally all principles of international law, is ruthlessly bombing urban centres, inflicting grave losses on the peaceful civilian populations of Arab countries. This is one more insolent challenge by the Israeli aggressor to the United Nations and world public opinion.

- 4. For more than six years the Arab peoples and States of the Middle East have been subjected to constant aggression and occupation in which the basic principles of international relations have been violated and the fundamental national and human rights enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations have been denied. This situation, as we have repeatedly warned, is fraught with extremely grave dangers for international peace and security. This has been confirmed again, unequivocally, by the latest developments in the Middle East.
- 5. In connexion with these developments, my Government issued, on 7 October, an official communiqué which I wish to quote:

"The newest escalation of military operations in the Middle East, as a consequence of Israel's continuing and deliberate aggression against Arab countries and the Arab people of Palestine, and its protracted occupation of Arab territories and systematic rejection and undermining of all efforts aimed at reaching an acceptable solution, have caused deep concern to the Government and people of Yugoslavia.

"In most emphatically condemning the Israeli aggression, the Yugoslav Government gives resolute and allround support to the just struggle of Arab countries against Israel for the liberation of all occupied territories, in accordance with the decision of the Conference of Heads of States or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Algiers.

- "At the same time, the Yugoslav Government appeals to all peace-loving forces and responsible factors in the world to take effective measures with a view to extending all-round support and assistance to Arab countries, whose legitimate and inalienable right is to fight for the liberation of their territories that Israel has occupied."
- 6. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has always lent its full support to the just struggle of the Arab peoples and has constantly exerted its efforts towards solving the Middle East crisis, convinced that such a solution should be

¹ Mr. Minić spoke in Serbo-Croatian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

sought in the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, which it has not been possible to implement because of Israel's obstruction.

- 7. After his meeting with President Sadat, in January last, President Tito addressed personal messages to President Nixon, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Brezhnev, President Pompidou, President Kaunda, Prime Minister Chou En-lai, Prime Minister Heath, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, and Pope Paul VI, in which he set forth his views on the situation in the Middle East, emphasizing that the eleventh hour had struck for taking immediate action for the solution of the crisis and supporting the initiative taken at the time by President Sadat and the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt for the attainment of a peaceful political solution of the crisis in the Middle East on the basis of the well-known resolutions of the United Nations.
- 8. These views were communicated simultaneously to all other Governments with which we maintain diplomatic relations. The course of events in the Middle East has, unfortunately, demonstrated how much time and how many opportunities have been wasted.
- 9. Now is the time to recall that only three months ago, at the initiative of the Arab Republic of Egypt, the Security Council thoroughly examined the Middle East crisis. Almost all the members of the Security Council warned then that the failure to solve this crisis and to eliminate the causes of constant and increasing tension was bound to lead to ever more serious conflicts. Let us recall that the non-aligned countries members of the Security Council submitted at that time a draft resolution [S/10974] embodying constructive elements for an over-all solution and that 13 members of the Security Council voted in favour of that text; however, that draft resolution was not adopted as it was vetoed by one permanent member of the Security Council [1735th meeting].
- 10. The events with which we are concerned make it incumbent upon us to emphasize again the following.
- 11. The Middle East crisis is a problem of the widest international proportions and constitutes today the most acute and the most dangerous hotbed of war in the world. It is so by reason of the interests that are involved in it, the forces and factors that are engaged in it, and the fundamental principles of international relations and rights of peoples and States that are implicated in it.
- 12. It is obvious that the easing of tensions, regardless of the results gained through it in relations between individual countries and in various geographical regions will rest on very insecure foundations as long as the solution of crises in all parts of the world is not undertaken. It has been confirmed once again that it is not possible to "control" so-called local, regional crises and wars that threaten general peace and security. I wish to stress here again the direct interdependence of peace and stability in the Middle East and the Mediterranean and peace and stability in Europe.

- 13. The so-called state of "no war, no peace" in the Middle East does not actually exist, as a war against the Arab countries and the Arab people of Palestine has been waged all the time. "Cease-fires" which do not rely on a just and over-all solution of the problem amount, in fact, to an attempt at maintaining the status quo in the interests of the conqueror and do not at all provide a basis on which peace can be built. In 1970 the Government of Egypt accepted the proposal on the temporary cessation of hostilities. It made thereby a great concession believing that this would create possibilities for finding a solution to the crisis. The other side not only failed to respond in an adequate manner but posed new conditions blocking every perspective for overcoming the untenable situation.
- 14. The present escalation of military operations, which directly threatens world peace, has underlined once again the grave responsibility of Israel and of those who support it in blocking avenues conducive to a solution of the Middle East crisis in conformity with the principles adopted by the United Nations.
- 15. The military operations at present under way have once again shattered the self-deception of the country of the aggressor that its security can be based on the oppression of other peoples, on the use of force, on massive recourse to State terrorism and on the assumption of one's own unalterable military superiority. Whoever bases his policy on such a premise—as is the case of the Israeli Government—brings into jeopardy not only peace and security in general but the fate of his own people as well.
- 16. The international community has on numerous occasions condemned the Israeli policy of force and aggression in the Middle East in the resolutions of the General Assembly, of the Security Council, and of other international forums. The recent Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-aligned Countries, held in Algiers, which was attended by almost two thirds of the States Members of the United Nations, expressed solidarity and pledged full support to the Arab Countries in their struggle for the liberation of the occupied territories and realization of the national aspirations of the Palestinian people. Notwithstanding all this, Israel has persisted in its policy of challenging the United Nations and flouting its decisions. In the present situation the Arab countries and the Arab people of Palestine are resisting the aggressor on the basis of the legitimate right to self-defence, liberation of their occupied territories, and self-determination-in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations. Resistance to aggression and the defence of the principles of the Charter constitute in themselves a contribution to peace. I should like to state clearly that we should not for a single moment lose sight of the fact that this struggle is being waged on the occupied territories of three sovereign States Members of the United Nations.
- 17. No one has the right to expect and demand of a sovereign country and an oppressed people that it stand idly by and not fight for the liberation of its territories and recognition of its national rights. Who among us here would renounce this right and tolerate the occupation of even the smallest part of his own territory?

- 18. It is high time that the United Nations, and primarily the Security Council, should address themselves to finding an over-all solution of the Middle East problem through the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly. A durable peace and security in the Middle East can be realized only on the basis of the complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories of Egypt, Syria and Jordan and through the realization of the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine. Only in this way is it possible to build a peace based on respect for national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and the right to self-determination of all the States and peoples of this region.
- 19. This time, the United Nations, and above all the Security Council, cannot stop at pronouncements only. Should Israel persist in its aggression, occupation and annexation, it will be necessary to examine the possibility of applying sanctions against it within the meaning of Chapter VII of the Charter, as demanded by the Fourth Conference of Non-Aligned Countries.
- 20. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, before coming to the subject of our debate I should like to congratulate you on your accession to the presidency of this Council. Your personal qualifications and your diplomatic experience are already well known to us and serve as our guarantee that you will guide our deliberations with wisdom. We have already had proof of this while observing the manner in which you have guided the consultations and the first debates in these last few days.
- 21. May I be permitted to pay a tribute, too, at this time to Ambassador Mojsov, the representative of Yugoslavia, who presided over the Council last month with a competence, an authority and a friendliness which I am pleased to recognize, but which I am sure came as no surprise to his many colleagues who hold him in particular esteem and friendship.
- 22. Once again there is war in the Near East. In the Israeli-Egyptian and in the Israeli-Syrian sectors large-scale military operations are taking place and they are the largest since June 1967. Although there are no sufficiently accurate data as to the number of soldiers involved on both sides, government communiqués and the information in the press give us a rather clear idea of the extent of the battles. The news, which has just been conformed, of bombing by Israeli forces of a building housing representatives of the Soviet Union in Damascus, under the ruins of which it is reported that many persons were found, gives, if that were still necessary, a tragic framework for our debate. I wish to express to the Soviet delegation our sad condolence in these painful circumstances.
- 23. Clearly the situation we face may in the days to come undergo unforeseeable developments which could jeopardize in the long run any chance of peace.
- 24. What we must note is that the operations are taking place in the Egyptian and Syrian territories which were occupied by Israel in June 1967. That element seems to me to be essential in so far as it will be decisive in the assessment which our Council must make of the situation.

- 25. Indeed, I do not believe that members of the Council could be satisfied with a hasty decision, knowing in advance that it will not be complied with and that it would merely constitute, in a problem that is already so complex, an additional factor of complication.
- 26. The international community of which our Council is the most legitimate expression will, I hope, assume its responsibilities and define the measures that can bring about an end to the present situation with respect for the legitimate rights of the parties to the dispute.
- 27. Here I shall simply recall that the position of France remains unchanged. France is in favour of a peaceful settlement of the conflict and of a negotiated solution in accord with the various United Nations resolutions and in particular in accord with resolution 242 (1967). My Government has never ceased to reaffirm this on many occasions here, before the General Assembly and elsewhere, whenever there was an opportunity to do so.
- 28. This necessary link to be established between the present events and the situation as a whole should be the main concern of the Council. It would be futile to attempt to impose on the adversaries provisional measures which would settle nothing, just as it would be futile to impose on them commitments which are not coupled with sufficient guarantees.
- 29. Some may object that the Council faces an emergency situation and must, accordingly, adopt emergency measures. But in our opinion that would mean disregarding the essential facts of the problem which we have been facing for a long time.
- 30. In the Near East, for a quarter of a century, countries which because of their proximity are condemned, so to speak, to coexistence do not manage to establish peaceful relations among themselves. A deep distrust, dating very far back, ceaselessly opposes them, whereas everything should on the contrary bring them closer together, as though the difficulties were beyond remedy and, as is shown in many other cases, can therefore not be the subject of a solution that is acceptable to all.
- 31. The latest events in this situation, however spectacular, constitute but a new phase in this confrontation. Has not the time come for us to attack the roots of the ill and in good faith seek the means to overcome this kind of inevitability? But to this end the Council must not confine itself to examining present events. It must, on the contrary, try to promote the quest for a solution that will cover every facet of the problem. This quest for a solution has been spoken of for a very long time and the parties to the dispute have declared themselves to be in favour of it. But, so far, every attempt made to start the quest for a solution has been sealed by failure. There is more or less general agreement on the principles contained in resolution 242 (1967), but there is no agreement on their implementation. The fact of occupation, because it creates relationships of inequality, constitutes the major obstacle.
- 32. In these circumstances is it not the role of the Council above all to promote the rapprochement of the parties in a

common quest for a negotiated settelement to which the international community would provide the indispensable guarantees?

- 33. Our deliberations, I believe, should be directed to that end and the resolution which we might adopt should, it seems to me, take into account all those elements. It goes without saying that my delegation is not opposed to the adoption of a cease fire; but, if we go no further, we will once again have satisfied our consciences at a small cost, without succeeding in bringing about a change in attitudes which alone can progressively lead to peace.
- 34. The time has come for the international community to put an end to this war which, whether open or latent, has not ceased for 25 years. The time has come for the Council really to assume its responsibilities and to attempt a major effort to define the framework for genuine negotiations.
- 35. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): Were it not for the gravity and the seriousness of the present situation, I would have preferred to open my statement with a longer tribute to your predecessor to the chair, Ambassador Mojsov of Yugoslavia, and a more explicit expression at the satisfaction of the Austrian delegation at seeing you, Sir, hold the presidency of the Security Council at such a dramatic moment. May then these short but sincere words of congratulation suffice.
- 36. The Council over the past six years has been confronted with many situations resulting from the absence of peace in the Middle East. Dangerous and abnormal as these situations may have been, none could have been more disastrous for peace and security in the world, of which this Council is the supreme guardian, than the situation the Council faces now: the outbreak of full-scale war.
- 37. Every meeting of the Council, including our most recent examination of the question of the Middle East in June and July of this year, has impressed upon us how urgent and how imperative a rapid solution of the crisis has become. But never has the need for action been more pressing than in the present situation which, more than analysis and argument, requires a quick and decisive response.
- 38. In the present situation my Government is motivated by a single overriding concern which must take precedence, in our view, over all other considerations: the concern for human life. This concern is increased because of the existence of strong and ancient bonds of respect and friendship between our people and all the peoples of the Middle East.
- 39. It was an outflow of this concern that Austria, in the past, has never failed to advocate and support a solution of this conflict by peaceful means. My Government has repeatedly urged renewed efforts for a peaceful solution in a spirit of awareness of the situation which, over the past six years after the last outbreak of hostilities, continued to be fraught with danger, with human suffering and despair, with violence and fear. In the General Assembly and in the Security Council Austria has lent support to all efforts designed to open the way towards the just and lasting peace

in the area which, amongst others, is the object of the unanimous decision of the Council adopted a few months after the end of the armed conflict in June 1967.

- 40. Many authoritative voices have warned of the consequences of failure, and it was none other than the Secretary-General who, in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization for the period 19 June 1966-15 June 1967 said:
 - "I am bound to express my fear that, if again no effort is exerted and no progress is made towards removing the root causes of conflict, within a few years at the most there will be ineluctably a new eruption of war."²
- 41. It is the tragedy of the present situation that all efforts and initiatives taken over past years have now again been defied by war. Once again human lives are lost; once again untold suffering is inflicted.
- 42. In a situation of this kind one objective, in the view of my Government, must take precedence over all others: to put an end to the sacrifice of human life, to stop hostilities without delay. A call for an immediate cease-fire would therefore, in our view, be the primary task of the Security Council.
- 43. The call for peace, the call to save human life should be unequivocal, unanimous and strong. This is the moment not to offer advice, dispense judgement, or attribute blame, but to accomplish this basic humanitarian duty in the face of bloodshed, destruction and suffering. We should do our utmost to enable the Council, in the shortest time possible, to come forward with this appeal. And we feel that such an appeal would have to be the first step towards a new and decisive effort to build a new, a firmer structure of peace on the basis of the decisions and resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly, on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations, and in accordance with the aspirations of the peoples and nations of the Middle East, which I trust are shared by all mankind.
- 44. The PRESIDENT: I call now on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.
- 45. Mr. ISMAIL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): Once again the Middle East is the theatre of armed conflict. Once again my country is the victim of a war of aggression launched by Israel on 6 October of this year. Finally, the explosive situation to which we have constantly drawn the attention of the whole world, and particularly that of the United Nations, has produced its unavoidable fruit, a bitter fruit-war. No one knows how this total war, which Israel has launched against the Arabs for the third time, will end, what its consequences will be, what scope it will assume and what forces and what Powers will be involved in it. All this depends upon the intention of the Israeli aggressor and upon his plans for expansion. However, Israel must not be unaware of the fact that one can always start a war, but one can never guarantee how it will end. We Arabs, the victims of permanent Israeli

² See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 1A, para. 45.

aggression since 1948, know but one thing: our fatherland and our resources are the subject of the covetousness of world-wide zionism and its imperialist satellites and allies. It is our sacred duty to counteract these Zionist and imperialist designs by all the means at our disposal. That world peace would suffer, that consumer societies would be exposed to disturbances, is something about which we have launched cries of alarm much too often in an attempt to warn the whole international community. Regularly every year, from the rostrum of the General Assembly, we have emphasized the explosive nature of the situation in our region. On numerous occasions we have drawn the attention of the Security Council and of the different organs of the United Nations to the expansionist and hegemonic designs of Israel.

- 46. Most recently, in the course of conversations which we had with a number of heads of delegations to the present session of the General Assembly, we emphasized the imminent aggression that Israel was carefully preparing. Everybody seemed to listen to us and to say that we were right, but unfortunately all of this remained without effect, without any concrete results. Why?
- 47. In the present system of the United Nations our Organization is paralysed by the improper use of the right of veto. We find ourselves in a situation where this veto has been utilized against justice and logic and against the will of 13 members of the Security Council. And that means that it has been used against the will of the whole world except Israel. If the veto has been provided as an exclusive privilege to the permanent members of the Security Council by virtue of the special responsibilities which they have for the preservation of world order, one cannot see how that right can be used to block the Security Council's machinery and to prevent it from fulfilling its principal function as defined in the Charter, namely, to safeguard international peace and security.
- 48. Some might argue that the right of veto is a privilege of political discretion whose use is left entirely to the judgement of the beneficiary Powers. That argument is more than fallacious because the very ones who use the veto improperly cannot claim that those who drafted the Charter had the slightest intention to include in it a provision which might be used against justice and logic and even against international peace. If the veto is a political privilege which does not always fit into the rules of law, it is not possible under any circumstances to admit that its use is left entirely to the discretion of the beneficiary States because that would be tantamount to having world peace depend upon the selfish and arbitrary will of a single State. In all cases where the use of the veto does not correspond to a situation of law and of justice it must necessarily and exclusively serve the cause of world peace. That is how we understand this famous right of veto. Unfortunately, the Government of the United States has acted against right, logic, common sense and the interest of world peace-in other words, against the rational and democratic conception of the right of veto.
- 49. Israel, which interprets the American veto as encouragement, increases its attacks against the Arab countries, and I would mention most specially the air attack against

Syria on 13 September last. We state nothing but the truth when we say that the war that Israel launched against Syria and Egypt on 6 October of this year is the direct result of the promise, stated on many occasions, that the United States would never let the Security Council adopt a resolution against the interests of Israel. Moreover this right of veto as it was conceived and included in the Charter almost three decades ago no longer, in our view, corresponds to the realities of international life and it is essential to consider the amendments that must be made in this respect.

- 50. I have asked why all our cries of alarm and warnings remained without any concrete results. I have just given part of the reply to that question—that is the improper recourse to the veto by the United States. Now I should like to provide the rest of the answer.
- 51. The essential idea at the foundation of the United Nations was to construct a system of collective security on a world-wide basis so that it might be possible to protect our universe against such trials as the wars of 1914 and 1939. In other words, the idea was to protect world security from the arbitrariness and selfishness of one State or a small group of States, and more specifically the arbitrariness or selfishness of a leader or group of leaders.
- 52. That being so, anything that strengthens and reinforces the authority of the United Nations is in consonance with the Charter, which constitutes a sort of collective contract unifying all Member States. On the other hand, any action or behaviour or attitude which is harmful to the authority of the United Nations or diminishes its prestige constitutes a violation equivalent to the failure to fulfil a contractual obligation.
- 53. Let us now consider what is happening in the world of facts. Having sabotaged the activity of the Security Council, the Government of Israel, supported by the United States, is conducting a policy of obstruction designed to prevent any collective political action aimed at finding a peaceful and just solution to the Near East problem. Thus, the talks of the four great Powers failed, just as all other attempts timidly made by other groups of States have failed. The mission of Mr. Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, has been similarly sabotaged.
- 54. The lesson that we were supposed to learn from this was that the solution of the problem was to be found in the hands of the United States and its protegé, Israel, and nowhere else. An attempt was made to eclipse the United Nations, the role of world policeman having to be exercised by a single great Power. But it so happens that that same great Power does not manage to keep its promise and honour a pledge given. Subterfuge or surrender to Zionist influence? In any event the famous Rogers Plan is abandoned.
- 55. That is why our cries of alarm have not met with any concrete positive reaction. There is a desire to freeze our collective security machinery and replace it by arbitrariness and the hegemony of a single great Power, which is itself a prisoner of world-wide zionism.

- 56. For well over six years Zionist forces have been occupying part of our territory as a result of a war of aggression which they launched against us on 5 June 1967. It was, as usual, a surprise attack. And it is comforting to mention here that at last the Israeli Generals who took part in that attack have publicly recognized—and the Israeli press has published this—that Israel was the first to open fire and that the existence of Israel was in no way threatened at that time by the Arabs—although that argument was advanced by the Israeli side as a pretext for justifying the war and attracting aid and sympathy from abroad.
- 57. Thus it was admitted by the Israelis themselves that it was a war of aggression, and as such it should have led to a condemnation of Israel, accompanied by an enjoinder on it to withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories.
- 58. The United Nations has done what it could, and since the Palestine drama in 1948 it has adopted numerous resolutions calling for the restoration of the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine and enjoining the aggressor to withdraw its forces from all the occupied Arab territories and to desist from altering the physical character and the demographic structure of those territories. However, Israel has simply become more arrogant and it has continued to practise an openly declared policy of annexation.
- 59. In the Golan region, in Syria, the Israelis have already built 19 Jewish settlements. In the other occupied Arab zones they have built scores of other colonies. In short, the annexationist intentions of Israel are no longer concealed and the Israeli leaders are openly saying that the settlements which Israel has built in the occupied territories give an idea of the segments they intend to annex.
- 60. The following is a statement by General Dayan published by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency on 16 March 1973:

"Dayan came out strongly in favour of large-scale Jewish settlement in the administered territories and indicated that wherever Jews settled would remain part of Israel. 'We have a right to regard Samaria and Judea as part of Eretz Israel', he said. He added, 'I do not think we shall advise Jews who settle in the territories to live under an Arab ruler...'. Dayan said he did not see any prospect for a general peace settlement at this time because the Arabs haven't budged from their insistence on total or almost total Israeli withdrawal from the administered territories. He said a partial settlement might bring a cessation of hostilities but not peace. He said he was opposed to a partial accord because an agreement without diplomatic or political relations is unacceptable. He said he would prefer the existing situation to that."

61. Yesterday in a press conference the following question was addressed to General David Elazar, Chief of Staff of Israel, "Is the Israeli army going to cross the Syrian cease-fire line?" The answer was: "Our troops are advancing from our territory towards the other side." I should like to emphasize the words "our territory", which means that,

- for Elazar, occupied Syrian territory has already become Israeli territory.
- 62. That is why Israel asks to have negotiations with us. It wishes us to sign a document in which we would agree to give up our occupied territories.
- 63. Yesterday and today the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel made a number of statements in which he asked the United Nations to enjoin the belligerents to cease fire and to return to the positions they occupied before 6 October this year. He also says that it was the Arabs who opened fire first. This type of mendacious Israeli allegation is very well known. In 1967 also they claimed that it was the Arabs who had started the war but subsequently, proud of their victories, their generals admitted that it had been the Israelis who had opened fire first.
- 64. As for the request to respect the cease-fire, Israel is the last country in the whole world to give any lessons to anyone on this subject. When the 1967 war broke out, the Security Council adopted resolution 235 (1967) of 19 June 1967 in which the Council took note of the acceptance of a cease-fire by Syria and Israel and confirmed its previous resolutions on an immediate cease-fire and cessation of all military action. But Israel, in spite of its acceptance of that resolution and its official statement, communicated to the Security Council, that it would observe the cease-fire, had on that very day-9 June 1967-ordered its troops to invade Syrian territory. That is confirmed by David Elazar, the present Chief of Staff of Israel, who wrote the following in the Israeli publication, Bediot Ahronout, on 22 February 1972: "On Friday, 9 June, I received from General Dayan himself by telephone the order to begin the attack on the northern front in Syria." General Elazar at that time was Commander-in-Chief of the Israeli forces attacking Syria.
- 65. The Israeli offensive against Syria stopped only on 12 June, when the Israelis had completed their occupation of the Golan, which they are still occupying at present. On 11 June the Security Council again adopted a resolution, resolution 236 (1967), condemning the violation of the cease-fire and calling for an immediate return to the positions occupied by the belligerents at 1630 hours GMT on 10 June 1967. The Israelis did not comply with that new resolution either and continued their march until 12 June, refusing to return to their positions of 10 June as stipulated in resolution 236 (1967).
- 66. Had Israel accepted the cease-fire order, which it had officially stated it had accepted on 9 June, no portion of Syrian territory would be occupied today. That is why Israel is not entitled to call for respect of the cease-fire from anyone else.
- 67. But there is more. Since 1967 Israel has on numerous occasions violated the cease-fire with impunity—I emphasize "with impunity". It has adopted and practised State terrorism; it has raised Mafia techniques to the rank of official policy practised by a State Member of the United Nations. The list of operations which Israel has fallaciously and cynically called "preventive" is very long. All these operations constitute grave and flagrant violations of the cease-fire.

³Quoted in English by the speaker.

- 68. In order not to take up the time of the Council I shall refrain from giving a list of these violations and shall limit myself to recalling the cowardly and unprovoked attack launched by the Israeli air force on 8 January 1973 against economic targets and urban centres in the north and south of Syria. This attack resulted in hundreds of dead among the civilian population and caused enormous damage. I shall also mention the air attack against Syria on 13 September last, which was also a surprise attack and without provocation.
- 69. It is surprising to hear Israel qualify the incursion of its military aircraft into Syrian air space as a routine patrol—in other words, something that should not provoke any reaction on our part. In fact, Israel's arrogance, which knows no limits, is beginning to be awkward for its protectors as well. We are certain that this arrogance, which is unparalleled in modern history and which is expressed in constant encroachments upon the sovereignty of certain independent States, will ultimately awaken the sentiments of justice among the responsible persons in those States and will lead them to act in such a way as to put an end to it. That, again, is why Israel has no valid right to draw attention to the alleged failure to comply with the cease-fire.
- 70. The Foreign Minister of Israel also calls for a return to the positions held before 6 October. After that, he says, he will be ready to negotiate to come to agreement on secure frontiers. How can a country agree to negotiate while its territory is occupied by a foreign Power? How can it agree to negotiate when the occupier declares that he will never agree to withdraw from the major part of the territory he occupies? For Israel, Jerusalem is not negotiable. The sector of Gaza, the Golan and Sharm-el-Sheikh can, under no circumstances, be returned. The West Bank of Jordan, according to the Davan plan or the Allon plan, is to be the area where these plans are going to be put into effect, both plans giving that Arab region a hybrid status, reconciling by some means military Israeli presence with Jordanian sovereignty. The policy of annexation and fait accompli of General Dayan is at present adopted by the party in power and constitutes its primary feature in the electoral campaign now in progress in Israel.
- 71. These are the circumstances in which Israel is inviting the Arabs to enter into negotiations without prior conditions—and I emphasize this: without prior conditions. Recent European history shows that any negotiations under conditions of foreign occupation can only lead to surrender, and any agreement which confirms the surrender is bound to yield to the thrust of nationalist forces that emerge, and ultimately will be swept away.
- 72. As for the Israeli thesis of secure frontiers, it is but a fallacious and rather flimsy argument. Nowadays the whole world is aware that there is no geographic obstacle that could have any valid effect against modern weapons. In fact, Israel, which has enormous quantities of the most highly perfected types of weapons, is advancing this fallacious argument in order to justify its policy of annexation. The front line in Syria, established after the 1967 war, is on a plain and Syrian guns can easily reach the settlements built in the Golan. According to the Israeli

- thesis, it would be legitimate for Israel to require that its final borders should be placed some score kilometres deeper into Syrian territory.
- 73. The Israeli Foreign Minister has called for a return to the positions held before 6 October. We have refused to concede his country's right to call upon others to observe and comply with the cease-fire, Israel having occupied the whole of the Golan, having taken advantage of the non-compliance with the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council in its resolution 235 (1967), and also having taken advantage of the violation of resolution 236 (1967). Israel cannot call for the return to positions occupied before 6 October because such positions happen to be in our national territory. And the fight we are waging now, and which was provoked by the Israeli attack, cannot be qualified as anything other than a national liberation fight, which is in conformity with the principles of the United Nations and in accordance with the norms of international law.
- 74. We are not seeking in any way to cause loss of human life and the destruction of property when this potential is not mobilized against our security and when it is not necessary to liberate our occupied territory. We are not threatening the survival of anyone. Our goal can be none other than to recover usurped Arab territory. Is it too much to ask for support in our liberation struggle from all peace-loving and justice-loving countries? Is it too much to ask of the United Nations to give us support in an action that is in accordance with resolutions that are being trampled underfoot by Israeli militarism?
- 75. The Foreign Minister of Israel has attempted to exploit the religious and humanitarian sentiments of his audience by stressing that the alleged Arab attack was launched when the people of Israel were celebrating an annual holy day. I should like to recall that it is a peculiar feature of the Israelis to strike when the moment appears to be least likely for beginning an attack. We have endured that experience on several occasions and we have suffered much from it. I shall add that the Islamic world as a whole has been engaged since 27 September in the sacred Ramadan fast, which is a month of prayer and charity. In the mind of Israel, an attack during the month of Ramadan resulting in a new Israeli victory brings the maximum of humiliation to the Arabs and obliges them to capitulate.
- 76. The representative of the United States yesterday made a statement [1743rd meeting] in which he set forth the position of his Government. That statement calls for several comments, which I shall attempt to make very briefly.
- 77. First, the report of the United Nations observers cannot always and in all cases be considered, alone, as evidence of the whole truth. In the majority of cases, Israeli military aircraft have avoided the front-lines, where the United Nations observers are posted in Syria, and have penetrated Syrian air space in the northern part of the country, coming from the west, after having covered a distance of over 300 kilometres in Mediterranean skies. The United Nations observers naturally cannot, in such circumstances, report violations of the cease-fire by Israel.

- 78. Second, it is difficult to understand what the representative of the United States was attempting to say when he called on the Security Council to perform its historic role. Does he mean that the United States is then to abandon the improper use of the right of veto?
- 79. Third, it is impossible for us to understand on what legal or moral basis the United States wishes to see a return to the positions occupied before 6 October. The cease-fire cannot be considered as a permanent régime, as this would in fact simply transform the cease-fire line into a definitive border between the belligerents. Right and morality shun this state of affairs and require that territory acquired by force be returned.
- 80. For six years and four months the United Nations had been rendered incapable of finding and applying a solution that would guarantee a just and lasting peace, and everything indicated that the situation was to crystallize for the benefit of the connivance of certain Powers with Israel and the dangerous tendency shown by certain other Powers to coexist with Israeli aggression and expansionism.
- 81. Now that Israel, through its new aggression against the victims of the aggression of 1967, is providing an opportunity for implementation of the numerous resolutions of the United Nations calling for the withdrawal by Israel from all the occupied Arab territories, it would be absurd and contrary to the spirit of all of those resolutions to go back to the line held before 6 October, which, by definition, was a provisional line, but which in practice turned out to be permanent and a constant defiance of United Nations authority, of the feelings of national dignity of all our peoples and the feelings of justice of all peace-and freedom-loving peoples.
- 82. I wish to affirm that we are unshakably attached to the principles of freedom and peace based on justice. We are at present fighting to repel the aggressor, we are exercising our right of self-defence. We do not wish to bring death to anyone. We are seeking to prevent the aggressor from sowing death and destruction in our land. We are staunchly loyal to the principles of the Charter, and as a small country we are in favour of strengthening the authority of the United Nations and enhancing its prestige. We abhor the necessity of devoting the greater part of our national income to the requirements of defence; we would prefer to be able to use all of our resources for the furthering of our well-being and the progress of our people.
- 83. We have nothing whatsoever against the Jews as Jews. What we are fighting against is solely and exclusively colonialism and Zionist expansionism, which seek to assert themselves in our region at the expense of our people.
- 84. This morning I received information from Damascus concerning the bombing by Israeli Phantoms of civilian targets in the capital of my country. On the instructions of my Government, I communicated that information this morning to all delegations from the rostrum of the General Assembly. 4 We have learned with great sadness and

indignation of the death of a certain number of United Nations personnel, together with members of their families; that the wife of the Ambassador of India in Damascus has been seriously wounded; and that five other officials of the United Nations in Damascus have also been wounded. Those officials were British, French, Italian and Jordanian nationals.

85. I should now like to read to you the same information as reported by Agence France Presse in a telegram from Damascus. I shall read directly from the printed sheets of the AFP teletype:

"For the first time since the unleashing of the fourth war in the Middle East, Israeli aircraft, beginning at noon on Tuesday, struck the Syrian capital, causing casualties among the civilian population, in particular among the diplomatic colony of Damascus. The wife of a United Nations expert, Mrs. Bhattacharya, was killed, and the wives of the Ambassadors of Pakistan and India, together with their children, were wounded.

"This raid was aimed particularly at the residential quarter, where the Soviet Cultural Centre and the Orient Hospital"-I should like to emphasize that, "the Soviet Cultural Centre and the Orient Hospital"-"are located. Shortly before noon, the first group of three Phantoms flew over Damascus at low altitude before dropping a series of bombs over the residential quarter, where the residences of several diplomats accredited to the Syrian Government are located. A few seconds after the flight of those aircraft, thick black and white smoke rose into the blue sky, which is particularly clear over the Syrian capital. A few seconds later, a Phantom again flew towards the same target, followed by the white smoke from the anti-aircraft missile. That same aircraft strafed with the machine-gun it carried"-I emphasize that, "strafed with the machine-gun it carried"-"groups of people that had formed in the streets of the quarter immediately after the bombing.

"It was during this attack that it seems that members of the families of the Indian and Pakistani diplomats were struck. In the same quarter, but at some distance, Madame Petié, the wife of the First Secretary of the French Embassy, was with a group which was likewise strafed"—and I emphasize "a group which was likewise strafed"—"The wife of the French diplomat was not wounded, but she had to take cover under an automobile in order to avoid the fire. Madame Petié, a few instants later, found in the garden of her villa a fragment of a bomb. Two minutes later, three other aircraft flew over Damascus at high altitude and their passage was followed by three series of explosions coming apparently from the same residential quarter and from sectors located to the south of the capital."

86. This information quite frankly calls for no comment. Other information has indicated that the residence of the Soviet Embassy staff has been bombed and that 30 members of the Embassy have been killed. This information fills our hearts with great sorrow. We express our feelings of sympathy and solidarity to the families of the victims. These barbarous Israeli acts show that Israel does not stop

⁴ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 2145th meeting.

short of any act of barbarity and atrocity. They show Israel's contempt for all human values and all international conventions relating to the protection of civilians in time of war.

87. I have also received, scarcely an hour ago, a telegram of condolence addressed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Secretary-General. May I be permitted to read this text:

"With a heart filled with sorrow and affliction we have learned of the deaths of a number of military observers, members of a United Nations unit, as well as of a number of United Nations experts who were among the victims of the barbarous Israeli bombing of civilian targets in Damascus. The death of Captain Tjorswaag with his wife and son, as well as the death of the wife of an FAO expert, Mrs. Bhattacharya, constitute an irrefutable condemnation of Israel and show its truly inhuman nature, which runs counter to humanity and peace. On behalf of the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic I would request you, Mr. Secretary-General, to accept my profound condolences and to be good enough to transmit to the families of the victims my most sincere feelings of solidarity and to communicate to them that I share their sorrow and bereavement. (Signed): Abdul Halim Khaddam, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic."

- 88. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Secretary-General.
- 89. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: As Secretary-General of the United Nations I have a special responsibility for the courageous officers from many countries who serve as United Nations Observers in the Middle East as well as for all United Nations personnel in the area, and I wish to thank the Foreign Minister of Syria for his expression of condolences at the death of a United Nations Military Observer, Captain Tjorswaag of Norway, and his wife and daughter in Damascus on 9 October.
- 90. I wish to inform the Security Council that on hearing this tragic news I immediately dispatched the following message to the Foreign Minister of Norway:
 - "I wish to express to you and through you to your Government my profound sorrow at the tragic death of Captain D. Tjorswaag and his wife and daughter in Damascus. Captain Tjorswaag and all the other United Nations Military Observers in the Middle East have carried out their difficult and exacting role with exemplary courage and dedication. The United Nations is greatly in their debt.
 - "I would ask you to convey my sympathy and condolences to the surviving family of Captain Tjorswaag in their terrible loss."
- 91. I am also deeply concerned at the report of the death of Mrs. Bhattacharya, the wife of an expert of the Food and Agriculture Organization and at reports of injuries to other United Nations personnel.

- 92. I also wish to express my deep sympathy to those Governments whose diplomats have been killed or wounded in Damascus.
- 93. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I had intended to ask for the floor a little earlier in order to make a special statement, but my distinguished friend the representative of France, Ambassador de Guiringaud, has somewhat anticipated me and has already mentioned in his statement the tragic news we have only just received, in reports from foreign agencies, concerning the barbaric, bestial and gangster-like bombing of the Soviet cultural centre in the capital of the Syrian Arab Republic, Damascus, by Israeli aircraft, and the death of six Soviet citizens. This has been confirmed by a large number of facts. There is also a report that in the area of Damascus where foreign embassies, including the building of the Soviet Embassy, are located, the buildings of no less than 10 foreign embassies have been destroyed and 30 staff members of the Soviet Embassy have been killed. This information has not yet been confirmed, but both Agence France Presse and UPI have reported it.
- 94. This is yet another bloody and villainous act of the Israeli aggressors. I cannot find words to express my indignation, anger and strongest possible protest against this act of the high-handed Israeli aggressors, the more so since it was perfectly clear that this embassy quarter, if I may call it that, contained no military targets. Embittered by the fact that they are encountering setbacks at the front, the Israeli aggressors decided, as high-handed aggressors usually do in such cases, to avenge themselves by bombing peaceful quarters of towns.
- 95. These bloody crimes are the equal of Hitler's actions as a result of which whole towns and populations centres were removed from the face of the earth. We cannot fail to react to such acts by the Israeli aggressors.
- 96. We have already stated our view, in yesterday's statement by the delegation of the USSR in the Security Council [1743rd meeting], that the cause of today's events in the Middle East is the aggressive, expansionist policy of Israel and those imperialist circles which support it. In the last few days Israel has concentrated considerable armed forces on the cease-fire lines with Syria and Egypt, mobilized reservists and, after thus heating the situation to the limit, unleashed military action.
- 97. Israel pursues a policy of blatantly ignoring the Charter, United Nations resolutions and the voice of world public opinion. Peace-loving forces throughout the world condemn Israel's policy of aggression, territorial expansion and international banditry. As has already been pointed out, this view has also been reflected in decisions of the recent Conference of non-aligned States and in resolutions of the Organization of African Unity.
- 98. In the opinion of the Soviet Government, it has become essential for all countries and peoples concerned with sparing mankind the dangers and disasters which accompany Israel's continued aggression in the Middle East to unite their efforts in the interests of the earliest possible settlement of the situation in that area on a just and firm basis, and of curbing the Israeli aggressor.

- 99. We consider that solidarity and unity of action in engaging the Israeli aggressors are now more important than ever to the peoples of the Arab and all other countries. The Soviet Union's position is that the struggle of the Arab States to liberate the territories occupied by the foreign invaders is their just and sacred right.
- 100. As the Soviet delegation has said before, it will be recalled that the Soviet Union consistently supported and continues to support peoples fighting for their freedom and independence. At the present critical juncture it will again give its support to the Arab peoples fighting in a just cause against Israeli aggression.
- 101. The Israeli aggression causes suffering not only to those who are directly situated in the region of the Israeli invaders' direct aggression. Israel's policy of aggression also causes suffering to the people of many, many countries. An important consequence of the continued occupation of Arab land by Israel and of Israel's unceasing aggression against the Arab States is that they damage not only the Arab countries and peoples, but also many other countries, indeed the whole world, but particularly the countries of Western Europe, not to mention the fact that in circumstances of international détente the Middle East is the most dangerous point of tension in the world. Israel's aggression and occupation of Arab territories have meant that for more than six years the Suez Canal, that vitally important international artery for the peoples of Western Europe and the countries of the Pacific and Indian Ocean region, has not been functioning. The damage to the Western European countries alone is calculated at thousands of millions of dollars. And Israel and its Government are guilty of and bear the direct responsibility for all this, which has caused incalculable damage to the peoples of Western Europe and of the Pacific and Indian Ocean region.
- 102. Just as in their age savage barbarian tribes, in their mad urge for destruction, disrupted, demolished, wiped from the face of the earth towns and the most precious monuments of human culture, so in our civilized age the Zionist barbarians have disrupted and paralysed the Suez Canal, that work of genius produced by human reason and the science and technology of the last century.
- 103. Economists in Western Europe and the United States seek the causes of present-day world inflation and the rise in prices in the countries of the capitalist world. Apparently, however, none of them has to date studied Israel's guilt and responsibility for the rising cost of living, for the general rise in prices throughout the world and for high costs as a result of the fact that the Israeli aggressors have paralysed a vitally important waterway between Europe, Asia and the Far East. Is this silence on the part of scholars a consequence of pressure applied to them by international zionism seeking to cover up and muffle comments on Israel's crimes and its responsibility before mankind, seeking to conceal the damage Israel has caused by its aggression not only to the Arabs, but to the whole world? Naturally, the responsibility for these barbaric actions and this damage rests fully and entirely on Israel, and Israel's rulers must answer seriously for these crimes to the international community, to mankind.

- 104. While expressing a strong protest on behalf of the Soviet Government, the Soviet delegation declares that responsibility for the new international crimes, for these bloody and villainous acts, for the death of Soviet citizens and for the destruction of the cultural centre and the Embassy building in Damascus rests fully and entirely on the Government of Israel, and personally on Prime Minister Golda Meir and General Dayan, those international criminals who have sullied themselves and stained their hands with bloody and villainous acts, in the murder of many foreign citizens.
- 105. I thank those representatives who have expressed, both in their statements here in the Security Council and personally and directly to the Soviet delegation, their condolences with respect to the tragedy which has befallen these Soviet citizens in Damascus.
- 106. I consider that it would be appropriate for the President of the Security Council, on behalf of the Council members, to address an urgent appeal to the Government of Israel to cease bombing peaceful towns in the Arab countries, to cease murdering both the Arab population and foreigners living in these towns. This would be the most reasonable and speedy action and reaction of the Council to this new bloody and villainous act by the Israeli aggressors.
- 107. The PRESIDENT: In view of the circumstances that have arisen, and with the consent of the representative of Indonesia, I have agreed to waive rule 27 of the provisional rules of procedure to enable members who have asked to do so to speak in terms of condolence in respect of the tragic news that has reached us this afternoon. I hope that members and representatives on whom I may call will confine their remarks to the immediate subject on which account I have waived rule 27, and will be as brief as the circumstances allow them to be.
- 108. I call on the representative of Israel.
- 109. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): It was not my intention to speak today. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel informed the Council yesterday that he would make a policy statement at a future meeting. However, the mendacity and hypocrisy which permeated the speech by Syria's Deputy Foreign Minister, and the regrettable exploitation by the representative of the USSR of the grave news of the death of innocent persons for his usual unbridled abuse of Israel, compel me to comment immediately on this point.
- 110. War is always a tragedy. Loss of life, whether civilian or military, must be profoundly regretted. To the aggrieved families, especially of foreign nationals killed in the hostilities, to their Governments and, in particular, to the Government of the USSR and the Government of Norway and to the United Nations we express our grief and condolences. My delegation will join in the expression of sympathy by members of the Security Council for all the victims of the renewed warfare, men, women and children, whether they be Egyptian, Syrian, Israeli, or citizens of other States. However, the responsibility for these losses must be placed squarely where it belongs—
- 111. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

- 112. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): The Soviet delegation does not wish to hear excuses and condolences from a representative of murderers and international gangsters.
- 113. The PRESIDENT: I must insist that visitors in the public gallery and representatives seated at the side of the chamber refrain from making demonstrations of approval or disapproval of what is said in this Council. The traditions of this Council demand that its work should proceed in an atmosphere of dignity and order, free from manifestations of this kind. I ask all visitors to refrain from any further manifestations.
- 114. The representative of Israel may proceed.
- 115. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I am not at all surprised that the representative of the Soviet Union found it necessary to leave this room the moment I was about to touch on responsibility for the aggression to which Israel has been subjected by its Arab neighbours for the last 25 years. A great share of that responsibility rests with the Soviet Union, which has in recent years identified itself with the fanatical, barbaric hatred and belligerency toward Israel of the Arab Governments, supplying them with unlimited quantities of arms, strengthening their hostility, encouraging them to pursue their criminal course. If not for the policies and actions of the Soviet Union, the Middle East might today have already been in a state of peace and not in a situation of renewed suffering and bloodshed.
- 116. I was about to say that the responsibility for these losses must, however, be placed squarely where it belongs, with those who have initiated the present fighting and those who have waged brutal aggression against Israel for 25 years. It is Egypt and Syria that on 6 October chose war instead of peace. They are the ones. They have decided not to talk with Israel but to shoot, not to build understanding and agreement, but to devastate, to burn, and to ruin. Since 6 October Syria has unleashed—
- 117. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Sudan,
- 118. Mr. KHALID (Sudan): Mr. President, I understood you to say you would call on members to express their condolences. If that understanding is correct, I feel that the present speaker is going beyond such expression.
- 119. The PRESIDENT: I would remind the representative of Israel that the purpose for which I interrupted the main course of the debate was to allow certain representatives who wished to do so to express condolences for those victims of the grievous developments that have been reported to us in the course of the afternoon. I have heard the representative of Israel express what it seemed to me were very sincere condolences. And I believe that, having done so, he might respect the President's request that we may be enabled as soon as possible to proceed with the main course of our discussion. I hope that that will be the case. He may now proceed.
- 120. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): My entire purpose is to restate our grief at the tragedy that is taking place today in our

- region. The representative who preceded me was permitted to make lengthy attacks on my country. I do hope that in the few remaining sentences of my statement I shall be able to express my respect for your desire, Mr. President, that the Council should be able to proceed with the course of the meeting.
- 121. I was about to say that since 6 October Syria and Egypt have unleashed massive premeditated aggression against Israel. Since 6 October Syrian long-range ground-to-ground missiles of Soviet manufacture—
- 122. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Sudan.
- 123. Mr. KHALID (Sudan): All I am asking is that the ruling of the President be respected.
- 124. The PRESIDENT: I hope that the representative of Israel has finished his message of condolences. Shall I allow him two more sentences?
- 125. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Mr. President, I am about to finish my message. The question is much too serious to be treated jocularly. I have come here to express the views of my Government, and I shall insist that the representatives of my Government be given precisely the same right as anyone else to express their views at this table without interruptions by such defenders of human rights and freedoms as the representative of the Sudan and others. I have already been interrupted three times, and I beg your indulgence, Sir, to be allowed to conclude my brief statement in a few more sentences.
- 126. Since 6 October Syrian long-range ground-to-ground missiles—
- 127. Mr. KHALID (Sudan): Mr. President.
- 128. The PRESIDENT: I should like to say to the Foreign Minister of the Sudan that I have appealed, as he has heard me appeal, to the representative of Israel to terminate his remarks as soon as possible. I think I should say in extenuation of the representative of Israel, in connexion with what he wishes to say to us, that it would have been equally the right of any other member of the Council to raise a point of order, shall I say, against the previous speaker. If I may appeal to all our colleagues, I think that perhaps that should be borne in mind. I hope that the representative of Israel may be allowed to finish his brief statement. I would appeal to him again to do so as soon as possible.
- 129. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Thank you, Mr. President.
- 130. Mr. KHALID (Sudan): I do not want to make your job difficult, Mr. President. All I want is for the rules of procedure to be respected. If the representative of Israel wishes to exercise a right of reply, he will have the time to say whatever he wants to say after the other representatives whose names are on the list have made their statements.
- 131. The PRESIDENT: I think I should allow the representative of Israel very briefly to terminate his statement.

In my own judgement he is departing very much from the terms in which I said I would waive rule 27, and I suggest to him that if he has statements that seem to be moving in the direction of those we have just heard, he ask to speak at the end of the meeting, when other representatives who are waiting to make their statements in the course of the general debate have completed these statements. I would appeal to him to reserve his further remarks, which sound to me as though they are embarking upon matters outside the range of condolences, until the end of the meeting, when I shall be happy to call on him.

132. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Thank you, Mr. President. I can fully understand your impressions. However, had I been allowed to proceed for another two or three minutes you would have realized that I was referring to the innocent civilian victims of the war renewed by Egypt and Syria—but to the Jewish victims, to the innocent civilian Jewish men and women who have lost their lives because of the aggression by our two neighbouring States, may I be allowed to refer to them as well?

133. The PRESIDENT: Please proceed. I hope that the Foreign Minister of the Sudan will bear with me and with the representative of Israel for a few minutes longer.

134. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): For the last three days Syrian long-range ground-to-ground missiles with warheads of 500 kilos each have rained fire and death on Israeli towns and villages. Damage and civilian casualties have been inflicted in the areas of Migdal Haemek, Gevat, Kfar Baruch, and Nahalal and in the villages of the Hula valley. Yet Syria has the audacity to suggest that in the face of its aggression, which makes no distinction between military and civilian, Israel should not defend itself even by air strikes directed against military targets such as the General Army Headquarters, the Headquarters of the Syrian Air Force, and command posts located in Damascus. Responsibility for the regrettable civilian losses-for which we express our sympathy-in the direct proximity to such military targets is borne by those Governments which have brought about this war. That applies also to the Israeli air actions against military targets in Egypt and the civilian losses that might have resulted from them.

135. Even now Egypt and Syria could stop this bloodshed and destruction by agreeing to the only constructive proposal made since the outbreak of the hostilities: cease-fire and restore the cease-fire lines. However, if they continue the course of war, they can hardly complain here of the consequences of their own criminal actions. There is no doubt that for their Day-of-Atonement aggression Egypt and Syria will atone for the treachery on Yom Kippur, the Day of Judgement. They will not escape judgement by Israel, by the enlightened world or by history.

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

137. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): My Government has just informed me that an air raid on Cairo has taken place. As a result of this air raid and our defence we have now four Israeli pilots in our hands—those who were attacking the women, the children and the men in the streets of Cairo.

138. My Government, while offering its condolences to the Secretary-General and, through him, to the Governments whose citizens have fallen victim to Israeli air aggression, has this very short announcement to make. If these air raids on civilian targets in our countries continue, the Government of Egypt will do its best and make every effort to dissuade the military leaders of Israel from continuing these raids.

139. Mr. SCALI (United States of America): I offer profound condolences to the Secretary-General and to all those of my colleagues whose fellow-countrymen, according to news reports we have received, have become innocent victims of the tragic conflict now raging around them. Such painful news must produce not only grief but also a stronger determination in the heart of each of us at this table to strive even more urgently to discover the path to peace. To all those who are still face to face with the horror of war we can and must offer hope.

140. Sir Donald MAITLAND (United Kingdom): The deplorable and tragic news from Damascus has dismayed my delegation and I should like to offer my sympathy to those whose compatriots have been killed or injured. According to one report, of which I do not yet have confirmation, the casualties included one of my own fellow countrymen.

141. Mr. SEN (India): This moment is doubly distasteful. First, so many people have been killed and injured in Damascus in most regrettable incidents and my delegation would like to extend its condolences and sympathy to all those who are bereaved and to wish all those who are injured a speedy recovery.

142. Mr. President, we had hoped that advantage would be taken of the ruling you gave to pay condolences not to get into the reasons behind all those incidents. I should also like to point out that your ruling was made after the Soviet Ambassador had spoken. However, I should like to state quite categorically that these incidents which have taken place in Damascus and elsewhere are the direct result of the hostilities in the Middle East and we must protest that civilian lives of other nationals are being sacrificed in the process. I would support the Soviet proposal that a message of condolence from the President should go to all the bereaved families, and particularly to the Secretary-General who also has lost some of his devoted servants.

143. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): When I spoke earlier in the Council I was unaware of the tragic news which has just reached the Council chamber. When I expressed earlier our profound and grave concern on the loss of life and human suffering, I was not yet aware of the full measure of the tragedy unfolding before us. May I therefore, with your permission Mr. President, express the shock and grief of my delegation at the tragic loss of innocent civilian lives in Damascus and all other theatres of the cruel war which was reported to us today, and I wish to offer, through you, the sincere condolences of my Government to the Secretary. General of the United Nations, to the Ambassador of the Soviet Union and to the representatives of all countries whose nationals have suffered.

- 144. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya): My delegation has learned with shock and deep sorrow of the death of innocent civilians in Damascus. We fail to understand why civilian areas should form targets of bombing in a military conflict of this kind. We deplore all loss of life, and our heartfelt condolences go to the Secretary-General and to the Governments and the families of those innocent civilians who lost their lives while going about their daily innocent activities. In this respect we offer our most sincere condolences to the Government of the USSR, which has lost so many devoted and able diplomats in Damascus. We also extend our sympathy and condolences to the Governments of other States whose citizens have been injured or killed in this conflict. We deplore these losses of life and we maintain that those who provoked the situation that has led to these tragedies will surely pay the price for what they are doing to human life.
- 145. Mr. MINIĆ (Yugoslavia)⁵: It is with deep feelings of sorrow that the delegation of my country learned of the latest information concerning the bombing in Damascus and the victims of that bombing, particularly in the diplomatic quarter of Damascus.
- 146. We wish to express, on behalf of our Government and of my delegation, our most sincere condolences to the Ambassador, the Government and the delegation of the Soviet Union for the very serious losses suffered by the diplomatic mission of the Soviet Union in Damascus. I also wish to express our most sincere condolences to the Secretary-General on the tragic death of an officer of the United Nations and his family. They fell in the service of world peace and in the struggle against aggression.
- 147. I also wish to express our sympathy to the Governments of India and Pakistan and to other Governments on the destruction of their diplomatic missions and the losses they have suffered among their embassy staffs.
- 148. These latest crimes of the Israeli aggressor call for the most severe condemnation by this supreme organ of the United Nations. The Security Council should accept the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union that it address itself to the Government of Israel with a categorical demand to put an end at once to the bombing of inhabited areas and to the killing of civilian populations.
- 149. I reject with indignation the hypocrisy of the representative of Israel in going beyond all measure in his statement regarding the bombing of Damascus.
- 150. Mr. BOYD (Panama) [interpretation from Spanish]: Having received confirmation today that United Nations personnel and personnel of the Soviet Embassy and other diplomatic missions have suffered loss of life when Damascus, the capital of Syria, was bombed, the delegation of Panama wishes to express its grief and condolences to the bereaved.
- 151. Mrs. Jeanne Martin CISSÉ (Guinea) (interpretation from French): It is with deep emotion that my delegation

- has learned of the tragedy that has struck the city of Damascus, a tragedy provoked by the bombing of the city that destroyed innocent civilian lives. I should like, on behalf of my Government, to address my sincere and heartfelt condolences to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to the Soviet Embassy, and to all Governments whose citizens have been killed in this tragic moment which the Syrian and Egyptian peoples are living through.
- 152. Mr. PEREZ de CUELLAR (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation has listened with deep sorrow to the news of the loss of civilian lives as a result of the new war which has been unleashed in the Near East. I wish to associate my delegation, with the deepest feeling, with the expressions of condolence already addressed here to the friendly delegations of the Soviet Union and the Syrian Arab Republic, to the Secretary-General, and to the Governments of all the countries which have suffered the loss of innocent lives.
- 153. The PRESIDENT: It is clear that all members of the Security Council share a feeling of shock over the grave news that has been received of the deaths of United Nations personnel, diplomatic colleagues and other innocent victims as a result of the continuing warfare in the Middle East.
- 154. In relation to the United Nations we have heard the Secretary-General read to us the telegram of condolence that he has already sent to the Government of Norway for the tragic loss of the United Nations observer, Captain Tjorswaag, and his family, and his telegrams to other victims.
- 155. As President of the Security Council, and speaking as the representative of AUSTRALIA, I wish to place on record the shock and the grief that we all feel over the tragic loss of innocent human life that has occurred. I shall respect the wishes of the Council and shall send a message of condolence to the Governments and the peoples concerned.
- 156. I call now on the Secretary-General.
- 157. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I deeply appreciate the expressions of condolence which have been voiced around this Council table over the deaths of United Nations personnel in Damascus. I shall certainly not fail to communicate these expressions of condolence to the Governments concerned and to the bereaved families.
- 158. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude to all my distinguished colleagues in the Security Council and all other representatives who have expressed condolences with respect to the tragic death of Soviet diplomats and other Soviet citizens in the capital of the Syrian Arab Republic, Damascus, at the hands of the Israeli international murderers. Of course, I exclude the representative of Israel from this.
- 159. On behalf of the delegation of the USSR I should like to express our sincere condolences to the representatives of those countries whose citizens tragically perished as a result of this monstrous international act of villiany by the Israeli murderers.

⁵ Mr. Minić spoke in Serbo-Croatian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

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

161. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I should like to say only one sentence. I should like to believe that although members of the Security Council have found it appropriate only today, in the light of reports from Damascus, to express sympathy with the innocent victims of war, these expressions, especially those of representatives of enlightened Governments—and I exclude the representative of the Soviet Union from that category—apply to all casualties irrespective of nationality, including Israeli citizens.

162. The PRESIDENT: I should like to think that we could now proceed with our debate.

163. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): Mr. President, allow me to begin by expressing my delegation's sincere condolences and deep sympathy to the families of the United Nations personnel who have lost their lives and to the Soviet Union, Norway, India, Pakistan and the countries whose diplomatic representatives and other nationals have been killed or wounded during the Israeli air attack on Damascus.

164. This meeting of the Security Council has been convened to discuss the very serious development in the Middle East situation. It is with a feeling of deep satisfaction that my delegation welcomes the assumption of the presidency of the Council by you, Sir, an experienced and wise diplomat, a representative of a neighbouring country with which Indonesia maintains the closest ties of friendship and co-operation, and whom I have had the privilege to know and appreciate as a colleague and friend during the last 15 years or so. I should like to assure you, Mr. President, of my delegation's co-operation in the execution of your important and difficult duties as President of the Council for the month of October.

165. It is an equally great satisfaction for my delegation and myself to express our appreciation to the outgoing President, my friend and colleague, Ambassador Mojsov of Yugoslavia, for the competent and efficient manner in which he presided over the Council's work during the month of September.

166. My delegation has tried to follow with close attention what is happening in the Middle East since the outbreak of renewed hostilities on 6 October last. We have listened most attentively to the statements made by the delegations directly concerned in the war activities and by members of this Council. It is not easy to find our way around the facts which have been presented to us. Indonesia's position, however, is clear, and has been clear since the very beginning of the Middle East conflict. We have said on many occasions that we support the efforts of the Arab countries to regain their territories occupied by Israel since the war of June 1967. We have always maintained that peace can only return to the Middle East if those territories are returned to their lawful owners, and if the rights of the Palestinians who have been chased away from their homeland are respected. We have also contended that it cannot be expected that the Arab countries will acquiesce in the continued occupation of their territories by Israel. We have urged the Council, especially its permanent members, to take effective steps to eliminate the root causes of the conflict.

167. Views have been expressed that the Council should appeal to the warring parties to end hostilities and withdraw to their original positions. My delegation agrees with the view that the Council should act speedily in order to achieve a cease-fire in the Middle East. We also agree that the parties should return to their original positions. But it is our view that those positions should be in accordance with resolution 242 (1967); they should follow the line established before the outbreak of the June 1967 war. This will be indeed an important step towards establishing secure and recognized frontiers in the Middle East and towards the return of peace to that region. I said "an important step", as real peace can only be expected to return to the war-torn lands of the Middle East if the rights of the Palestinians are recognized and respected. It would be naive to expect that peace will return to the Middle East if Israel continues to occupy Arab territories, if the Palestinians continue to be denied their rights.

168. Views have also been expressed about the primary responsibility of the Security Council with regard to the maintenance of peace and security. Members are worried about the prestige of the Council. My delegation is of the view that the prestige of the Council can be upheld only if we prove capable of taking concrete actions that will lead us out of the impasse, out of the situation of "no war and no peace" resulting from the contradictory interpretations given by Members to the provisions of resolution 242 (1967). My delegation agrees that the Security Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, and that the permanent members have a special responsibility to see that the Council lives up to its responsibilities. I do not think, however, that mere concern for the prestige of the Council without concrete and effective action is sufficient. My delegation would like to remind the Council of the efforts made by its non-aligned members during this summer's debates on the Middle East. We regret that the Council failed to adopt draft resolution S/10974 of 24 July 1973. In rejecting it, the Council should have been aware that the only option it left to Egypt was to have recourse to force if it wanted to recover its territories occupied by Israel.

169. Members have referred to resolution 242 (1967) as the basis for finding a solution to the Middle East problem. My delegation agrees with that view. However, when the Council adopted resolution 242 (1967), in its wisdom it left the provisions of that resolution open to contradictory interpretations, a priori dooming to failure efforts for their implementation. It seems to my delegation that adherence to resolution 242 (1967) alone will not help us towards a solution of the Middle East conflict, as has been proved by the failure of all efforts during the last six years. If resolution 242 (1967) has to be the basis of the search for a solution, the Council has to agree on one and the same interpretation in order to be able to implement its provisions effectively. Otherwise it will be just another excuse to continue the impasse, to perpetuate the situation of "no war and no peace" in which Israel can consolidate its position in the occupied Arab territories and continue its policy of integrating those territories into Israel, with all the dangers inherent in such a state of affairs. The outbreak of hostilities with which the Council is now faced is sufficient proof that these dangers are not imaginary.

170. As far as my delegation is concerned, the only interpretation of resolution 242 (1967) that can lead us toward peace in the Middle East is to follow the sequence of, first, withdrawal of Israel from occupied Arab territories, then negotiation as to the outstanding issues, including the rights of the Palestinians. If these two aspects are settled, secure and recognized borders can be established and peace has a realistic chance of returning to the Middle East. It is an atmosphere of peace and goodwill, rather than soldiers and guns, that will be the most effective guarantee that secure and recognized borders will be respected.

171. Being realistic, my delegation remains of the view that to arrive at one and the same agreed interpretation of the provisions in resolution 242 (1967), we need the co-operation and the political will of the permanent members, especially of the super-Powers, and the same sincere co-operation and political will are essential for their effective implementation in order to arrive at an over-all solution of the Middle East problem.

172. The raids on Port Said, Cairo and Damascus by the Israeli air force, causing casualties among innocent people, should remind the Council of the urgency of a meaningful action. We cannot strongly enough condemn attacks on non-military targets, causing numerous casualties among innocent people. If it is the intention of Israel to demoralize the Arab peoples and break their fighting spirit, perhaps Israel will remember the reaction of the British people to the bombardment of London by Hitler's Luftwaffe during the last world war.

173. My delegation is prepared to work together with other members of the Council in the endeavour to bring peace, real peace, to the Middle East.

174. Mr. SEN (India): We are glad, Sir, that your presidency of the Council this month brings with it a wealth of experience and wisdom, of skill and dedication, which we so badly need when we are about to discuss one of the most difficult and dangerous problems before us. In your task you have the full co-operation of my delegation, as did indeed the Ambassador of Yugoslavia, Mr. Mojsov, when he conducted the affairs of this Council so successfully last month.

175. In the preliminary discussions, before a Council meeting was called to discuss the present hostilities in the Middle East, we had indicated to you that, while we had no objection to such a meeting, if requested, we were not at all certain that in the event of a likely failure by the Council to come to a satisfactory decision, public opinion in the world would not be more disappointed than if the Council had not debated the problem formally and openly.

176. It has been rightly pointed out that the Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and that people all over the world would expect the Council to discharge it. We are also aware that in the Middle East today, much death and destruction is taking place and, if at all possible, we should try to stop the fighting. I cannot, however, fail to recall with regret many instances in the past, sometimes involving great Powers, when massive death and destruction took place and, for whatever reasons, they went unheeded by the Council. In the Middle East, several such incidents have occurred during the last seven years. However, we shall always gladly adhere to the homely saying, "Better late than never". Today Arab and Israeli lives are being sacrificed in a totally unnecessary conflict. Yet, significantly, neither the Arab Governments nor the Israeli Government have requested any action by the Council. We cannot overlook their possible reasons for not asking for the Council's help. Nor can I claim that I care more for Arab and Israeli lives than they themselves do.

177. For seven years the Arab countries have waited for a peaceful solution. For seven years Egypt has done everything in its power to bring about a correct implementation of resolution 242 (1967). As late as July of this year, the Council decided to find a solution to the problem, but its efforts came to nought because they were obstructed by a veto. Subsequent developments have shown that that veto was not only against the expressed will of 13 out of the 15 members of the Council, but was also in conflict with the views of the non-aligned countries from four continents, and many other States besides. At that stage the message given by the Council to the Foreign Minister of Egypt was clear. It was simply that since all solutions could be prevented arbitrarily, the only way Egypt could assert its legitimate rights was therefore by force alone. The present hostilities in the Middle East are a mere translation of that message which the Foreign Minister of Egypt carried home. He has made no secret of it. Indeed, today's message also should not be lost on us, when he spoke about what Egyptian authorities wish to do should bombardment and aerial bombardment of civilian centres continue.

178. Some delegations have indicated that if the present hostilities come to an end, some unknown and unexpected avenues to peace would be open to us. At the same time, all delegations have been anxious to reaffirm in most solemn terms that there has been no change in their Governments' position. We do not, therefore, see why the cessation of hostilities can bring about a greater prospect of a peaceful solution than what has happened in the past. A cease-fire was established at least four or five times during the last seven years, always as a first step. There have been no significant second or third steps, and all attempts at political settlement have proved abortive.

179. What Egypt and Syria are doing now is nothing more than upholding the provisions of the Charter in asserting their right to self-defence and to territorial integrity. This right is inherent to every sovereign State, and if Egypt and Syria have desisted from exercising this right it was because they had hoped that the Council would find a peaceful solution. It is no wonder, therefore, that the representative of the United Kingdom said:

"The ultimate verdict may well be that the basic factor was the frustration of the international community in its

efforts to bring about that just and lasting peace in the Middle East of which the promise was held out by Security Council resolution 242 (1967) nearly six years ago." [1743rd meeting, para. 68.]

180. While Egypt and Syria are exercising their right—a right which can never be and has never been extinguished—Israel has extended the area of conflict and given it a true and tragic international dimension by attacking and bombing such places outside the area of occupation as Damascus and Port Said. A report has just now been given by the Foreign Minister of Egypt that Cairo too has been attacked.

181. In the attack on Damascus several diplomats, including United Nations officials and the Indian and Pakistani Ambassadors' families are reported to have been either killed or severely injured. The Soviet Government suffered a particularly heavy loss with the death of more than 30 persons. We deplore these deaths and condemn these attacks.

182. So, on the one hand, Egypt and Syria can be considered to have upheld the Charter, while, on the other hand, Israel is open to the charge of having renewed an international war by attacking several places in Egyptian and Syrian territories. This is a fact we have to keep in mind in coming to any decision.

183. Without the necessity of repeating the discussion that took place in the Council in June and July of this year, it should be clear to all objective and responsible persons that if peace is to return to the Middle East, Israel must withdraw from the territories occupied by force as a result of the June 1967 war. Unless this basic principle is accepted by the Council as a whole, it will be both unfair and unjust for the Council to ask for a cease-fire that will leave vast territories of Egypt, Jordan and Syria in the illegal occupation of Israel.

184. We, like all other delegations, would like to see the present hostilities cease, but they can cease only when withdrawal of Israeli forces has been accepted by Israel and begun in practice. We agree with the statement made by the representative of the United States of America that the "least damaging way to bring this about is to have the parties concerned return to the positions held before hostilities broke out" [1743rd meeting, para. 16]. Since the hostilities broke out on 6 June 1967, the parties concerned should return to the line that separated them on that date.

185. Some eloquent statements have been made that all methods have been tried except negotiations. This is simply not true. Withdrawal from occupied territories has not been tried, and unless this takes place Egypt has made it clear that there can be no negotiations. We support this view of Egypt and other Arab States and will indicate our support in any action that the Council may take.

186. Only yesterday the Government of India expressed its official policy in a statement which reads as follows:

"The Government of India is deeply concerned at the eruption of fighting in West Asia. The Government has

consistently declared that the cause of tension in the area is Israeli aggression and refusal to vacate the territories occupied by armed forces. This intransigence on the part of Israel is clearly the basic cause leading to the present outbreak of hostilities. Our sympathies are entirely with the Arabs, whose sufferings have reached the point explosion. Their cause is based on justice and demands forthwith the attention of the international community. Immediate implementation by Israel of resolutions 242 (1967) constitutes a solution which can arrest the tragic march of events, settling the peace of the regard and of the world at large."

187. We and many others have learnt to our cost that there cannot be any peace unless political problems asse examined as a whole, and not simply with a view to stopping the bloodshed without taking into account the causes which lead to such bloodshed. There can be no peace without justice. The denial of justice in the circumstances of the Middle East is nothing but a direct encouragement so war and conflict. Those of us who would like to see a just and durable peace return to the Middle East must bend was efforts to ensure that Arab territories are no longer occupied by the Israelis. The rest of the problems including the rights of the Palestinians—can then be solve. and some of them will lead to negotiations, direct indirect, and in an atmosphere of equality in which reparty will bring to these negotiations the weight of victors. or the humiliation of defeat and occupation.

188. Mr. KHALID (Sudan): My first duty here, Mr. Presedent, is to associate myself with others who have said that it is a bit of good fortune that you are guiding could deliberations at this time. Your own wisdom is a help. Your country's non-involvement is a help. It is the overinvolvement of some others that has brought us to this impasse.

189. My second duty is a sad one. With profound grief we have learnt the news of the brutal bombing of the peaceful abodes in Damascus and the tragic loss of life it caused. It deep sorrow we extend our condolences to the Secretary-General and the Governments of Syria, the Soviet Universal Norway on the death of their citizens in the service we world peace and international co-operation.

190. We also extend our sympathies to other Governments whose citizens have fallen victim to this revolting, indiscreminate bombing.

again stormy with the confused alarums of war. This was resurprise to the fair-minded elements of the world community, those that knew man's reaction to the disgrace with humiliation and the usurpation of basic rights of life and property. The caveats were many. They came from States victims of blasphemy, and there is but one blasphemy and that is injustice. They came from elderly and respected Heads of State. They came from uninvolved but not disinterested regional organizations. And all of them have shared the view so wisely echoed by our Secretary-General that as long as the prospects of achieving a just and accepted settlement of the Middle East problem was not in sight the cease-fire would remain precarious and unstable.

- 192. In the face of all those appeals and warnings, the Security Council remained unmoved. And when it did act a few months ago, its action was impeded by the negative vote of the United States Government. Yesterday the United States decided to move-to get us moving. We welcome this desire to use the United Nations machinery more effectively. We welcome the desire to see the sanctity of cease-fire lines enforced by the peace-keeping organs of the United Nations-though my Lebanese friends would have liked to see this energetic concern demonstrated when the armistice lines, much older than the cease-fire lines, were violated in April of this year, and my Syrian friends would have liked to see this energetic concern demonstrated last month, when Syrian harbours and hamlets were savagely bombarded. However, we still say better late than never.
- 193. But those of us who heard the United States representative yesterday must have said that it is within the United States power to do better than it did yesterday. Perhaps the over-involvement of its successive administrations over the years made Ambassador Scali's speech sound as unrealistic as a voice from outer-space. Mr. El Zayyat has spared us all the effort of looking up the United States record in impeding a settlement in the Middle East. What he had to leave out for the sake of brevity, the Security Council knows full well. Let us talk of humanitarianism, it being the basis of the argument for the cease-fire passionately advocated by the representative—not by way of instructing anybody, but by way of refreshing our minds.
- 194. During the 1967 hostilities, I was in one of the European capitals. The scenes of war captives ordered to walk barefooted in the scorching sun of the desert, with their boots on their heads, you must all have watched, as I did, on television, or have seen them in photographs.
- 195. To call for a cease-fire on humanitarian grounds is transparently hypocritical. The Arabs have lost and won wars, but their worst enemy cannot produce such a record of gross brutality as that described here today. On the contrary, the generosity displayed by Saladin to his adversaries in this same corridor, today coveted by the Zionists as it was eight centuries ago by monarchs of Europe, is legendary.
- 196. Let us have grounds other than humanitarian, if there are any. The clientele of the United States cannot escape their destiny. They were the object of inhuman persecution and humiliation throughout the best part of their history in Europe, and they are taking it out on the Arabs now.
- 197. Of the permanent members of the Council, China, the Soviet Union and France spoke yesterday and today and came out in favour of a dynamic and just action by this Council. That is the way responsible Powers should act. Yugoslavia, India and Indonesia said today what we in the non-aligned world expect them to say: they advocated fair-mindedness, a concern for world peace and a sense of justice—all qualities they abundantly possess.
- 198. I had hoped that the United Kingdom Government would not have stopped at what it said. Britain knows the

- area and owes the Arabs something. To be stuck with Harrogate two, or is it three, years later, is assuming that time has had to stop. Time does not have to stop. Things have happened since then. Serious things. Britain, well-known for its many-layered perceptions, could have done much more than requesting a cease-fire, on humanitarian grounds, as if mercy had been one of the qualities of Israel.
- 199. A note of caution here. Those words on humanitarianism should not be misconstrued. This is not a war of revenge. It is a move to liberate the occupied territories, as quite rightly said by the representative of the People's Republic of China yesterday. Wars of liberation are the last resort of a self-respecting nation. Ridiculing President Sadat because he said he was willing to lose a million souls cannot cut much ice in the eyes of the Arabs. He knows as well as the whole world knows that his adversaries are overequipped and over-trained. To use a figure of speech of this sort is an indication of mounting impatience. Liberation movements do not sit there and calculate losses. They get into the battle having exhausted all other means.
- 200. Again for the sake of memory, let us go back a little and inform the United States Government how many attempts at peace have been foiled by its fear of antagonizing Israel or its design of having a bastion of its interests overseas, impervious to what that means to the peoples of the area, the real custodians of its interests. The United States of America must look back with a new vision to opportunities lost and take a leaf out of President Kreisky's book, who lived down his emotional aches with admirable statesmanship.
- 201. Let me enumerate a few of those opportunities that foundered on American casual treatment of the Arab's right to live in peace. First, 10 days after the June war, the late President Lyndon Johnson put his "five-point plan" to which Arabs did not raise any serious objections. Second, there was Charles de Gaulle's plan which raised a hue and cry in Israel. Third, there was President Tito's plan which did not even get off the ground. Fourth, we have resolution 242 (1967) of this Council, over which we have been squabbling ever since it was voted into existence. Fifth, we have Gunnar Jarring's struggles and frustrations. Sixth, there was the June 1970 William Roger's plan that was torpedoed to death by Israel when it fired on the Egyptian teams dredging the canal.
- 202. Well, how much more can the Arabs endure? The peace plans have not worked. On the contrary. Israeli electoral in-fighting is pressing parties to a show of steelier muscles calculated to catch votes. We cannot be expected to wait on the pleasure of General Sharon, whose electionmuscles seem to be ridiculously inflated. He said "Israel is now a military super-Power-all the forces of the European countries are weaker than we are. We can conquer in one week the area from Khartoum to Baghdad and Algeria." Please. If Europe can take it, Khartoum cannot take it, and this is no bombast. The United Nations should condemn it, and that is the only answer this Organization can give to insolent vanity. General Sharon, however, is counting on the movements that the Sixth Fleet has made a habit of since 1958. But, let us trust that the United States of America will be as good as its word; it is the mightiest

Power, and can give Pax Americana what Pax Britannica—with all its falterings—gave the world in its heyday.

203. After two and half decades and as the current situation dramatically illustrates, Israeli arguments for peace, based on the theory of attrition, have proved dangerously sterile. The current outbreak of war in the Middle East must move the Council to undertake a far-reaching search for a solution to the problem, and to recognize the obvious. The Council can, in no manner, tolerate the fact that the security of Israel should be preserved to the peril of the Palestinians, and at the cost of Arab territories. Any political solution must come to grips with two basic facts: first, the totally unacceptable occupation of Arab territory, and second, the emergence of a new vitally important political force in the area, namely, the national consciousness of the Palestinian People. Our point of departure is resolution 242 (1967) of November 1967; our take-off point is draft resolution S/10974 of 24 July 1973.

204. These are passing thoughts I put to you and my colleagues and I reserve the right to speak again at a later stage.

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

206. Mr. ISMAIL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): The representative of Israel said that the Israeli forces had no other goal than military targets. To reject this mendacious allegation, I shall read an extract from the text of a telegram of the Agence France Presse which I read in its entirety in my earlier statement:

"... A few seconds later, a Phantom again flew towards the same target.... That same aircraft strafed with the machine-gun it carried groups of people that had formed in the streets..."—in the streets, not in barracks—"... immediately after the bombing.

"It was during this attack that it seems that members of the families of the Indian and Pakistani diplomats were struck. In the same quarter, but at some distance, Madame Petié, the wife of the First Secretary of the French Embassy, was with a group which was likewise strafed..." [see para. 85 above].

207. I have just been given information that a correspondent of the American television network, CBS, who witnessed the attack on civilian targets in Damascus, sent a cable which was circulated here in America, and I read from it as follows: "Civilians have been badly hit in Damascus, private homes destroyed, hospital hit, no less than 30 Soviet diplomats killed."6

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

209. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I listened very carefully to the last intervention of the Deputy Foreign Minister of Syria. There was one thing missing in his words, and that was the precise location of those military targets mentioned by me which were also hit by the Israeli air force: the head-quarters of the general staff of the Syrian army responsible

for the upheaval that is taking place today in the Middle East with so much suffering and bloodshed spread by the Syrian military forces; the location of the headquarters of the Syrian air force; the location of the various command posts which were hit in the air strike by the Israeli air force.

210. As I said earlier, how can Syria, having decided to tear to pieces the cease-fire in existence between Israel and itself since 1967, having launched a massive over-all offensive against the Israeli armed forces and against Israeli civilian localities, towns and villages, demand that Israel should not defend itself by striking back at those military targets which are the sources of the suffering, the grief, the bloodshed which has been brought upon the area as a result of the initiative and the decision of the Syrian and Egyptian Governments?

211. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Syria in exercise of his right of reply.

212. Mr. ISMAIL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): We just have been told that I did not indicate the location of the act. Well, I do not know whether I can read French or not but I shall read it for the third time: "That same aircraft strafed with the machinegun it carried groups of people that had formed in the streets..."—in the street, with the weapons which were on board the Israeli aircraft. One usually employs bombs, but in this case machine-guns were used on purpose in order to destroy innocent civilians.

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

214. Mr. El-ZAYYAT (Egypt): I wish only to register a note about this continuing mention of Israel defending itself. Israel is defending-if we can use that word-Egypt and Syria. I should like to make it absolutely clear to the representative of Israel that the fighting is going on in Egyptian land and in Syrian land. But I really did not ask to be allowed to speak because of that. I just want to seek some information which I hoped would prove that the information which I got is false. We are informed that some United States citizens are volunteering as pilots in the Israeli air force. We further are informed that the United States Government is contemplating sending another 30 Phantom jets such as the one that was strafing people in the streets of Damascus and such as the ones that raided Cairo today. I do hope fervently that this is false information. I do not think that the citizens of this country are going to give their money and their lives in order to sustain the domination and the occupation of other lands, even at the price of bombarding civilians and murdering people in their houses in Damascus, in Port Said, in Syria and in Cairo. I wanted to make this request for information because this has great significance for us. What makes me bring this to the Council is a piece of news of a press conference given in Washington, D.C., today by Congressman Lehman, who says he is going to ask that his Government, the Government of the United States of America, support with all its military and financial might the war that is now being carried on by the Israeli military establishment against those who are trying to liberate their lands. We should certainly welcome the news that that information was false.

⁶ Quoted in English by the speaker.