

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1456th MEETING: 1 NOVEMBER 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1456)	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring Presidents and welcome to the representative of the United States	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 1 November 1968 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8878);	
(b) Letter dated 1 November 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8879)	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.

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 1 November 1968, at 8.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Otto R. BORCH (Denmark).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1456)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 1 November 1968 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8878);
 - (b) Letter dated 1 November 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8879).

Expression of thanks to the retiring Presidents and welcome to the representative of the United States

1. The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed with the business for this evening's meeting I wish, in my capacity as President of the Council, to say a word of appreciation to my predecessor who bore the responsibility of the presidency during the month of October. As no meetings were held during that month, I wish furthermore to express my appreciation to Ambassador Ignatieff of Canada who presided with such distinction over our meetings during the month of September. His courtesy, skill and dedication have provided me with an example which I shall endeavour to live up to.

2. In my capacity as President of the Security Council I call upon the representative of China.

3. Mr. LIU (China): May I thank you, Mr. President, for your courteous reference to me as your predecessor for October. I should like to take this opportunity to associate myself whole-heartedly with the tribute which you have paid to my predecessor, Ambassador Ignatieff of Canada.

4. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Mr. President, in offering to you the very best wishes of the Canadian delegation and our co-operation with you in your capacity as President being assured, I wish also, of course, to recognize the services of your predecessor in the consultations he carried out and the functions he performed during the preceding

month. Time has erased the memory of my exertions over a month ago, but you were so kind as to say that in some way I might be an example to you of courtesy and efficiency. I feel that the Canadian delegation always looks to the Danish delegation for examples of both those qualities and I have no doubt that you will set an example to the Council in the month of November, and I wish you every good fortune.

5. The PRESIDENT: I thank Ambassador Liu and Ambassador Ignatieff for their remarks. I should like to take this opportunity to welcome to the Council table the representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Wiggins, who is attending his first meeting in his new capacity as United States representative on the Security Council. I am sure I speak for all my colleagues in extending a cordial welcome to Ambassador Wiggins and assuring him that we look forward to working with him in the same spirit of friendliness and co-operation that we enjoyed when working with his distinguished predecessors, Ambassador Ball and Ambassador Goldberg.

6. Mr. WIGGINS (United States of America): Mr. President, I want to thank you very much for your kind words of welcome and to express the hope that your cheerful expectations of future relations may be fulfilled by events.

7. The PRESIDENT: As I have already informed members of the Council, I received this morning a request for an urgent meeting from the representative of the United Arab Republic, in a letter which has been circulated in document S/8878. Subsequently, as members have also been informed, I received a request for an urgent meeting, submitted by the representative of Israel in his letter which has been circulated in document S/8879.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 1 November 1968 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8878);
- (b) Letter dated 1 November 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8879)

8. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the usual practice of the Council, I propose, if I hear no objection, to

invite the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Israel to take places at the Council table in order to participate without vote in the discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. A. El Kony (United Arab Republic) and Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) took places at the Council table.

9. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the question before it.

10. The first speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of the United Arab Republic, on whom I now call.

11. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): Mr. President, I should like to express my deep appreciation to you, Sir, and to the members of the Council, for your having convened the meeting this evening. At the same time, I should like to apologize for the inconvenience I may have caused.

12. The United Arab Republic has requested this urgent meeting of the Security Council because an already grave situation in the Middle East has been further aggravated by a wanton act of aggression by the Israeli armed forces against the territory of the United Arab Republic.

13. This latest act of aggression is rendered even more ominous by its premeditated nature. The premeditation is borne out by the statements of several Israeli Cabinet Ministers, among them Mr. Moshe Dayan, who did not shy away from declaring only last Tuesday: "The Egyptians will be hit where it hurts".

14. Mr. Yigal Allon also had something to say on the matter. He stated in the Knesset last Wednesday: "Egyptian commandos should not delude themselves into thinking that war can be confined to the Canal area".

15. But it is not only the premeditation that presages ill for the future; it is also the blatant admission of the Israeli Government and its gloating over the crime. It might be interesting to note that the confession of their wanton aggression has this time been embodied in a statement from the office of the Prime Minister, so as to indicate once and for all the aggressive official policy of the entire Israeli Government.

16. Last night, at 2200 hours, local time, an Israeli plane violated United Arab Republic air-space and infiltrated deep in the Nag-Hamadi area, bombing two civilian targets: a large transformer station, and the well-known Nag-Hamadi Bridge and barrage, damaging the latter and setting fire to the former. One civilian was killed and two were injured.

17. The situation is clear and the facts speak for themselves. They do not require any further elaboration on my part.

18. As I have already said, the situation in the Middle East has become even more grave as a result of this latest Israeli aggression. The fact that the bombing was aimed at installations constituting part of the economic infrastruc-

ture of the United Arab Republic clearly denotes that the intention of those who planned and initiated this wanton aggression was to deal a blow at the economy of the United Arab Republic by attempting to paralyse some of its constituent elements.

19. Furthermore, the selection of civilian installations as targets for aggression is undoubtedly a clear indication as to the scope and content of Israel's policies. Worse still, these civilian targets are far removed, by hundreds of miles, from military positions and concentrations of troops. It certainly demonstrates that in pursuance of its aggressive policies Israel sets no limitations on itself and does not hesitate to resort to the most immoral practices, regardless of their consequences to either human lives or material property, in order to satisfy its leaders' lust for expansion.

20. The systematic manifestations of these destructive and expansionist policies are, and remain, at the root of the grave situation prevailing in the area. The Israeli authorities should realize that such acts of aggression aimed at intimidating the people of the United Arab Republic cannot succeed in daunting their will to live in peace, dignity and freedom. If there is any success in this latest Israeli venture, it lies only in the fact that it exposes the real nature of the Israeli policies and bares the illegal, immoral and inhuman tactics with which those policies are pursued.

21. It may seem ironic that, while Israel continues to initiate aggressive acts against the neighbouring Arab States and to launch wanton attacks against civilian installations, a whole campaign of publicity and propaganda is being conducted about the peaceful intentions and constructive approaches of Israel towards a settlement in the Middle East. This is not in the least surprising, for this is the real attitude: words of peace and acts of war. This has always been, and will always remain, the pattern of Israeli behaviour.

22. Peace is not a matter of declarations void of content, or of eloquent speeches. Peace consists fundamentally and basically of concrete acts and deeds.

23. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic has stated to Ambassador Jarring, "Every day that elapses without the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Arab territories constitutes, in fact, a new aggression and a new violation of the rule of law".

24. Israel's refusal to declare its acceptance of and its readiness to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 is a disservice to the cause of peace in the area.

25. On the other hand, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic has plainly stated to Ambassador Jarring that the United Arab Republic: (a) accepts the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967; (b) is ready to implement its obligations arising from that resolution; (c) believes that a time-table for the implementation of all the provisions of the resolution should be set up by Ambassador Jarring; (d) believes that the Security Council should undertake the supervision of and guarantee the implementation of the 22 November resolution.

26. At a time—indeed on the same evening—when the world at large had noted with relief the recent tendency to refrain from the use of force in the settlement of conflicts, it is to be deplored that Israel not only pursued but intensified the use of military force, and in its most unlawful form, to attain its sinister ends. This is certainly bound to fail. In the light of this treacherous attack we would be entitled to question the validity of all claims as to the peaceful intents and contents of the Israeli manoeuvres. What type of peace is Mr. Eban carrying to New York when it is preceded by a dastardly act of aggression?

27. It is satisfying and equally heartening to note that the debates in the twenty-third session of the General Assembly have shown in no ambiguous terms that the international community demands from Israel the prompt withdrawal from the Arab territories it has occupied since 5 June 1967. That is the verdict of the collective will of world society. This verdict, which has been widely endorsed, is the cornerstone of any settlement in the area. We sincerely hope that the Council, in its consideration of this wanton Israeli aggression, will examine the situation in the light of this just verdict.

28. On previous occasions the Security Council, discharging its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, has condemned Israel's policy of aggression and military attacks. More than once during the last six months Israel has been condemned, called upon, and warned to desist from all aggressive military actions.

29. In fact, when the Council adopted resolution 248 (1968) on 24 March 1968 it declared: "that such actions of military reprisal and other grave violations of the cease-fire cannot be tolerated and that the Security Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts." Israel, however, did not desist.

30. Again the Council, on 16 August 1968, when faced with new aggression, considered Israel's action as endangering the maintenance of the peace, and the Council's condemnation was on that occasion expressed in this stern language:

"Condemns the further military attacks launched by Israel in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and resolution 248 (1968) and warns that if such attacks were to be repeated the Council would duly take account of the failure to comply with the present resolution."
[Resolution 256 (1968).]

31. This latest brutal and wanton military attack by Israel against civilian targets in upper Egypt is of a far graver nature. I hardly need to emphasize to the Council the serious and criminal character of this phase which the Israeli aggression has assumed. The armed attack of Israeli aircraft on civilian targets far away from the cease-fire areas or scenes of military concentrations confronts the Council with a deteriorating situation fraught with imminent danger.

32. It is therefore high time for the Council to enforce the measures envisaged in its previous resolutions and apply the

sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Verbal condemnations do not suffice; Israel is the subject of the longest list of such condemnations. Its response to the Council's resolutions has been manifested in continued defiance and disregard.

33. It is therefore incumbent upon the Council not to content itself this time with another condemnation to be disregarded by Israel or another warning to go unheeded by it. The Council must discharge the authority entrusted to it in the Charter and apply the required enforcement measures which will put an end once and for all to Israel's lawlessness, aggression and disregard for all norms of civilized conduct.

34. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

35. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Mr. President, permit me to express to you my delegation's respects and to extend our best wishes for success in your high office. We should also like to convey our respects to your distinguished predecessors.

36. During the last few weeks the entire world has watched and waited in rapt attention for signs of progress toward peace in the Middle East. It is a long-delayed peace. As far back as 1948, when Egypt and other Arab States launched war against Israel and invaded its territory, the United Nations called on the parties to conclude a permanent, peaceful settlement. The Arab States refused, and have waged war against Israel ever since. Israel found itself defending its sovereignty, independence and life from behind truce lines, then from behind armistice lines; and since June 1967 it has been compelled to repel Arab attacks carried out across cease-fire lines.

37. On 22 November 1967 the Security Council called again on the parties to the Israel-Arab conflict to establish a just and lasting peace in the area. Nearly a year has passed, but Egypt still adheres to the Khartoum decision:¹ no peace, no negotiations, no recognition of Israel. Its President continues to reiterate this belligerent position in his speeches. Its army persists in its acts of aggression against Israel.

38. Sanctimonious declarations of Egyptian acceptance of the November resolution remain valueless when they are accompanied by a refusal to make peace with Israel, by a rejection of agreement with Israel and by unabated warfare against Israel.

39. Throughout this period, however, peace-making efforts have not ceased. The Secretary-General's Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring, has pursued his mission of peace with boundless patience and tireless dedication. Lately some seemed to find a little more hope and encouragement in those efforts. Every indication that progress was possible was welcomed; every hint of willingness to seek understanding was carefully nurtured.

¹ Resolution of the Arab Summit Conference held at Khartoum from 29 August to 1 September 1967.

40. People everywhere asked themselves whether the United Arab Republic was not ready after all for peace, despite the Khartoum decisions, despite its avowal of terror warfare, despite an ominous resurgence of violence along the cease-fire line, despite President Nasser's warlike pronouncements, and despite the harshly intransigent attitude adopted by its Foreign Minister in the General Assembly.

41. Then in a sudden and sinister assault along the entire cease-fire line Egypt dealt a grievous blow to the peace efforts and to the hopes that it might be willing at long last to abandon the course of war. The answer to the world's prayers for peace in the Middle East came in a hail of Egyptian shells and rockets.

42. On 26 October, at approximately 1650 hours local time, the United Arab Republic forces opened a co-ordinated and sustained artillery, mortar and rocket barrage across the entire length of the Canal on Israeli positions situated on the east bank. The fire was premeditated and without provocation of any kind from the Israeli forces. Ten thousand Egyptian shells were poured into the Israeli lines.

43. A proposal of the United Nations military observers for a cease-fire was agreed for 1745 hours. Israeli forces complied. The United Arab Republic forces, however, continued their attack. Fire ceased only at 1820 hours.

44. Then at 1920 hours the United Arab Republic forces resumed their artillery shelling. The Israeli forces did not return fire. Egyptian firing ceased at 1955 hours, only to start again at approximately 2150 hours. This time the artillery barrage was meant also to provide cover for an attempt by Egyptian forces to cross the Canal.

45. At 2200 hours local time an Israeli patrol encountered an Egyptian army force that had crossed to the east bank, south of the Little Bitter Lake, and penetrated behind the Israeli cease-fire lines in the Mitla crossroads area. Following an exchange of fire the Egyptian force retreated to the West bank, leaving behind one Egyptian soldier killed.

46. An Israeli truck was blown up the next morning by one of the mines laid by the raiding force. Other mines were discovered before they could cause damage [see S/7930/Add.95, paras. 4, 9; S/7930/Add.96].

47. Also at 2200 hours another attempt was made by the United Arab Republic forces to cross the Canal in the vicinity of Port Tawfiq. That attack was repelled before the Egyptian force succeeded in landing on the east bank.

48. The United Nations military observers proposed a cease-fire for 2400 hours. Israel agreed. The Egyptian forces, however, continued the artillery barrage in the Port Tawfiq and Mitla crossroads areas. Firing ceased only at 0130 hours.

49. In this gross and treacherous aggression fifteen Israeli soldiers were killed and thirty-four wounded. In addition, one civilian resident of Kantara was killed and two others were wounded. Most of the casualties were inflicted in the early stage of the attack. Some of them were caused among soldiers participating in or watching a Saturday football match.

50. The reports submitted to the Security Council by General Odd Bull leave no room for any reasonable doubt whatsoever concerning Egypt's full and exclusive responsibility for this premeditated aggression.

51. Despite that fact, and despite aroused world opinion and general condemnation of this aggression, Egyptian warlike acts continued after 26 October and, as recorded in General Bull's report of 30 October [S/7930/Add.97] additional incursions across the Canal occurred on 29 and 30 October.

52. On 27 October a military spokesman of the United Arab Republic declared that the massive Egyptian attack on the previous day was "in line with Cairo's new policy of 'preventive defence'".

53. Those assaults were the climax of a series of carefully prepared attacks by the United Arab Republic, carried out recently in pursuance of that policy of so-called "preventive" military operations.

54. The policy was first applied on 26 August 1968, when a United Arab Republic commando unit crossed the Canal, laid an ambush on the east bank and killed two Israeli soldiers and abducted a third [S/8788].² That incident was followed by the massive Egyptian artillery assault along the Canal on 8 September 1968 [S/8805].² On that day the United Arab Republic Armed Forces General Command formulated, in a public announcement, the new doctrine of "preventive" operations.

55. It was described as "preventive defence" and explained as follows by a spokesman of the United Arab Republic Armed Forces Command:

"The execution of preventive defensive actions means that Egyptian forces will no longer make it possible for the enemy to attack and that Egyptian forces will launch offensive actions. They will scrutinize the movements of the enemy and the reinforcement of his troops so as to strike at him before he attacks. . . . From now on the initiative will be Arab."

56. The implications of this policy are further illustrated by a report in the authoritative Cairo daily *Al-Ahram* of 29 October 1968, which in quoting the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Gohar, declares that this policy will entitle the United Arab Republic to react even to the strengthening of the Israeli forces on the east bank. The paper goes on to state that the doctrine of preventive defence implies freedom of action for the United Arab Republic to open fire.

57. That policy has been pursued by a series of unprovoked, hostile Egyptian acts of opening fire, mine-laying and incursions by land and air across the cease-fire lines. I have given the Council details of those attacks in my letter of 30 October [S/8877].

58. It will be recalled that on 23 October, that is, three days before the Egyptian attack of 26 October, the United

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-third Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1968*.

Arab Republic Air Force attempted to carry out reconnaissance flights over Israeli positions on the east bank of the Canal, resulting in an air clash in which the intruding Egyptian planes were driven back—I refer representatives to General Odd Bull's report of 24 October [S/7930/Add.94].

59. On the morning of 26 October the semi-official Cairo newspaper *Akhbar El-Yom* interpreted the air incident as an expression of the determination of the General Command of the forces of the United Arab Republic to pursue its previously announced policy of "preventive defence", and observed that an additional confrontation was soon to be expected in the Suez Canal zone.

60. In fact, on the afternoon of that day, the United Arab Republic forces launched their large-scale attack along the entire cease-fire line. As reported in my letters to the President of the Security Council and as substantiated in General Odd Bull's reports of 27 and 28 October [S/7930/Add.95 and 96], there is no doubt about the offensive and unprovoked nature of the Egyptian action. The United Arab Republic forces were the first to initiate fire and the last to comply with the United Nations cease-fire proposals. Moreover, the United Arab Republic gravely escalated the dimensions of the military confrontation by introducing the new element of ground-to-ground rockets. That is recorded in General Bull's report. The artillery and rocket barrage served also as cover for attempts by Egyptian military forces to cross the Canal to the east bank and to carry on their operations from there.

61. The premeditated character of the United Arab Republic initiative is furthermore reflected in the advance co-ordination between the military operations in the field and the propaganda organs in Cairo. Within fifteen minutes after the Egyptian forces opened their simultaneous and concerted fire along the 100 kilometre cease-fire line, Cairo radio was already broadcasting a complete, carefully worded Egyptian version of the incident, including the prefabricated claim that Israel had attacked first, a claim disproved completely by the findings of the United Nations military observers.

62. The Egyptian attempts to deny responsibility and distort the facts ring as hollow as indeed they are in the light of the evidence adduced in General Bull's report. Criticisms of the report by the United Nations military observers, attributed in the Egyptian information media to United Arab Republic Government officials are a weak camouflage for the United Arab Republic's inability to offer a reasonable and acceptable response to the fact that General Bull places on Egypt, and on Egypt alone, the responsibility for the aggression of 26 October.

63. The large-scale, planned and wanton Egyptian attack of 26 October was launched at a time when the situation had been completely quiet along the Suez Canal cease-fire line. It constitutes a most serious assault against the cease-fire and casts serious doubts on the willingness of the Government of the United Arab Republic to ensure its continuation.

64. It becomes even more sinister when one considers that the attack was made at a time when in New York

Ambassador Jarring was striving to achieve progress in his task of promoting agreement between the parties for the establishment of a just and lasting peace. Whatever the Egyptian motive may have been in deciding upon, planning and carrying out the military operation of 26 October, the United Arab Republic Government could not have been unaware of the fact that its inevitable consequence must be to prejudice the peace-making efforts.

65. Ever since the adoption by Egypt of the policy of preventive military operations—the ambush of 26 August and the artillery attack of 8 September—it has been clear from which side came the unprovoked blows on the cease-fire. It was clear from which side originated the mine-laying raids, the ambushes, the wide-front assaults by artillery, mortar and tanks. It was clear on which side vehicles were being blown up, people killed, maimed and captured. It was clear which party refused to respect the cease-fire.

66. Yet the Security Council was unable to condemn the murder of Israelis. It was helpless to call for an end to Egyptian military attacks against Israel. It ignored the avowed United Arab Republic policy of continued warfare against Israel.

67. After prolonged and patient restraint Israel was left with no choice but to act itself in self-defence and in order to impress upon the United Arab Republic the necessity of respecting the cease-fire. Israel decided nevertheless not to respond in kind to Egypt's murderous attacks. It decided not to seek to inflict on the United Arab Republic the loss of human lives. Israel confined itself to a measure designed to bring home to the Government of the United Arab Republic the fact that the policy of cease-fire violations is a perilous one. Israel took a measure aimed at disabusing the United Arab Republic of the notion that the Egyptian army might ignore its cease-fire obligations with impunity, that Egypt could claim security for itself and deny it to Israel. Israel acted to remind the United Arab Republic Government that the aggressor is not beyond reach.

68. Last night an Israel commando unit blew up a power station and two bridges on the Nile between Aswan and Cairo. It sought to avoid bloodshed. It carefully avoided densely populated areas, nor did it attack troops. It struck in an effort to persuade the Egyptian Government that the continuation of its aggressive actions is fraught with danger and that the maintenance of the cease-fire agreement is a common interest of both the United Arab Republic and Israel.

69. The people of Israel is a small people, but it too has a right to life like other nations. Israel is a small nation, but it too has a right to independence, security and peace. It has taken my people twenty centuries of subjugation, exile, suffering and carnage to retrieve our birthright and re-establish the sovereignty wrested from us by the Roman conqueror. We shall not allow Arab conquerors with imperialist ambitions to deprive us of it. In lands all over the world the Jewish people has paid too high a price for survival to bend or weaken or falter now in its own land.

70. Of the Arab States we ask nothing but to leave us in peace, to live and let live. Let us build, not wage war. Let us

construct, not destroy. If, however, the Arab States refuse to recognize our rights, if they continue to shed our blood, they must understand that we shall defend and protect ourselves as best we can, until they end their twenty-year war of aggression and live at peace with us. Repelling Arab attacks, thwarting Arab aggression, is to us not a matter of military exercises, but of life and death and survival, and the people of Israel cannot allow its fate to become the plaything of hate and warmongers.

71. Much of the Middle East tragedy is due to the irresponsible attitude of the Egyptian Government which has time and again become prisoner of its own hate propaganda and led its people to frenzies of war lusts and illusions. This was the situation created by Arab leaders in 1948 when, in an attempt to deny the Jewish people its right to self-determination and independence, they plunged the area into a war of aggression, promising to annihilate the nascent State of Israel and its people. This was the situation that prevailed throughout the unhappy armistice period when the Egyptian Government, instead of working towards peace, as required by its international obligations, stirred up more hate and more hostility by every means at its disposal and pursued active belligerency with the avowed aim of bringing Israel to its knees. This was also the situation in the spring of 1967 when President Nasser and other Arab leaders intoxicated themselves and their nations with the passion for destroying Israel by force of arms.

72. Now again, the United Arab Republic Government appears to be carried away by the illusion that continued warfare against Israel is the right road. Influenced by the unlimited supply of offensive weapons it has received and is still receiving, it has openly embraced, as a standing policy, the initiating of military actions against Israel. This is a grave departure and it may bring about the same unfortunate results as past aggressive initiatives on the part of Egypt. The United Arab Republic Government must be aware of this, and if it is not it is surely incumbent on the Security Council to apprise it of the gravity of persistent acts of aggression in violation of the cease-fire.

73. Israel will continue to observe the cease-fire agreement. The obligations the parties have assumed under the cease-fire are of a reciprocal nature and must therefore be mutually observed. The time has come to think of peace not of war, to seek peace not continued bloodshed. The strict maintenance of the cease-fire is essential if the parties are to advance toward peaceful agreement and end the protracted conflict.

74. Mr. WIGGINS (United States of America): The United States is both distressed and disturbed that this Council is again confronted with clear and grave violations of the cease-fire. This cease-fire, established in June 1967, has been reaffirmed repeatedly and in terms of increasing strength. We have collectively insisted more than once that the cease-fire should be scrupulously observed by all the parties.

75. As human beings we are distressed by the loss of lives, the destruction of property and the human suffering which these violations have caused. As a member of this Council we are distressed by this demonstrated disregard of and

disrespect for past decisions and indifference to the demands and even implorings of this Council, which stem not from narrow national interests but from the collective responsibility of this Council under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

76. These new violations have more serious political implications than any since those of October 1967. Moreover, they come only two months after other incidents in the same sector of the cease-fire—incidents which led this Council, through a presidential declaration [*1448th meeting, para. 73*], to require of the parties strict observance of the cease-fire and then, through a resolution, to insist that the cease-fire be rigorously respected [*268 (1968)*].

77. As a national Government and a member of the Security Council with a deep commitment to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, we are deeply distressed by the novel justification for these cease-fire violations put forward by the United Arab Republic—"preventive or protective defence"—and we continue to be distressed, as we have been in the past, by the Israeli defence of "reprisal" or "retaliation". Neither is acceptable as doctrine or as practice. Both depict a frame of mind and a pattern of thought which casts serious doubt upon the determination of those involved to exercise the restraint, discipline and forbearance which is an absolute necessity if the integrity of the cease-fire régime is to be preserved and if there are to be further and prompt steps toward replacing that régime with a permanent settlement.

78. Given the evidence placed before us by General Bull and the statements made by the parties—both inside and outside this Council—it would be relatively easy for the Council to pass judgement upon these cease-fire violations: to denounce the Canal crossings and the heavy artillery bombardment initiated along the entire Suez Canal sector by the forces of the United Arab Republic on 26 October, and to deprecate the strike of retaliation carried out deep in the territory of the United Arab Republic by Israeli forces only yesterday. This is another illustration that violence begets violence.

79. But if we are to fulfil the high responsibility entrusted to us, we must do better than pass judgement. We must reaffirm in unmistakable and unequivocal terms our insistence that there should be no violation of the cease-fire for any reason whatsoever, whether for so-called preventive defence or for reprisal. We must assert our demand that both sides urgently take steps, individually and in co-operation with the United Nations cease-fire machinery on the ground, to ensure that all those under their respective control, military or civilian, scrupulously and faithfully observe the cease-fire.

80. This Council also has the right, in fulfilling its Charter responsibilities, to ask of the parties whether they intend hereafter not just to adhere to, but to observe scrupulously, the cease-fire; and whether they are prepared to co-operate with the United Nations machinery to ensure that the cease-fire violations of the last few days are exceptions or aberrations which shall not be repeated.

81. And finally, my Government feels it is incumbent upon this Council, faced with unsatisfactory observance of

the cease-fire in the Suez sector, to seek promptly to determine—with the help of the Secretary-General and the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization—what if anything can be done to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations cease-fire machinery and to prevent future violations of the cease-fire by either party.

82. Under the present conditions in the Middle East, as my predecessor stated in this Council less than two months ago, and as has been all too vividly demonstrated in the last few days, a cease-fire cannot result in anything better than a fragile and implicitly explosive situation. As we stated at that time, a cease-fire is not peace—and it would be a foolish deception to confuse it with peace. But a cease-fire is a necessary condition to the shaping and the building of peace. It follows from this, in both logic and practice, that this Council must insist upon the integrity and scrupulous observance of the cease-fire. We must not weaken the fragile foundation of “no violence” which the Secretary-General’s representative, Ambassador Jarring, is trying to transform into a just and lasting settlement, in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

83. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): I should like, first of all, to offer the President the congratulations of the Algerian delegation on his assumption of the presidency of the Security Council, and to endorse the remarks he addressed to his predecessor, Mr. Ignatieff, the representative of Canada.

84. Everything today points to the fact that Israel is engaged in raising the bidding, a policy which, in the end, can touch off a general conflagration. This is apparent from the very nature of Israel’s aggressive military operations, which now seem to be directed less to the destruction of inhabited places than to spectacular and provocative actions. It is apparent also, from the news which everyone has read concerning the Israeli raid on the west bank of the Suez Canal.

85. There are several reasons. In the first place, Israel wants to gain a little more credibility for the notion that it is, allegedly, an invincible, omnipotent and omnipresent State, capable of making its presence felt at any time and in any place. In the second place, Israel has to prove to its domestic public opinion, whipped to frenzy by the Tel Aviv authorities, that those authorities have no intention of tempering their warlike ardour and that Israel means to set itself up as the arbiter of the situation in the Middle East.

86. This is not the first time that the Algerian delegation has warned the Security Council against Israel’s reckless undertakings and/or the consequences they may be expected to have. Perhaps my delegation should repeat those warnings once more, for it seems to us that today a new step has been taken: that step is the launching of operations which are completely pointless from a military standpoint and whose predictable consequence can only be to create the conditions for a conflagration which must inevitably become generalized. Our appraisal of the situation should indeed be stated in even stronger terms, for it is no exaggeration to compare the situation now obtaining in the

Middle East, other things being equal, to that which existed at one time on the banks of the Yalu River.

87. A second conclusion which the Algerian delegation draws from this latest Israeli aggression is that it is useless to build castles in the air in the Middle East about northern or southern or other frontiers, or to go on arguing about the cease-fire of this or that date, so long as the sole and real problem of the Middle East is not confronted without equivocation: the problem of Palestine, of the occupied national territories. Peace, like war, is one and indivisible, and it is fanciful to hope that lasting peace can be established on the foundations of extended local cease-fires.

88. Actually, everything indicates that Israel has gradually been caught up in its own toils, that it has been trapped in the myth that it itself has created following its past and present terrorist actions.

89. Judging by Israeli reactions and by the satisfaction which apparently is felt in Tel Aviv, it would seem that the only important fact in the present situation is that the aggression of 31 October 1968 was carried out by a commando group.

90. Without going into the improbability of this business of a commando group disporting itself, apparently, 230 miles west of the Suez Canal, we find it a source of serious concern for the future that it should be possible to rejoice over this type of action without at the same time perceiving the clear threat that it implies. The threat, indeed, is barely veiled. The United Arab Republic is in fact being served notice that, failing unconditional capitulation on its part, the destruction of the Aswan Dam is not to be ruled out. My delegation would not wish to dwell on the predictable consequences, both political and military, of such a threat at a time of rising tension such as the present.

91. We shall not expatiate on humanitarian considerations, for we believe that the unconcealed threat of destruction is capable of opening the eyes of those who, notwithstanding all indications, continue blindly to see Israel as a refuge for the survivors of Auschwitz and Treblinka. Today it is the Nile; tomorrow why not the Zambezi? Perhaps there is still time today to attempt a radical solution of the problem of the Middle East, in all its aspects and all its implications, for it is hardly necessary to emphasize that, even from the Israeli point of view, it is hard to understand this escalation which has already turned the present conflict into a popular war whose outcome is predictable.

92. Perhaps the only explanation that could be given today lies in the fact that the alliances in the Arab world do not have the good fortune to please the imperialist States and that now, as in the past, Israel is prepared to play the cards dealt it by hidden hands that do not have to be identified.

93. However this may be, the Security Council is invited to take urgent and decisive measures, not with a view to calling once again, and vainly, for the implementation of a cease-fire which settles nothing, but to confront without delay the political problem created by the presence of Israel in the Middle East.

94. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I wish to take this opportunity, on behalf of the Soviet delegation, to associate myself with the good wishes expressed to the President on his assumption of that most responsible office, the presidency of the Security Council. At the same time, I should also like to welcome to the Security Council our new colleague, the representative of the United States, and to express the hope that he will make a constructive contribution to the Council's work.

95. The events in the Near East continue to be central to the Security Council's preoccupations, the situation in that part of the world continues to be fraught with dangerous problems. The reason for this is the aggressive policy of Israel, which persists in refusing to carry out the Security Council's decision concerning a political settlement in the Near East and seeks to hold on to the Arab lands which it has seized.

96. It is precisely Israel's occupation of the territories of Arab States that is the constant source of tension and the reason for ever new outbreaks of hostilities.

97. Mr. El Kony, the representative of the United Arab Republic, has at today's meeting presented specific facts showing that Israel's new acts of aggression against the United Arab Republic—the Israeli air raid deep inside the territory of the United Arab Republic and the bombing of targets in that territory—was a premeditated act of provocation and therefore constituted a further act of aggression, a further blatant violation of the decisions of the Security Council, and a further violation of the cease-fire.

98. In his statement today, the representative of Israel endeavoured to justify these acts. Indeed, he threatened that such violations would continue. Quite obviously, the Security Council cannot remain indifferent to this situation.

99. In the dangerous situation which Israel is creating in the Near East, the duty of all States which recognize their responsibility for international peace and security, the duty of all members of the Security Council, on which the Charter of the United Nations confers the primary responsibility in this respect, is to condemn Israel categorically, to demand that it should cease immediately, once and for all, its acts of aggression against the Arab countries, and that it should comply without delay with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 concerning political settlement in the Middle East.

100. As we all know, the Arab States long ago announced officially—and references to this were made recently from the rostrum of the twenty-third session of the General Assembly—that they accept that resolution of the Security Council and are prepared to carry it into effect. The Arab States are loyally and constructively co-operating with Mr. Jarring, the Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General and most of us desire the success of his mission. Thus everything hinges on Israel.

101. The development of events in the Near East shows how dangerous it is to delay a political settlement in that

part of the world, and how imperative it is that the aggressor's forces should be withdrawn with all possible speed from the Arab lands they have occupied.

102. As for the Soviet Union's position on this question, the Soviet Union is determined to see to it, together with all peace-loving States, with all those concerned to strengthen peace in the Near East, that Israel's aggression is brought to a halt and that a political settlement is effected in the Near East on the basis of the aforementioned resolution of 22 November 1967.

103. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, first let me congratulate you on the attainment of your high office. I would only say now that we are happy to put you to work on this first day of your sentence, a sentence so I expect of one month's hard labour. We thank your distinguished predecessor for maintaining a pacific silence for a month, a pacific silence which leaves us in good heart and in good voice for the stormy month ahead. It is some time since we had a Danish President. We remember the last occasion with respectful admiration. Knowing your own qualities of persistence, thoroughness and sound judgement, we know that we shall have equal cause to be grateful to you. I know that we shall all respond to your leadership.

104. I also take this opportunity to welcome Ambassador Wiggins. He comes from the superior isolation of Washington to the turmoil of New York. He comes from the high arrogance of the editorial to the low anxiety of parliamentary diplomacy here in the United Nations. We welcome him whole-heartedly. We shall all compete, I am sure, in contributing to the completion of his higher public education.

105. I doubt if anyone will wish to prolong our debate tonight. This is certainly not the time to intensify hatred or to increase tension; nor is it the time for stoking the fires of partisan belligerency. It will be well to ponder the statements we have heard. We need time to reflect on the lessons which we should by now have learned. Nevertheless, there are three propositions which it may be well to put to the Council before we go to bed tonight.

106. The first proposition is an old one. It must be in all our minds as we listen to the statements made by the two sides; it is the old proposition that violence is evil, that violence breeds violence and that violence takes us not nearer to a settlement but makes a settlement all the more remote. No one of us can fail to be concerned and disturbed as bloodshed and destruction go ahead while conciliation and co-operation fall back. Ingenuity and energy are devoted not to containing and stopping the violence but to extending and intensifying it. But both sides must know that violence can lead only to more hate and more hopelessness.

107. The second proposition which must be in all our minds tonight is that the violence which has occurred makes more necessary and more urgent the advance to a settlement. I have long felt that one of the most extraordinary features of the situation in the Near East is that we endeavour to grapple with a problem on which we all know very well the eventual answer. We know it in advance.

In the Far East or in Africa it may still be difficult to see the outline of just settlements. In the Near East however we have together unanimously declared the purposes and principles on which a settlement must be based. We have all accepted those purposes and principles. We know before we start what the basis of the ultimate settlement must be, a settlement in lasting justice not to one side but to everyone. The only remaining question is whether that solution is to be achieved with or without an interval of terrible conflict and vast human suffering. Consequently, the greater the bitterness and the worse the bloodshed, the more we should devote all our effort here to the enterprise which we started in this Council nearly a year ago. That enterprise led to the appointment of Ambassador Gunnar Jarring as the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

108. We now know more clearly than we did then that the purposes and principles we laid down are the only basis for a settlement. We are all the more sure of that now than ever we were. And we have since learned that the Secretary-General's Special Representative is a man of unrivalled integrity and resolution. We have here in New York the Foreign Secretaries of the United Arab Republic and Jordan. The Foreign Secretary of Israel is due here, I trust, within hours. We trust that we shall turn from the recrimination of this debate to give Ambassador Jarring in his dealings with the Foreign Ministers every support and encouragement as his mission now enters on its decisive stage.

109. There is a third proposition which I hope will be in the forefront of our minds. Let us never forget—as we deplore the intensification of violence and as we trust that the recent violence will itself, God willing, give impetus and urgency to our advance to a settlement—let us not forget that it is the innocent who suffer first from violence and they who suffer most. We think of the civilian populations who live in danger and in fear. And we do not forget that in the hills of eastern Jordan, as winter now approaches, there are hundreds of thousands of men, women and children facing great hardship and privation and apparently doomed to the suffering of exposure to another harsh winter. They are innocent. More than 300,000 of them have homes to which they can immediately return. There are refugee camps in the comparative clemency of the climate in the Jordan valley now standing unoccupied. The families now facing hunger and cold on the high hillsides from Irbid to Es-Salt should, I believe, come first in our compassion and high on our priorities of action. And I, for one, do not believe that an appeal for their return to their homes will now go unheeded.

110. We seek the end of violence; we seek an end to human suffering; we seek a just and permanent peace.

111. Last November we in this Council achieved a unanimous decision. I greatly trust that this November it will be possible, through the good offices of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, to ensure that the purposes and principles which we set a year ago will now be given practical effect. Either we advance together now in November, or all our efforts over a year will come to grief. I certainly agree with what we heard the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union say just now when he

put it to us how dangerous it is to postpone a political settlement. There has been far too much delay; there has been far too much bloodshed; and there has been far too much suffering. It is not a destination we seek, we know the destination; but we still need to find the road to the destination on which we all agreed a year ago. That is the compelling responsibility which must dominate our debate and direct all our urgent deliberation.

112. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have just received a note from the representative of Saudi Arabia stating that he would like to address the Council this evening on the question under consideration [S/8882]. If no member of the Council has any comment, I would propose to invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take a seat at the Council table in order to make a statement.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took a place at the Council table.

113. The PRESIDENT: If the representative of Saudi Arabia is prepared to speak now, I should like to call on him.

114. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Thank you, Mr. President. I do not know, Sir, whether anyone in the Council should congratulate you or commiserate with you, especially at this late hour. However, I do think it is an honour for me to speak under your presidency—the more so because you come from a small country; Saudi Arabia is a small country and I am sure you will understand my intervention with sympathy.

115. I had not decided to take the floor this evening. However, I was compelled to do so for two reasons. First, Mr. Tekoah could not restrain himself from throwing aspersions on the Arab States and the Arab people. Secondly, it is already 2 November in London, England—2 November, the perfidious date of the Balfour Declaration, 'which is at the root of all the trouble with which you are dealing here tonight. Coincidentally, it fell to me to address this Council on the same date a couple years ago [1314th meeting]. It is indeed strange that those who take a leading part, besides the representative of Israel, should be our distinguished colleague from the United States, whom I welcome, and my good friend Lord Caradon, the representative of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom lies about 3,000 miles away from Palestine. The distance has not changed since the days of the Balfour Declaration. The United States lies at a distance of 7,000 miles from Palestine. And they take the issue to heart, both of them, and address us with the same platitudes which I have been hearing since the 1920s from the British and since 1947 from the Americans.

116. What have the indigenous people of Palestine done to the United Kingdom or to the United States, or what have the Arabs for that matter done to either of those countries, to merit their intervention in successive years on behalf of a usurping State called Israel? Have we Arabs interfered in the affairs of the United Kingdom? The farthest the Arabs could go, centuries ago, was Spain. Now our Spanish friends thank us for the culture of the Arabs in Spain. We did not

go as far as the United Kingdom in our incursion, and that was in the Middle Ages. If some Arabs have come here to the United States, they have come as immigrants and identify themselves, as good Americans, with the interests of the United States.

117. This question has lived with me for forty years and you gentlemen here talk about it because you are briefed. I am excepting Lord Caradon, who was in Palestine as a magistrate in the twenties. He knows about the question, but of course he represents his Government and he has to abide by instructions. But you gentlemen here talk about this question of Palestine vicariously, from hearsay or in accordance with the instructions of your Governments, which are based on the modalities of self-serving national interest or for no reason other than that you now think that you can solve this question the way you would like to.

118. Who does not like peace? All of us like peace. We are committed in this Organization to peace. But peace cannot come by compulsion. Peace cannot come by coercion. No, Sir. Every Arab is perturbed by what is happening in Palestine. I have addressed myself to the Council; from the days of Abraham to now I have marshalled the facts of the Holy Land. Tonight again Mr. Tekoah mentions that they regained the land which the Romans robbed from them 2,000 years ago. I question Mr. Tekoah across the table with regard to the two interventions. Since when was God Almighty, our Creator, in the real estate business, that he allocated Palestine to the Semites of the Jewish faith? We are Semites too. Let them produce the title deeds. Again I have to remind him of King David, who said in one of his psalms: "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof." It is a hoax that Palestine belongs to any one religious denomination since Roman days. Palestine or any other country belongs to the indigenous people of the land and in 1919 the indigenous people of the land were 94 per cent, and some of them were Jewish. They were our brothers, and they were mostly Semites. There were a few who had come from Eastern Europe and settled there in the 1890s. But the Jews who were there we had no quarrel with. They were our brothers. Here come Jews from Eastern Europe who have used Judaism as a motivation for political and economic ends. They want, in the twentieth century, to make a nationality out of a religion, when nationalism has failed and culminated in two world wars.

119. I do not want to go into the history of the Balfour Declaration, but Mr. Balfour promised the Holy Land for two reasons. One was that the Zionists were powerful and in 1917 worked hard to bring the United States into the First World War. Secondly, he thought the British Empire was indestructible and that it would be a good thing, although the Arabs were fighting on the side of the Allies, to have a wedge in the Arab lands. The British looked far ahead, in those days at least. Who knew who might court the Arabs? They wanted a *raison d'être* for their presence in the Holy Land. As Mr. Balfour told Sir Ronald Storrs, who in 1916 was a member of the British Agency in Cairo, when he questioned Mr. Balfour with regard to the equivocality of the Balfour Declaration—and I am paraphrasing: "Every word of it was judiciously studied for maintaining the interests of the British Empire." Where is the British Empire now? Fifty years later we are here in the midst of

this trouble. Empires will crumble, and they have crumbled, when they are not based on justice. Where is the Empire now? I should like to ask Mr. Wiggins, who is a journalist, to refresh his memory about the memoirs of a President of the United States in 1947 and read what he mentioned about the Palestine question. I do not want to repeat it now. I have repeated it chapter and verse from the rostrum of the United Nations. But Mr. Wiggins is making a case tonight, and I have to enlighten him to the best of my ability, having lived with this question for forty years. He looks a very honest and good man.

120. I do not want to repeat what Mr. Truman said in his memoirs. Successive American Governments have told me in the presence of the person who is now the Chief of State that they did not know what Mr. Truman was doing when he took that decision, without being briefed enough. He comes from the Middle West. What does he know about the Holy Land and its politics? He was skilful in the domestic politics of the United States and a great President as far as that was concerned—but what did he know about the Holy Land? He was ill-advised. Telephones were buzzing for the dissidents. Israel was created by the pressure exerted in those days by the President of the United States.

121. Successive American Governments have told me that that was a mistake. But their policy is making capital out of that mistake. Mr. Balfour once thought that the presence of a national home for the Jews might one day redound to the interest of the British Empire. I must say—and this is to the credit of the United Kingdom—that there is no empire today. For anyone who exercises world power to think that words such as "peace" or equivalent platitudes can solve the problem, there will be retribution, my dear Mr. Wiggins.

122. We have been in that area six thousand years, we Semites. Are they Semites? They have a Semitic religion and there may be more Semites—and if they are, they are our brothers. I presume you are a Christian and you have a Semitic religion but that does not make you a Semite. Those Zionists from Eastern Europe are no more Semites than you or I are Chinese.

123. You come as the arbiters—my food friend Lord Caradon and you yourself, Mr. Wiggins—of our destiny. But not of the destiny of Saudi Arabia, not of the destiny of Egypt. Egypt is one of the cradles of world civilization. Unless mankind commits suicide there will always be an Egypt, there will always be a Saudi Arabia—and I hope there will always be a United States of America. Let us not get drunk with power.

124. Now a word to my good friend Mr. Malik. I was sitting in 1947 at Lake Success when Palestine was partitioned and we were indeed taken aback when Mr. Gromyko raised his hand in favour of the partition of Palestine. But since then the Soviet Union has changed its policy. "Oh," you might say, "of course; that is for their national interests". But what are you doing yourselves? Are you not serving your national interests or are you so in love with the Zionist Jews—you Anglo-Saxons from the United States and England? I lived in your countries long enough. I know how you—not you, you are gentlemen—but how some of your people referred to the Jews or the Arabs.

They were second-class or third-class citizens. But of course attitudes have changed and we are living in an enlightened age. The Soviet Union has corrected its error. It was a mistake—at least they tell us so.

125. They serve their interests. Of course they serve their interests. Is there any State here that does not serve its interests? We have not got into a federalist world or one world; we all serve our national interests. But if they are serving their national interests, at least their national interests harmonize with the interests of the people of Palestine, who have been sadly neglected.

126. You talk as if this dispute were between Egypt and Israel, or Syria and Israel, or tiny Jordan and Israel. Well, of course it is, but it is largely due to the Palestine people having been banished from their own land. And Mr. Tekoah speaks of hatred and atrocities. Has he forgotten the massacres of Deir Yassin? I do not want to poison the atmosphere with anything that might spell hatred, because I think hatred is a disease and we should all try and see to it that we do not hate even our enemies. I hope we have no enemies. I submit that the Zionists are their own worst enemies. They chose to establish a national State in, if I may use a figure of speech, a hornet's nest.

127. There are a hundred million Arabs from the shores of the Atlantic to the confines of Iran; down to the Sudan in the heart of Africa and to the frontiers of Turkey, an area that is larger than the United States and has more resources perhaps than the United States. A hundred million people. They may bicker—ask me. They may bicker and quarrel with one another, but when it comes to the incursion of those Eastern Europeans, or for that matter any foreign element, into their midst, they become one and when they find that the Palestinians have been chased out of their land, every one of them, every Arab, becomes a Palestinian.

128. Let us not fool ourselves. Arab Governments will come and go like other Governments. The Arab people may have a psychosis—call it a psychosis—but there is no psychiatrist to treat them in the Security Council. And—I am talking figuratively—only when the pus goes from that abscess and is squeezed out will there be peace in Palestine. Mr. Tekoah takes issue with what happened on the Suez. I am not a military man. He talks about aggression against Israel. Israel as of now lies on the shores of the Suez Canal. When it was partitioned in 1947, and wrongly so, on the map it looked like a dagger with a hand. Now it has become like a bottle of ink that has been spilt over that Arab region and has spread to the Suez Canal beyond the Jordan River—and that is not the end of the story.

129. What have the Arabs done to you, my friends from the United Kingdom? I am not saying, "my friends" derisively; I am saying it because I mean it from the bottom of my heart. I lived in the United Kingdom for many years and the British are a marvellous people. And I must say that the American people are lovely people. I have not been to Russia, but I am sure that from what I have seen of the Russians that they are a big-hearted people. But what have we done to all of you that you should sit as arbiters in the Security Council, in the General Assembly, over the destiny of the Arab lands? What have we done to you? You come

here and tell us what we should do and what we should not do.

130. I am not talking from books tonight, nor did I talk from books on other nights. I am speaking from my personal experience which is drawn from the sufferings of the Palestinian people and of many Arab people. I do not come here with typed sheets of material because I have lived with it for too long. We have no hope that you will arbitrate in a way that will redound to the benefit of the Arab world although the interest of both your countries is in the Arab world. But of course the Zionists have wormed their way into your countries, into your Governments; they control the mass media of information; they are big financiers; they tip the balance of elections. You have to court them. Do not court us: for heaven's sake leave us alone. You have interests in the Arab countries. It is a wonder that your interests have not been menaced or threatened. It shows you how alert are the Governments of Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, Morocco, Lebanon, Iraq and other countries. They have restrained the people. Do not think that the people are pieces of clay in their hands. I have been receiving the young in my office in sit-ins and they have been telling me that I should work with them to overthrow my own Government because it is not doing enough to expel the invaders of Palestine. Do you think that the Governments are poisoning the people? If you want to believe Mr. Tekoah, it is your privilege. He is a Zionist; you can believe him. But it is the people who will tread upon our Governments if once and for all they do something which contravenes the aspirations of the people and what they expect to be done in order to see to it that the rights of the people of Palestine are not for ever cast by the wayside.

131. This is not the usual speech you listen to in this Council. There are a few of our friends who have suffered with us and know what it is like, such as our colleagues from Pakistan and India—Asians, Moslems and non-Moslems. They realize the position because at one time they were the victims of colonialism and this is colonialism by proxy. Why should you go and colonize if there is someone to do it for you? I feel sorry for the Jews who live in Palestine because many of them are real Semites and I feel sorry also for the non-Semitic Jews: they are human beings and we believe in the brotherhood of man. We have nothing against them as Jews. On the contrary, we have the same God. For your information, Mr. Wiggins, Jehovah was the God of the wife of Moses the Midianite from Jordan. Of course, God is invisible and in those pagan days some name had to be given to Yahweh, Jehovah. Their prophets are our prophets, but we never knew when we were young that the day would come when Eastern European Jews—or gentiles, for that matter—would come under the banner of religion to claim the land. Yet all of you tell us here—and you remind me of preachers—"All of you, you Zionists and you Arabs, should exercise self-restraint and be brothers". How can we? We cannot be brothers when the indigenous people of Palestine—forget that they are Arab; the indigenous people of Palestine, many of whom may have been Jews but became either Christian or Moslems, while some of them remained Jews—are excluded from their country.

132. You do not intimidate the Arabs by announcing that your Government is going to sell Phantoms. The Soviet

Union has a lot of sophisticated equipment also, which they will sell. If you want a conflagration, we warn you that although we would not have brought it about the Arab people will fight to the last man, from Morocco to the confines of Iran down to the Sudan, but not necessarily in pitched battles. Technologically they are weak but in spirit they are strong. There is a resilience in Arabism, which is invincible. The Arabs started in that peninsula, a very few of them, and we Arabized that whole area. Now there are 100 million of them. The British gave British passports to the Indians, but they remained Indians, and the people of the colonies remained people of the colonies. And you, my dear friend from the United States, call your country a melting-pot but you have not yet melted all the ethnic groups. We know that and we hope you will do so because there is nothing greater than the ideals of the old America. I studied in one of your universities abroad and I know what the ideals of the Americans are—the old fashioned Americans, not the hippie Americans.

133. You cannot do away with Arabism, unless of course you bring the world to an end. The British went to Africa, the French went to Africa, and so did others. They could not Frenchify or Anglicize the people in their colonies. We did not Arabize by missionary work. The people became Arab, the people of North Africa became Arab, some of the black people of the Sudan became Arab, not through missionaries or by conversion but because Arabism appeals to them and they are our brothers. We do not look at the colour of the skin, we Arabs: whether it is black, white or yellow, they are our brothers and they are all Arabs.

134. You cannot say that about America. This is still a young country. The “melting pot” has not melted every ethnic group. Nor did our friends the British succeed in Anglicizing their colonial peoples when they had the colonies.

135. Here I want to give an example, and it is addressed across the table to the representative of Israel. He said that they were there for two thousand years. What about the Red Indians who are on reservations? They were here in Manhattan. Would you allow the Red Indians to come from the reservations and say, “we should have the United States back”? Would you give it to them, just because they do not have any arms?

136. Whom are we fooling here? First of all, I proved that the religious argument is a hoax. These people are secular, just as we are. I am secular. My religion is my own concern. These people from Israel are secular. Oh, they have their fundamentalists just as every other religion has—the Orthodox Jews. We have fundamentalism in Southern Arabia, we have fundamentalists everywhere. But they are secular and they are playing on the sentiments of those poor Jews who were persecuted by Hitler, thinking that after twenty years those Palestinians in the camps will have died, and then the Arab countries will absorb them and everything will be solved.

137. And what do we find? It does not please me, because, as you said—you, the representative of the United Kingdom and the representative of the United States—there will be a lot of innocent blood shed. And I would decry it if

any Jewish blood were shed, if any Jews are killed, because they too are human beings. I am not a believer in blood. Blood is only for transfusion, not for racial determination.

138. But did we begin this whole thing? It started on 2 November, which is already the date in Europe, the date of the perfidious Balfour Declaration.

139. A fait accompli you might say. There is no fait accompli in the Fertile Crescent, in that part of Asia lying astride three continents. There is no fait accompli. Conquerors have come and conquerors have gone, and the indigenous people still remain. We have suffered a great deal throughout the centuries. So what? Let there be another spell of suffering, if man has not learned to live in peace. What shall we do? Shall we come to the Council, as I mentioned on several occasions, to deal with sanguinary events in an interminable chain, a chain that has no end? Of course we can do something. You can—instead of telling us—prevail on those whom you help usurp Palestine. You could counsel them to behave and open the door of immigration to any European Jew who would like to come, without trying to propagandize all the Jews in Christendom and elsewhere, urging them to go to Palestine and live under the banner of Zionism.

140. I am afraid those Jews who are loyal Americans are beginning to be brain-washed because of the mass media of information that the Zionists control in this country and in Western Europe. And if our friends in the Soviet Union do not watch out, they will try to brain-wash them too, for they are very capable.

141. Do we hate the Jews? No, we do not hate the Jews. I repeat and I repeat again: some of my best friends are—not were, but still are—Jews. But they are not Zionists. Anyone who wants a list of them, I can give it to him privately. I have no quarrel with the Jews. We have a quarrel with a political movement, a movement of Zionists masquerading under the banner of the noble religion which is Judaism, for political and economic ends. That is the whole story. We have to have a motivation. We thought that religious motivations were antiquated, ever since 1914. In 1914 the Allies had such slogans as “the war to save democracy”. They were fooling themselves. The Second World War was waged to gain the “four freedoms”. You have to have a slogan. What four freedoms? There is war now, in the era of the United Nations, just as there was during the time of the League of Nations. We thought we could bring an end to war.

142. We still find political arrangements being made behind the scenes. We salute coexistence between the great Powers. Sometimes we are lost, we small Powers. We do not know what that coexistence implies. One day we find them roaring at each other like two lions—but keeping a safe distance. And the “hot war”—there is no hot war amongst them, there are “hot lines”—the “hot wars” are in our area.

143. This is what is happening, Mr. Wiggins. You are a journalist; I hope you will cover that in the future in your newspapers, saying that you met a man who lived with the Palestine question for forty years and he told you what he thought about it and told your colleagues also. You may

not agree with me politically, but if you need more information you do not have to take my word for it. Lord Caradon knows about these things. He knows us Arabs, he knows us better than we know ourselves. We could claim him as an Arabist; he talks our language, he salutes me in Arabic. He knows me, but he is just a representative of his country, as we all are. What can he do?

144. You will come again here to the Council and deal with events that remind me of the tribal wars of yore: "We killed them and they killed us. They killed us and we killed them." This is what is happening in the Holy Land of Palestine, the land of Christ, the Prince of Peace.

145. I am talking of the political Zionists, not the religious Zionists. To the religious Zionists Zion is of the spirit. It is not the territorial Zion. Zion is a mountain. Although they are secular, they become fundamentalists, the political Zionists. We have no quarrel with Zion of the spirit. But these Zionists are Zionists that came from Eastern Europe in order to colonize that part of the world, with the motivation that God gave them the land. God does not give any land. People grab land. No, they grabbed it by conquest.

146. If there were no resiliency in the Arab people, I would say that they might succeed as the old pilgrims succeeded, by decimating the Red Indians. We are not Red Indians. I have a great deal of admiration for the Red Indians, for their valour and for their honour. I have read about them in the books of American authors, who were not red but white, and who were honourable and who were honest. Most of the treaties were broken by the white man, not by the Red Indians. At least honourable American authors have written about this sad episode.

147. But we are not Red Indians; we are Arabs. Ninety-eight per cent of us are Moslems and there are 600 million Moslems, or about that number, in the world. What will you do with them? Antagonize them? "Oh", you say, "religion is losing its grip." But there can be a revival of religion. And I will decry any religious war. There will be a revival of religion. Maybe there will be a revival to the good of religion, to re-establish the moral codes instead of glorifying in the ritual.

148. I come now to the item before us. I think, gentlemen, that you are wasting your time. You will probably meet and reach a consensus which will be read out by the President and will call upon the two parties to respect the cease-fire line. They are becoming like clichés, rubber stamps. You will depend on the observations of the representative of the Secretary-General, the illustrious General Odd Bull. More observers will be put here and less observers there.

149. But it will not work out. The whole Arab world is galvanized. The only solution is that the Zionists in Palestine should come to their senses—and I hope they do that, for their sake as well as our own—and relinquish that dream that they can gather the Jews of the whole world in Palestine. Let them renounce such ambitions, which really belong to the colonial days of the nineteenth century, and

look forward to an era of brotherhood with the Arabs, in which they can live in Palestine as people of the area, not under the banner of Eastern Zionism, which usurped a part of the Arab world. They are welcome there to live with us as brothers, but not under such a banner as Israel symbolizes.

150. My last word for tonight, after a lengthy day, is that we should all ponder what to do in the future. I hope members of the Council will take what I have said seriously; and if by any chance I have hurt anyone with my talk, I must assure them that it was not intended. I was speaking from my heart, from the heart of a person who has laboured for twenty-three years in this United Nations for the observance of human rights and it saddens me that human rights are nowadays trampled under foot, because there can be no observance of human rights, no respect for human rights, in any bloody conflict, or in any times of emergency.

151. So I do hope that a new approach will be devised to deal with this problem, instead of abortive meetings ending up with fruitless resolutions or a consensus that is not at all effective, not even a palliative. The Council should grapple with the situation squarely to see our point of view, instead of counselling restraint, to prevail on the Zionists, for their own good and for the good of the people of the area, to re-examine their presence in that part of the world. If they want to stay there, let them stay as part of the Middle East, like other people, without chauvinism, without any exclusive nationality, but rather, as part and parcel of a community that reveres the Holy Land because of their religious associations, without any political gain or any ulterior motive, economic or otherwise.

152. I must thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for granting me the time to speak. I apologize to you, Sir, but I knew that as the representative of a small nation you would not begrudge me the right to speak. I am also thankful to the big Powers which have not objected to these words.

153. The PRESIDENT: There are no more speakers inscribed on my list for tonight. I might therefore perhaps be allowed first to express my gratitude to all the speakers who have extended their good wishes to me for the coming month. I may perhaps be allowed in particular to express my gratitude to the representative of the United Kingdom for the generous comment he was good enough to make not only about my distinguished predecessor, but also about myself.

154. Having consulted members of the Council informally, I would venture to suggest that the Council decide to adjourn now and to reconvene on Monday afternoon, 4 November, at 3 o'clock. If that is generally acceptable, I might also urge all the members of the Council to remain available in order that the President may contact them should any development make either consultations or a meeting necessary before Monday afternoon.

The meeting rose at 11.30 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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