

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

1718th

MEETING: 7 JUNE 1973

MAR 4 1981

UN/ISA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1718)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929)	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 EIGHTEENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 7 June 1973, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Yakov MALIK
(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

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/1718)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);
 - (b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929).

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General, under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its previous meeting, I shall, with the Council's consent, invite the representatives of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Chad, the Syrian Arab Republic, Nigeria and Algeria to take part in the Council's examination of the situation in the Middle East.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Zayyat (Egypt), Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel), and Mr. A. H. Sharaf (Jordan) took places at the Council table; and Mr. J. W. S. Malecela (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. H. G. Ouangmotching (Chad), Mr. H. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. O. Arikpo (Nigeria), and Mr. A. Bouteflika (Algeria) took the places reserved for them in the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I should like to inform the members of the Security Council that, as President of the Council I have received letters from the representatives of Morocco and the United Arab Emirates requesting that their delegations be invited to take part in consideration of the agenda item before the Council at this

meeting. In accordance with established practice and the provisional rules of procedure, and with the Council's consent, I propose to invite the representatives of Morocco and the United Arab Emirates to take part, without the right to vote, in the Council's examination of the situation in the Middle East.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. Zentar (Morocco) and Mr. A. Humaidan (United Arab Emirates) took the places reserved for them in the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I invite the first speaker at today's meeting, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania, to take a place at the Council table and I give him the floor.

4. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, allow me first of all to thank you and, through you, the members of the Council for the opportunity given to my delegation to participate in the Council's deliberations on the Middle East question.

5. May I also, Mr. President, take this opportunity to extend to you the congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the current month. It is a happy coincidence that a man of your outstanding qualities and dedication, a worthy representative of a great country, should preside over the deliberations of the Council on so crucial an issue. We are confident that under your able and wise leadership the Council will arrive at the right conclusions consonant with the prevailing situation. To that end, we pledge our fullest co-operation and wish you and the Council all success.

6. I should also like to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for his untiring efforts in the service of peace. Ever since his appointment as Secretary-General he has left no stone unturned in search of peace. Be it on the Middle East or on southern Africa he has certainly exerted all his efforts. If I may say so, one thing is sure and that is that we cannot accuse the Secretary-General of not trying.

7. At its tenth ordinary session the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) was again seized of this important question of the Middle East. Certain important decisions were made at that meeting and one of those decisions was that certain Foreign Ministers, amongst whom I was honoured to be one, be designated to come and make the feelings of Africa known to this august body regarding the extremely explosive situation in the Middle East and the dangers inherent in that situation. It is in conformity with this mandate that I am now taking the floor.

8. Since the Israel aggression of 1967—and here my delegation would not like to go into the historical background—that country has continued to occupy several parts of territories belonging to independent Arab States, especially the Republic of Egypt, a founding member of OAU. It has been rightly stated that this situation is a threat to international security and that, hence, this Council must not only talk and express pious sentiments without taking firm and concrete action to dislodge the aggressor and to put right the situation brought about by that aggression. For us in Africa the situation is not only a continuing menace to the territorial integrity of Egypt, but is also a situation which we view as a direct threat to our own security.

9. Our concern with the situation in the Middle East does not spring only from the fact that an African State is a victim of aggression. It stems also from the fact that Israel has now developed an immunity to international public opinion comparable to that of the minority racist régimes in southern Africa. The international community has called on South Africa several times to withdraw from Namibia. That régime has continued to defy that call. In the same way this Organization, OAU, the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, which was held in Georgetown, Guyana, as well as Governments, institutions and individuals have called upon Israel to withdraw from Arab territories, with no favourable response from the Government of Israel. It has continued to flout world public opinion and has continued to disregard it completely. Once it painted the picture of a small country threatened with extinction. In fact when the representative of Israel spoke yesterday the same picture again was painted in this Council. Yet now it is proving itself not as a country which is threatened but as the country which is threatening others. Further, it has begun to propound and to practise aggression and expansionism and its behaviour has continued to be that of an aggressor. It has continuously committed acts of aggression against some of the Arab States and it has continued to practise its policy of expansionism by holding on to countries occupied as a result of aggression while arrogantly maintaining that it does not envisage withdrawing to the borders existing before the war of aggression in 1967. Recently it has embarked on acts of terrorism as a policy of State and these acts of terrorism have been endorsed by the highest levels of Israeli leadership.

10. This Organization cannot accept that position. It is a position which, if endorsed, will mean the endorsement of the acquisition of territories through the use of force. It is a position which if accepted will mean acceptance of aggression as a policy in international relations. It is a position which, if we endorse it, will really mean endorsing the rule of the jungle, that is, a world without law. Surely this is not what this Organization was established to defend and perpetuate.

11. Yet we have repeatedly stated these things before. We have called on Israel to withdraw from the territories it illegally occupies. We have called on it to abide by the law and to treat the people in the occupied territories in accordance with the Fourth Geneva Convention. We have called on it not to change the status of Jerusalem, we have called on it to respect the legitimate aspirations of the

Palestinian people whom it has forcibly evicted from its homeland. Lastly we have approved the appointment of the Special Representative and the initiative which he has tried to undertake under very difficult circumstances. But the result of all this is for Israel to reject one initiative after another, giving one or the other of numerous flimsy excuses. The refusal by Israel to answer the special memorandum of the Special Representative is a clear indication of the contempt with which Israel treats these efforts. It is also a clear indication of the complete contempt of the position of the Special Representative and through him the Secretary-General. That initiative of the Special Representative was indeed a step to be commended as designed to evade the deadlock which had come up at that stage of the contacts. The Government of Egypt must be commended for the prompt action it took in answering positively the questions put to it by the Special Representative. On the other hand, the Government of Israel must stand condemned for its refusal to respond to the initiatives of the Special Representative, and of course the proposals which it put up designed to perpetuate the consequences of aggression.

12. As I said before, this Organization has called for the withdrawal of the Israel forces from the occupied territories. The Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Countries in Georgetown also have called for the unconditional withdrawal of the Israelis from the occupied territories. On several occasions OAU has done the same. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU took an initiative to talk to the parties in the conflict in exercise of their duty to protect the security of Africa. That initiative was again frustrated by Israel. Israel has turned a deaf ear to all these calls and has indeed looked at all these calls with complete defiance. The international community represented by this Organization cannot and should not stand idle in the face of this defiance. It was in the light of these considerations that OAU at its summit session just concluded in Addis Ababa suggested to its members that they consider taking all measures, political and economic, against Israel if it is not going to heed the call of the international community and withdraw its troops from the occupied territories. It is, indeed, on those lines that we have come through this Council, to warn Israel that unless it heeds these international calls it will definitely be compelling OAU to take such steps.

13. This Council was designed to be an instrument of peace. It was designed to implement the decision which it took to see that peace is maintained. That decision has already been taken. The framework of peace in the Middle East has been laid down under Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Egypt has through its positive co-operation with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Jarring, demonstrated its willingness and readiness to implement that resolution, while Israel has taken a position amounting to frustration of it. Therefore it is the duty of this Council to carry out its obligation so that the United Nations may not be brought into further disrepute.

14. All States, especially those which claim to stand on the side of justice, should refrain from making it possible for Israel to enjoy the fruits of aggression. In this respect the role of certain Governments is indeed crucial. Those

Governments have constantly supplied Israel with arms and all-out support. Without that support Israel could never afford to assume the posture of arrogance and indifference to the opinion of the world community, let alone successfully carve away the Arab territories it now occupies. But with that support assured it has developed the most intolerable recalcitrance and arrogance, which must be condemned by the United Nations.

15. As we are sitting in this Council the Israeli authorities have just concluded the festivities to mark the twenty-fifth year of the founding of the State of Israel. On that occasion Israel not only commemorated its birthday but also boasted of its activities and achievements since its founding—among them being, of course, the activity of occupying Arab territories. Among the festivities staged was a mammoth military parade in Jerusalem. As the members of this Council know, that parade was held once more in flagrant defiance of Security Council resolutions 250 (1968) and 251 (1968), to which the President of the Council had drawn the attention of the Israeli Government before the parade. That parade shamelessly demonstrated and epitomized Israel's contempt for the United Nations and indeed for the entire world community.

16. It is indeed ironical that that State should have found it appropriate to commemorate its silver jubilee by an act of defiance of the decision of this Organization to which it owes its very existence. Yet we must recognize the cold fact that from its very inception Israel has sought to defy one decision of the United Nations after another. The fact that the size of present-day Israel is far larger than that of the State created under the partition plan [*General Assembly resolution 181 (II)*], because of its expansionist policies, is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that, though Israel is a product of the United Nations, that State has constantly pursued aims and policies inimical to the purposes and principles of our Organization. While one is tempted to catalogue the series of acts of defiance and violations committed by Israel before and after the 5 June hostilities, I must refrain from doing so. This is because I am convinced that such an exercise is not only unnecessary but a great waste of the time of the Council, since its members are more than familiar with the various incidents and actions. These are actions which have served to alienate the sympathy that at one time many a country had for Israel out of consideration for the sufferings inflicted on the Jewish people by the Nazis in Germany.

17. While we do not consider it necessary to give a detailed account of Israel's hostile actions against the Organization in the process of consolidating its conquests and stifling the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, it is, I submit, imperative that we draw the necessary experience and conclusions from them. Our intervention in the current debate stems from free Africa's understanding of the implications of Israel's actions and our recognition of the inherent danger of such practices in the domain of international relations. For it would be the height of folly not to recognize that, if such practices are allowed to triumph, then the world will have entered a new and highly precarious era in which an aggressive State, because of the massive support and encouragement that it receives from one or more powerful States, can play havoc with the

security and sovereignty of other States while the world body remains a passive spectator. Such an era would indeed be hazardous to the freedom and independence of the not so powerful States in the world of today. Viewed in this context, I submit, Israel's intransigence, expansionism and aggressive postures should be a subject of concern not only to the Arab and African States but indeed to the entire third world.

18. We have come to this Council not merely to express our firm and unequivocal support for and solidarity with a sister African State—the Arab Republic of Egypt—a victim of a brutal aggression perpetrated by an extracontinental State. Nor are we here simply to reiterate our indignation and concern at the continued forceful occupation of the Arab lands of Jordan and Syria or for that matter to place on record our unreserved support for the Palestinian people, who have for too long been dispossessed, oppressed and repressed but who have valiantly refused to give up the struggle for the realization of their legitimate aspirations notwithstanding the formidable might and ruthlessness of their oppressors.

19. Naturally, through our participation in the discussions of the item under consideration by the Council, we seek to make our position quite clear on these issues. But there is an even greater and more fundamental reason behind our presence here, mandated as we are by the supreme organ of our continental organization, the Organization of African Unity: this is to reaffirm our firm determination and resolve to support and strengthen the United Nations. If I may put it briefly and clearly, I would say that we, as members of OAU, have indeed all come here to strengthen the reputation of the United Nations. We are here, therefore, to render our full support to the principles and purposes of the United Nations and to this end to demand uncompromisingly that its decisions be scrupulously adhered to. For, in the final analysis, the aggressive and expansionist conduct of the Israeli authorities not only constitutes a serious threat to the freedom, peace and security of the Arab States but, above all, poses a continuing menace to the very authority and credibility of the United Nations.

20. The persistent denial of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, the consolidation of the fruits of conquest, the increasingly brutal incursions into the sovereign State of Lebanon—all these are measures undertaken with impunity by Israel in flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions—which puts into serious question the authority of this Organization.

21. Thus it is not just the Palestinians and the Arab people whose territories are under foreign occupation and who have to endure the arrogance and humiliating practices of an occupying Power: it is indeed the United Nations which is now being made to appear as a hopeless institution in the face of continuing aggression and scornful and contemptuous behaviour by the aggressor. The African people, who are already gravely concerned at the erosion of United Nations authority in dealing with the recalcitrance of the *apartheid* and colonial minority régimes in the southern part of our continent, have every reason to be more apprehensive and preoccupied at the spectacle of another

recalcitrant régime 'playing havoc with the security and independence of a North African State, in blatant disregard for the demands of the international community.

22. Free Africa, which wishes to be left alone in order to develop its resources for the well-being of its people, to eliminate the hangover of centuries of degradation and humiliation, has greater reason to expect from this Council firm and positive action designed to bring to an end the anomalous and highly dangerous situation now prevailing in the Middle East. Because, in order to develop, our continent needs peace based on the freedom of our people. And that peace is unthinkable when one of the members of our family—an older and an important one, at that—continues to be subjected to foreign occupation. That peace becomes fragile when the legitimate rights of a people to self-determination are trampled under foot. Indeed, that peace becomes Utopian when the law of the jungle is allowed to hold sway in our present day and age.

23. I have put deliberate emphasis on our expectation for firm action by this Council. For it is not sufficient to indulge in mere condemnations or strong warnings. Such courses of action may on different occasions have had momentary salutary effects for the Council if not for the victims of aggression. But, most certainly, they have not brought solution to the problem any nearer. A close study of the report of the Secretary-General [S/10929]—and here we must again pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for a well-prepared document—is an eloquent testimony to Israel's "immunity" and indeed its insensitivity to mere condemnations and warnings, however seriously couched by this Council.

24. From the June 1967 war to date, that régime has been condemned by the Council at least seven times—I repeat: at least seven times. It has also received several warnings—I repeat: several warnings—to no avail. In retrospect, some of those warnings make pathetic reading, not to speak of the fact that they make this Council perfectly ridiculous. To refresh the memories of the members of the Council, I would just like to go through some of those warnings which it has issued.

25. First, in resolution 248 (1968) of 24 March 1968, after condemning Israel for its attack against Jordan, the Council warned that repetition of such action would not be tolerated, and that it would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against the repetition of such acts.

26. Secondly, following Israel's attack against Beirut International Airport, the Council, by its resolution 262 (1968) of 31 December 1968 again warned that if such acts were repeated, it would have to consider further steps to give effect to its decisions.

27. Thirdly, subsequent to the premeditated Israeli attacks against Jordanian villages and populated areas, by resolution 265 (1969) of 1 April 1969 the Security Council again warned that if such attacks were repeated, the Council would have to consider further and more effective steps under the Charter.

28. Fourthly, following the premeditated air attacks on villages in southern Lebanon, the Council, in its resolution 270 (1969) of 26 August 1969, again warned Israel that it would have to consider further measures envisaged under the Charter to ensure against repetition of such attacks.

29. Fifthly, subsequent to the invasion of Lebanon by Israeli forces, the Council, by resolution 280 (1970) of 19 May 1970, once again warned Israel that it would consider further measures under the Charter to implement its resolutions; furthermore, a similar warning was given in resolution 316 (1972) of 26 June 1972, following further acts of aggression committed by Israel against Lebanon.

30. We ask a very sincere question: When will the Council take those "effective measures under the Charter" instead of time and again, repeating the same warning, which is really now becoming a very stale thing in the documents of the United Nations?

31. It is quite clear from the foregoing enumeration of the Council's previous decisions that this august body has not been found wanting when it comes to condemning the aggressor or, for that matter, serving an appropriate warning. Yet, as I said earlier, these condemnations and warnings make pathetic readings. For while the Security Council has proliferated its condemnations and warnings, Israel has intensified its policies of annexation and State terrorism against some of its neighbours. State terrorism has been practised in particular against innocent civilians of Lebanon. It is in that country, Lebanon, that the Israeli military seem to take immense satisfaction in perfecting their skills, and at times, ironical as it may be, with the full glamour of publicity.

32. Fulfilling the mandate entrusted by the Tenth Summit Conference of OAU, the Tanzanian delegation wishes to make an earnest appeal to the Council to take decisive measures to arrest and to terminate the trend of lawlessness and injustice in the Middle East. We call upon the Council to decide, here and now, on effective measures calculated to eliminate the consequences of the 1967 war of aggression; to restore the legitimate rights of the Palestinians, who are now compelled to live in exile in conditions of squalor and utter frustration, and to establish conditions where a just and lasting peace can prevail in that region.

33. In this connexion, we particularly expect the Council to take all appropriate measures to enforce its decisions, and if the Council warns that it will take certain measures under the Charter, we certainly expect it to take those measures instead of proliferating the warning. For the uneasy "no war, no peace" situation that now prevails in that unhappy part of the world cannot and would not endure for long. The risk of a serious conflagration whose effects none of us can escape is too obvious to be emphasized. The patience of the victims of aggression, as well as that of the dispossessed Palestinians, is increasingly running out as the arrogance of Israeli authorities continues to assume wider dimensions. Let not history record that on such a clear issue the Security Council failed to live up to its responsibilities in support of the victims of aggression and thus paved the way for an international holocaust.

34. The initiative taken by the delegation of Egypt for an over-all review by the Council of the situation in the Middle East is a very timely and commendable one. It is a clear demonstration of that country's fervent desire that a peaceful and diplomatic solution be found to eliminate the consequences of aggression and wipe out injustices in the Middle East.

35. The Security Council must respond to the challenge in search of peace and justice. Failure on the part of the Council to act, and act firmly and decisively, would inevitably have far-reaching repercussions. As one of the spokesmen mandated by the African Heads of State and government to present the position of OAU on the problem, the United Republic of Tanzania expresses its confidence that the Council will live up to its responsibility as the main organ of the world body responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. We dare not expect less.

36. Following some of the statements made in the Council yesterday we should like to outline three major things which appear to have come before the Council. In the first place, it would appear that in this Council Israel poses as a country that is seeking peace. Israel poses as a country that wants no conflict with its neighbours. But certainly when one tries to examine what Israel does with its neighbours this view cannot be maintained.

37. Secondly, it would appear, at least from the statement yesterday of the representative of Israel, that he appealed for quiet diplomacy instead of debates in the Council. Nevertheless, I think it is more than evident that six years of quiet diplomacy have not produced any tangible results. Therefore, the United Republic of Tanzania feels that, in appealing here again for quiet diplomacy, Israel is really asking the world to remain calm, to remain quiet, while Israel continues the consolidation of its aggression.

38. Thirdly, we have noted once again the statement of the representative of Israel on the question of secured boundaries. On this we must express our anxiety, because it would give an indication that the Council in actual fact is being asked to redraw the boundaries between Israel and its neighbours. We would have thought that the boundaries of Israel were marked at the time when Israel became independent under the aegis of the United Nations. Therefore, to have this theory of secured boundaries repeated again and again certainly raises anxiety for my delegation, that *ipso facto*, the Council is being asked to redraw the boundaries between Israel and its neighbours. We do hope that that will not happen.

39. Finally, let me remind the Israelis and their friends of the lessons of history. Since the days of Alexander the Great and other conquerors before and after him the loot and the rewards of conquest have always been short-lived. I repeat, they have always been short-lived. Indeed, their prestige and imperial glory have always ended in smoke. Israel may be a victor twice, or even thrice, over its Arab neighbours. Yet, if Israel persists in this present course, history will ensure that it, like other conquerors, will end in smoke. The only just course for Israel's continued survival--I repeat, the only just course for Israel's continued

survival--is its adherence to recognized norms of international behaviour, which alone can achieve for Israel the understanding and goodwill of its neighbours and the support of the community of nations, rather than relying purely on its military might.

40. May I end by saying again that the continued existence of Israel very much depends on the goodwill of the international community rather than the few guns that Israel may be able to amass.

41. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): The next speaker at today's meeting will be the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria, whom I invite to take a seat at the Council table to make his statement.

42. Mr. ARIKPO (Nigeria): Mr. President, please allow me, first of all, to congratulate you on your assumption of the office as the current President of the Security Council. Under the Charter the Security Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. As it is the firm belief of my country, Nigeria, that the Council is acting on behalf of the entire membership of the United Nations, your task at this meeting is very grave and onerous. But having regard to the very high respect in which you are held among your colleagues, and in view of your undoubted wisdom and experience, no one, in my view, is better qualified to preside over the Council on this historic occasion.

43. For the first time since November 1967 Council resolution 242 (1967) relating to the Middle East situation is being reviewed and debated in all its aspects by this most authoritative body which originally adopted it. I understand that hitherto the Council has always met to deal with incidents and infractions resulting from the violation of the resolution, but never to discuss it in its entirety. Because of the nature of the agenda of the current meeting, I believe that the outcome of the Council's deliberations will be of very profound interest to all the Member States of this Organization.

44. Secondly, Mr. President, I am very happy that you come from a country, a very great and powerful country, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with which my country has the most cordial and friendly relations. I am sure, therefore, that your country and your very good self fully understand my country's concerns and interests which have brought me here today.

45. Thirdly, I want to thank you and the other members of the Council most sincerely for the honour you have done me and my country by allowing me to participate in your deliberations. My country attaches very great importance to the current meeting because on it depends whether this intractable question, the Middle East situation, will continue to be an agenda item of the United Nations or whether the parties directly concerned should resolve it by themselves through force of arms, as is becoming increasingly inevitable--a prospect that we must all dread to contemplate.

46. Since 1967, Nigeria has not participated in the Council debates on the Middle East situation. That has been due

mainly to an act of self-restraint on our part—an act dictated by two considerations. Throughout 1967 Nigeria was a member of the Council. When the dark ominous clouds were gathering over that region, so dear to the hearts of all Nigerians, and the Council seemed helpless to prevent the impending war, Nigeria was one of those countries which worked honestly and tirelessly to prevent it from becoming a total catastrophe. And when the war did take place Nigeria also actively participated in all the meetings and efforts that led to the cease-fire resolutions and subsequently to the adoption of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. We are therefore not really tenderfeet in this matter. We know its delicate intricacies and difficulties and we fully appreciate that a problem so conditioned in all its essential dimensions by human factors is not easy of solution.

47. We had hoped that since nearly all the parties concerned, at least the major ones, had accepted resolution 242 (1967), every effort would be made by them to secure its successful implementation. For the resolution not only dealt with the immediate effects of the June 1967 hostilities but also provided a viable basis for a peaceful settlement of all the aspects of the Middle East situation. That hope was strengthened by the fact that we had good relations with all the parties concerned and therefore had no cause to doubt their sincerity of purpose nor our good offices service to them.

48. I come here today deeply troubled that, after six years of patient waiting, six years that have been marked by some of the most horrifying tragedies and terrorism in human history, no satisfactory progress has so far been made to achieve peace in the Middle East. I am all the more disturbed by this lack of progress after reading the report of the Secretary-General [S/10929] of 18 May 1973, together with all its annexes, and after recalling the resolutions of the General Assembly of 1970 and 1972 which were adopted on the same matter in the strong belief that a just and lasting peace could be established in the Middle East in accordance with Council resolution 242 (1967).

49. The Secretary-General's report is very instructive from the point of view of the facts it contains. But it carries a budding seed of despair, judging by its record of Israeli policy that is tantamount to despoliation and defiance of the several resolutions adopted by the Security Council, the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies. The report, which is a serious, objective and detailed account of what has transpired in the Middle East since June 1967, is a document worth commending for close study by all the States Members of the United Nations, particularly the small, powerless ones. For its lesson is self-evident. If international peace and security are going to be based on the principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, to which all Member States, large and small, have voluntarily adhered, then parties to disputes brought before it should be willing to avail themselves of its legitimate efforts and institutions to resolve them. Otherwise, there is no future for the small, powerless countries. That was why I found the reaffirmation of Mr. El-Zayyat, the Foreign Minister of Egypt, of his country's loyalty to the United Nations yesterday most moving. That loyalty is, in fact, evidenced by the account given by the Secretary-General in

his report that Egypt has so far accepted all the resolutions of the United Nations organs with respect to the situation and that it has also given a positive response to Ambassador Jarring's aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 [S/10403, annex I].

50. My country, Nigeria, and indeed Africa, has been very concerned with the situation in the Middle East in general and, in particular, with the continued occupation of part of the territory of Egypt, an African homeland, since June 1967. As a result, OAU has at the highest level and on several occasions passed resolutions reaffirming its support of resolution 242 (1967) and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations with a view, on the one hand, to arresting the deterioration of the situation, a situation which naturally threatens the security, integrity and unity of the African continent, and, on the other, to preventing the *status quo* from leading to another shooting war between the Arab States and Israel.

51. There have been enough wars in this world. We could do with an era of peace. Hence the unprecedented effort on the part of OAU to reactivate the Jarring mission in 1971. A summation of our continental effort is contained in paragraphs 95 and 96 of the Secretary-General's report. My Head of State, General Yakubu Gowon, was privileged to participate in two trips in pursuance of the OAU peace mission to the Middle East in 1971. Paragraph 96 of the Secretary-General's report, which contains the kernel of the outcome of the mission, read as follows:

"The mission noted certain positive elements in the replies it had received from the two Governments. Both parties had renewed their acceptance of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and were ready to resume indirect negotiations under the auspices of Ambassador Jarring. The mission came to the conclusion that the success of renewed negotiations could be regarded as assured, if the practical application of the concept of secure and recognized boundaries did not oblige Egypt to alienate part of its national territory and that it was necessary to obtain Israel's agreement to the putting into effect (without territorial annexation) of arrangements offering sufficient guarantees to ensure its security."

52. During its twenty-sixth session the General Assembly took into account the report of the ten African Heads of State and Government who, acting on an OAU mandate, tried to assist both Egypt, an African country, and Israel, a country with which many African countries have continually had friendly relations, to come to an amicable settlement. In the end, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2799 (XXVI), paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 of which read as follows:

[The speaker read out paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 of the resolution.]

The General Assembly also invited the parties to the Middle East conflict to give their full co-operation to the Special Representative in order to work out practical solutions to the vital outstanding issues.

53. Since then, as the Secretary-General said yesterday, the report shows that, "great efforts but little progress" has

been made as regards peace in the Middle East [1717th meeting, para. 16]. One is tempted to ask: Why? Because Israel seems unprepared to consider any alternative for securing its boundaries other than by the territorial acquisition of its neighbour's lands. Surely, no boundary can be secure unless the communities it separates accept it as such and agree to respect it and to live peaceably together side by side.

54. As if in anticipation of the Secretary-General's assessment of the situation, the Heads of State and Government of 41 independent African countries who met in May 1973 in Addis Ababa, partly to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the founding of OAU and partly to seek solutions to problems confronting Africa, were anxiously seized of the continued occupation by Israel of part of the territory of the Arab Republic of Egypt. Whereupon, the Assembly of African Heads of State and Government, representatives of all 41 independent African States, unanimously adopted a resolution¹ which noted with deep concern that, despite the numerous resolutions of OAU and the United Nations calling upon Israel to withdraw from all occupied African and Arab territories, Israel not only persisted in refusing to implement those resolutions but also continued to practice a policy of intimidation "with a view to creating in the said territories a state of fait accompli aimed at serving its expansionist designs". The resolution went on further to deplore the systematic obstruction by Israel of all the efforts exerted to reach a peaceful solution to the problem at both the international and the African levels and to recall in that respect the negative attitude of Israel towards the 1971 mission of the ten African Heads of State mandated by OAU to work for the implementation of resolution 242 (1967), which stipulated in particular the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories in conformity with the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force.

55. Noting further with satisfaction that Egypt had spared no effort to reach a just and durable solution of the problem, and that these efforts were already characterized by the constructive co-operation of Egypt with international as well as African forums, the resolution went on to state:

[The speaker read out the text of paragraphs 2 to 9 of OAU resolution AHG/Res. 70 (X).]

56. Mr. President, with your permission, I wish formally to present a little later, for the Council's perusal and for circulation to States Members of the United Nations, the full text of the resolution which the Assembly of the Heads of State and Government of OAU recently adopted on the matter. It is in the context of this resolution that my colleagues from Chad, the United Republic of Tanzania, Guinea, Algeria, Kenya, the Sudan and I are here today as spokesmen of Africa on this matter. We have come to demonstrate our solidarity with the United Nations and our faith in its resolutions. We have come to plead humbly that every effort should be made to implement the resolutions which you adopt here in the Security Council, particularly

¹ Resolution AHG/Res.70 (X), subsequently issued in document S/10943.

resolution 242 (1967). Being small and powerless countries, we have come to declare solemnly that in this age of mindless violence it is high time that morality and law take precedence over arms. Being small and powerless countries, we have come to say that we shall always keep an open mind to all possibilities of peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Being small and powerless countries, we may not be able to influence the course of momentous world events—at least not now. But in the spirit of goodwill and solidarity, a spirit in which Africa has frequently related to Israel, we wish to appeal through you, Mr. President, to the friendly State of Israel to pay more heed to the resolutions of the United Nations and to show some consideration for the legitimate concerns of Africa. We may not count for much individually; but, in the aggregate, it is in the interest of the friendly State of Israel that it does not force us to adopt measures which, in the final analysis, will not promote its cause for friendship and understanding in Africa. That is the message that the Heads of State and Government of 41 African States have mandated us to deliver to the Council at this current series of meetings.

57. Deeply conscious of Articles 2 and 25 of the Charter of the United Nations, we, the representatives of Africa, are confident that at the end of your present deliberations you will be able to answer some of the questions which the Foreign Minister of the Arab Republic of Egypt put to you yesterday in the name of justice and peace. Otherwise, the future does not look too bright either for the Middle East or for the United Nations itself.

58. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I thank the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria, who is representing the Organization of African Unity at this meeting, for his statement and for all the kind words which he addressed to my country. I fully share his opinion that friendly relations, mutual understanding and co-operation really exist and are developing between the Soviet Union and Nigeria, just as they are between the Soviet Union and the overwhelming majority of the countries of Africa.

59. In the Ministry of Foreign Affairs it was my honour to be concerned for almost eight years with the relations of the Soviet Union with the countries of Africa and I have every reason to express great satisfaction that the relations between the USSR and Africa are developing in terms of friendship, mutual understanding and universal co-operation.

60. As to the request of the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria concerning the circulation of the resolution of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, I will ask the Secretary-General to instruct the Secretariat to issue this document as an official document of the Security Council and to circulate it to all 132 States Members of the United Nations [see S/10943]. This will be a very useful measure. States Members of the United Nations will have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the demands, the wishes and, if I may put it this way, the voice of Africa, which sounds forth in our time as a weighty, important and constructive voice seeking to achieve the noble purposes of the United Nations in the strengthening of peace and international security and the

development of friendship and co-operation among peoples—to achieve these noble ideals embodied in the United Nations Charter.

61. The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic is next on the list of speakers for today's meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

62. Mr. KELANI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I am extremely grateful to you and also to members of the Council for having allowed my delegation to participate in this debate on the situation in the Middle East. However, before going on to that matter itself, may I be allowed to say how gratified my delegation is to see you assume the presidency of the Security Council during this month, a post for which you are eminently qualified. We are also extremely pleased at the close co-operation that exists between our two countries and our two delegations and we know that your own qualifications as a statesman and your concern for justice will continue to be placed at the service of peace.

63. The matter before the Council today is a matter of principle, one which touches the very foundations of the United Nations. The usurpation of the Palestinian homeland continues. The Zionist aggressor occupies by force territories belonging to three Member States and continues to develop its annexationist intentions. Is the Security Council ready to exercise its powers once and for all to put an end to this situation or is it, through inertia, to continue to tolerate acts accomplished by force?

64. At the very root of the Arab-Israeli conflict lies the problem of the Palestinians. The Arab Palestinian people were expelled by force from their homeland. A Zionist State was artificially created and upheld by imperialist States under the leadership of the United States, and it immediately revealed its aggressive and expansionist nature.

65. Peace has escaped the Middle East only because of the very origin of the crisis. Efforts were made to deprive the Palestinian Arab people of its inalienable right to self-determination, a right that was proclaimed as one of the fundamental rights of the Charter, in fact in Article 1 of that document, and then these people were made refugees or second or third class citizens and placed under the Zionist colonial and racist yoke.

66. Since 1921, the date on which the British Mandate was imposed on them under the pretext of a "sacred mission", and up until the present time the history of these Palestinians has been a history of a constant heroic struggle to regain their sacred national rights.

67. The immigration of foreign settlers followed. It also laid the groundwork to destroy the Arab society of the Palestinians, Christians and Moslems and to replace them by a society of transplanted Jews, a foreign body politic.

68. Neither the Balfour Declaration of 1917 nor the General Assembly resolution on the partition of Palestine in 1947 can deprive the Palestinian people of its sovereignty and grant it to that alien group of settlers.

69. The Palestinian Arab people never gave up its national rights over its own country. The usurpation of its territories and the illegal acquisitions by force that followed still stand as one of the flagrant violations of international law. They exist due to the force upheld by imperialism. But they are by their very essence lawless.

70. The main Zionist claim, based on "the right of the Jews to Palestine" is only a legal absurdity. It cannot create sovereignty over a territory that does not belong to them and has not belonged to them for over 20 centuries, a territory where the Jews constituted only one twelfth of the population. If the principle of a territorial claim after more than 20 centuries was to be recognized as valid the entire world would be turned topsy-turvy.

71. The architects of the partition of Palestine in 1947 hoped that time would lead to the forgetting of injustice. But three wars, the last of which almost drew the world into the abyss, were sufficient proof of the fact that no solution of the Palestine problem not in harmony with law and justice could possibly lead to peace in that region.

72. The refusal of the Arab world to accept that fate for Palestine and its people is the refusal to allow injustice and illegality. The Israel-Arab conflict cannot be solved until the problem of Palestine has been settled, and that on the basis of the restoration of the national rights of the Palestinian people.

73. In the course of its brief existence Israel, under the pretext of assuring its security, has been guilty of armed aggression against the neighbouring Arab States. Far from respecting the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of which it is one of the creations, Israel has led a small minority of Powers that constantly violate and disobey the Charter. In this conspiracy against international law the complicity of the United States has been clearly established. Due to military, economic, political and diplomatic support which it offers Israel, it is encouraging it to commit these crimes against the Palestinians and the Arabs in general, to consolidate its occupation and to take no heed of the decisions of the Security Council or of the General Assembly. In advance they offer Israel overt assurances against any punitive measures by either giving it assistance or threatening to use the veto in order to paralyse the Council in the adoption of any effective measures. When last September the United States did in fact veto a draft resolution that was a simple appeal for a cessation of military operations, a new phase in the escalation of the conflict was started. Its encouragement of Israel became more active, more direct. In fact it stimulated Israel to intensify its aggression with impunity and assured Israel of "overwhelming military superiority over its enemy". Thus the United States proclaimed itself at one with Israel in its animosity against the Arabs, against Syria in particular, and against the Palestinian people.

74. Yet the United States constantly speaks of impartiality. Did it at least ask Israel about the fact that money it had given Israel was used to create colonies of immigrants in the occupied territories? Is this not unquestionable evidence of annexation? If Israel were truly respecting the resolutions of the United Nations, what happened to

resolution 236 (1967), adopted by the Security Council on 11 June 1967, enjoining Israel in terms leaving room for no doubts to return to the lines from which it had launched its aggression against Syria? Why is it consolidating its occupation in the Golan Heights by building colonies one after the other, as it has done in all the other occupied territories? What ties does it envisage between peace and the establishment of these colonies, such as Ramat Magshirim, Nahal Al, Neot Golan, Mero Chama, Givat Yoav, Ramot, Kfar Ginar, Bnei Yehuda, Ramat Shalom, Nor, Hispin—and I am mentioning only those that are on the Golan Heights? What has become of the official United States declarations regarding respect for the territorial integrity of the countries of the region? What is its exact attitude regarding the illegal acquisition of territories by force?

75. I do not intend once again to rehearse the long inventory of Israeli aggressions, which have been almost uninterrupted since 1948; nor shall I dwell on the sufferings of the Palestinian Arabs expelled from their homes or on the ravages that have been inflicted on the neighbouring Arab countries.

76. One need only examine the frequent condemnations, the numerous resolutions adopted by the Security Council to be aware of the frequency of these aggressions and of Israel's contempt for all the resolutions of the United Nations. No other challenge to the international community and the universal conscience has been as flagrant, as arrogant and as unpunished.

77. Therefore the Council can only pronounce itself on the specific situation. If the acquisition of territories by force is admissible, the United Nations has lost its *raison d'être*; if not, the Security Council must adopt the necessary measures to redress the situation.

78. Israel's attitude is well known. Its leaders announce aloud that their armed forces will never return to the 4 June 1967 lines and that they wish substantially to modify those lines. What is meant by that? Does it mean annexation or not? Let them tell the Council what they mean. Let their partners and their protectors shed some light on the matter for the benefit of the Council.

79. If we give them what they want, we shall be digging the grave of this Organization and crushing the hopes, placed in the Organization, that humanity would be saved from the scourge of war and that the law would prevail. The independence and sovereignty of all the small nations will be at stake; the international community as such will no longer exist, and its place will be taken by the law of the jungle.

80. Thus peace and security in our region are threatened by these two factors: the expansionist policy systematically practised by Israel, on the basis of military aggression, as attested to by the annals and the records of the United Nations; and the tragedy of the Palestinian people, the majority of whom have for a quarter of a century been living in camps far from their own homes, far from their native land, living on international charity doled out to them sparingly despite their inalienable right to return to

their homes, to regain their own possessions and to resume their old existence, a right recognized in more than one resolution of the United Nations. This problem has never ceased to exist, in the manifestations of life in the region, and on the humanitarian, political, economic and international levels. The problem will continue as long as the world conscience and international efforts fail to influence Israel. Injustice engenders revolt, and the revolt of peoples and nations is a symptom of the waning of the international system and of the deterioration of world peace.

81. The Arab people is today the victim of an operation of extermination whose scope goes beyond the operation of the Nazis. In fact this is a two-fold colonialist experiment, intended to suppress the very existence of the Arab people and to subject the survivors to direct colonial domination.

82. The same colonialist logic which from the outset held that the expulsion of the Palestinians was inevitable has also created another Zionist imperative: that is, that the Palestinians ousted from their homeland must never return to it. The rationale behind this inflexible Israeli policy was stated undisguisedly by General Moshe Dayan when he admitted that "economically the refugees could be absorbed" but, nevertheless, categorically rejected the return of the displaced Palestinians as not being "in accordance with our aims". He explained, "This would make Israel a binational State or a poly-Arab-Jewish State, instead of a Jewish State—and" he went on, "we want a Jewish State."

83. The apologists for the Zionists consider that the Palestinians became refugees only because they resisted and that, having resisted and failed, they lost their right to return to their homes and to their homeland. But that is a morally and historically fallacious argument. In fact, the sole choice open to the Palestinians from the outset, according to Zionist logic, was to become willing refugees or to become refugees by force. Furthermore, how absurd it is to contend that any effort to defend one's natural right is sufficient ground for being deprived of it. That is tantamount to saying that any unarmed owner of something, if attacked or mugged, must be dispossessed of his rights and deprived of his property. Such a principle has never been accepted by the United Nations.

84. Shortly after the forced exodus of the refugees in 1948 the General Assembly recognized their right to return to their homes or be compensated. That recognition has been upheld and restated in 24 formal resolutions adopted by the General Assembly since 1948.

85. Subsequent expulsions of smaller groups of refugees beyond and out of the "demilitarized zones" since 1950—these were known as "intermediate refugees"—were always followed by Security Council resolutions calling for their return as soon as possible.

86. In 1967 a larger number of refugees—the new refugees—were the subject of debate in six organs of the United Nations, which called for their immediate repatriation in 17 resolutions.

87. The treatment of the population of the territories occupied by Israel since 1967 has also been covered in 10 formal condemnations by the international community.

88. Five international organs have called for international inquiries regarding the acts of the Israelis in the occupied territories, and two Committees specially set up for the purpose, one by the General Assembly and the other by the Commission on Human Rights, are at present working on the matter; but thus far, because of the refusal of Israel to allow them access to the occupied territories, the efforts of the Organization have been unsuccessful.

89. But that attitude should not surprise us. Israel's denial of the right of the Palestinians, its repressive practices in the occupied territories, and its sabotaging of international inquiries lie at the very roots of Zionist expansion.

90. If it is true that the United Nations has constantly condemned Israel's persistent contempt for the numerous international assurances given to the Palestinian people, it is equally true that this disapprobation on the part of the international community will be futile as long as it is not accompanied by corrective action. But the will to adopt such measures has not been evident.

91. The debates of the United Nations from the summer of 1967 to the present time have dealt exclusively with the withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied territory; but, having achieved its main political goal of creating a State, having achieved the majority—though not all—of its territorial objectives, and having in the present circumstances done as much as it could to obtain its demographic objectives by reducing the number of indigenous Palestinians under its jurisdiction to controllable proportions and gathering together the Jews of the world in the land which it had conquered, Israel states that it is now ready for "peace". But this is a peace intended to guarantee to Israel the enjoyment of its gains and to legitimize the faits accomplis achieved by the force of arms.

92. What, then, is this peace that the leaders of Israel profess? Is it peace dictated by aggression? Is it peace based on annexation? Is it the peace of Deir Yassin and other monstrous massacres? Is it peace based on an out-and-out denial of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people? What peace? And what trust can anybody place in the words of the Israeli leaders when they are refuted by the threatening declarations of their military or militarist leaders?

93. We want peace in our region, because that is an imperative condition if we are to safeguard our civilization and continue the progress we have already begun to make. In fact, all our plans for collective security are defensive in nature—defensive against any armed surprise attack by Israel against all or any part of our territory. However, the Israelis continue to adduce fallacious arguments that are completely beside the point in order to justify their military occupation and their persistent refusal to withdraw from the territories that they conquered by aggression. They contend that withdrawal without sufficient guarantees of what they refer to as the future peace and security of the region would be unacceptable.

94. But what is the main threat to peace and security in the region? What has been the constant source of upheaval and instability and the cause of frequent conflicts? What are the true guarantees of future peace? For many years the people of the region lived in peace and tranquillity. It is only during the past 25 years that the world has seen these great dangers to universal peace and security as a result of the situation created in the Middle East.

95. I have repeatedly stated the position of my Government. It is based on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, on the rules of international law and on the tenets of justice and equity. At this stage I should like to sum up what my Government and people expect from the Security Council.

96. An end must be put to Israeli aggression. The consequences of that aggression must be liquidated, beginning with the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Israeli forces from all the occupied territories. The right of the Palestinian people to their land, to their country, and to the free exercise of their right to self-determination must be recognized. This could lead to constructive results; it could create a climate conducive to progress towards a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

97. As long as the Arab people of Palestine and their inalienable rights are not recognized by Israel, we shall never progress towards peace; we shall only be following a mirage. But we will reject any conditions or any resolution based upon an invasion. We urge you to remove all traces of the aggression. Any solution that might perpetuate the occupation of our country must be categorically rejected by us, because we consider that such a solution would mean only one thing, namely, yielding to the logic of force and conquest, and that is a course that we firmly refuse to follow.

98. The United Nations must confront a situation of a historic and inevitable nature. But the problem is not only an Arab problem. The problem affects any individual of the international community whose country might, one day or another, become the victim of an invasion. To do away with the results of aggression, to punish the aggressors, spells a victory for the international Organization, for the principles of the United Nations and for all the great and noble human values.

99. The moment of truth has arrived. What will the Security Council do regarding this grave and explosive situation now confronting it? First of all, it must be recognized that the territories of three Members of the United Nations have been deliberately violated, with premeditation, by another State represented here. The troops of this last State today stand on the soil of those first three countries. Therefore, the aggressor must immediately be obliged to withdraw to the lines it occupied before the 5 June attack. To allow Israel to preserve what it conquered will be tantamount to allowing the aggressor to make use and to enjoy the fruits of its aggression as a bargaining point in order to achieve the objectives for which it unleashed the war in the first place. It would be immoral and it is intolerable. Another danger inherent in such political blackmail is that as long as Israel remains in possession of these lands it will continue its aggression.

100. We are here to express our trust in the international conscience represented by the Security Council, the United Nations organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. Our Arab people, together with all the peoples of small peace-loving countries throughout the world, consider these meetings as our last hope to see right, reason and justice triumph over the law of the jungle, the law of conquest, and the logic of force.

101. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Somalia requesting that the delegation of Somalia take part in consideration of the question now before the Council. In accordance with the usual practice and with the consent of members of the Council, I propose to invite the representative of Somalia to take part, without the right to vote, in the consideration of this question.

102. Since there are no objections, I invite the representative of Somalia to take a place at the side of the Council Chamber, on the understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when his turn comes to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. H. Nur Elmi (Somalia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

103. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I call on the representative of Israel to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

104. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Egypt's Minister for Foreign Affairs asked yesterday that the Security Council change resolution 242 (1967), and in particular to replace the establishment in agreement between the parties of secure and recognized boundaries by the Egyptian diktat to restore the insecure provisional old line of 1967; and to replace the call for a just settlement of the refugee problem, which appears in resolution 242 (1967), by a provision referring to the so-called Palestinian rights, implying in effect, as we heard yesterday, the dismemberment of Jordan, a State Member of the United Nations.

105. Mr. El-Zayyat said that he does not seek a verbal victory. He would unquestionably obtain at least that were the Security Council to accede to his demands. There is no doubt that a change in the substance or interpretation of resolution 242 (1967), if it were allowed to pass, would earn some headlines. However, it would also create a complete void in the United Nations framework as far as the Middle East situation is concerned, with resolution 242 (1967), the only basis for United Nations efforts acceptable to both parties, shattered and gone. For all we know, the Foreign Minister of Egypt may wish to take such a vacuum back home with him.

106. If that were the outcome of the Security Council's debate, not all avenues to peace would of course be closed. The absence of any common basis for United Nations activities might in fact hasten the negotiating process outside the United Nations. And the experience with international problems in other parts of the world has

proved that this is the most effective way of settling conflicts. Indeed, the Foreign Minister of Egypt would be welcome in Jerusalem for peace negotiations. Such exchanges would doubtlessly be more fruitful than exchanges of acrimony in the Security Council debates.

107. The indispensability of establishing secure and recognized boundaries, and not restoring the chaos and peril of the old military lines, has been convincingly demonstrated today by the appearance of the Syrian representative. The Syrian statement confirmed Syria's unequivocal denial of Israel's right to exist as a sovereign State and Syria's rejection of any notion of peace with Israel.

108. This is of course not new. The State which has used today the facilities of the Security Council to broadcast over the entire world its voice of war, a voice of barbaric terrorist outrages and of suppression of human rights of the hapless Jewish community of Syria, has openly rejected Security Council resolution 242 (1967), the basis for peace-making efforts in the Middle East, and barred all contact with the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative.

109. Syria has time and again declared that its objective is to destroy Israel. Thus the President of Syria stated a few years ago:

"We say: We shall never call for, nor accept peace. We shall only accept war . . . We have resolved to drench this land with our blood, to oust you, aggressors, and throw you into the sea for good."

I submit that the appearance in the Security Council debate of a State which openly strives to annihilate another Member State of the United Nations is a travesty of international law and of the United Nations Charter and a disgrace to this Organization. In any case, Israel cannot take lightheartedly Syria's attitude as Syria is Israel's neighbour. Syria, whose proclaimed aim is Israel's liquidation, is about to enter a federation union with Egypt. Moreover, Egypt's own attitude, as indicated by me yesterday, is not free from similar overtones.

110. Yesterday afternoon, a spokesman of the Egyptian Permanent Mission explained that Minister El-Zayyat's remark to the Security Council to the effect that Egypt is ready for talks with Israel without pre-conditions should be considered merely as a rhetorical point. Should more significance, then, be attributed to other seemingly positive points—for example, even to the declaration that Egypt has accepted the central obligation of resolution 242 (1967): to conclude a peace agreement with Israel? Was that declaration made really in a sincere desire to establish genuine peace, or was it also only for tactical propaganda reasons?

111. In a statement to the People's Assembly in Cairo on 12 February 1973, Egypt's Foreign Minister explained:

"We must realize the true dimension of the battle that we are now experiencing and that began before we elected Al-Sadat President of this Republic, before Israel attacked Egypt in 1967 and before the outbreak of the revolution in 1952. Egypt wrested from Israel its most important

weapon in the propaganda field when it answered in the affirmative to Jarring's aide-mémoire of February 1971."

112. The present battle, the Egyptian Parliament was thus told, is the same that has been waged against Israel for 25 years. Egypt's affirmative answer to Jarring's aide-mémoire should be viewed as part of the propaganda contest with Israel. That attitude could in fact have been discerned from the very first, because only 10 days after Egypt's reply to the Jarring aide-mémoire Hassanin Heykal, President Sadat's close confidant and adviser, wrote:

"There are only two specific Arab goals at this stage: one, elimination of the consequences of the 1967 aggression through Israel's withdrawal from all the lands it occupied that year; and two, elimination of the consequences of the 1948 aggression through the eradication of Israel."

113. President Sadat stated on 17 February 1972:

"Israel is a foreign limb which has been forced on to the body of the Arab nation and this body rejects it. Nor do we have the right to compel the Palestinian people to accept the Security Council resolution because the land is their land, both those areas occupied in 1948 and the remainder of Palestine occupied in 1967."

114. On 17 May 1973 Minister El-Zayyat declared to German newsmen, in a programme recorded for Radio Free Berlin:

"Egypt demanded only that Israel withdraw to the borders of Palestine since this would also put the Palestine problem proper into its natural context. To Egypt this is not in contrast to the Palestinians who demand the dissolution of the State of Israel."

We heard echoes of that attitude in the statement made yesterday by Egypt's Foreign Minister.

115. In the light of this, Egypt's refusal to negotiate with Israel appears not only as a rejection of the method of quiet diplomacy, a rejection of the method of dialogue—a method never tried before, the only method that could bring about agreement with Israel—but as a reflection of Egypt's denial of Israel's fundamental rights as an independent State. Indeed, as Prime Minister Golda Meir wrote in the quarterly review *Foreign Affairs* of April 1973:

"The heart of the problem is what caused the Six-Day War, not the territories administered by Israel after the war. Simply put, the root issue is the Arab attitude to Israel's very existence and security. Once the Arab countries accept the legitimacy of Israel, as we have always accepted theirs, there is no reason for their intransigence against negotiating the differences between us. In this connexion, let me state as firmly as I can that Israel's insistence on negotiations, direct or indirect, is not a manoeuvre devised to bait our Arab enemies. The vehement refusal of the Arab leaders to discuss with us the terms of a peace settlement must raise the question as to whether they are really prepared to live in peace with us. This is the crux of the conflict."

Unless the crux of the conflict is taken into consideration, there can hardly be a constructive examination of the problem.

116. References have been made to anti-Israeli resolutions adopted in various international organs by virtue of the numerical superiority of the Arab States, resolutions which ignore Israel's basic rights and legitimate views and interests. Indeed, on the one hand there are the unbalanced resolutions reflecting the partisan and ephemeral views of their supporters; on the other, there are, however, the precepts of international law and morality applicable to all nations at all times. Israel will insist that the conduct of Arab States towards it be based on the fundamental principles of international law and of the United Nations Charter and not on political texts which testify merely to the fact that the State of Israel is outnumbered by its opponents.

117. This condition is not new. We have lived with it throughout the ages. We have always been small in number. That has never weakened our determination to survive. Our deprecators have always been many, but that has never shaken our faith. There is no solitude when justice and history are with us. The knowledge of the basic righteousness of the Jewish people's struggle to remain alive, to preserve its civilization and to restore its sovereignty has always given us the strength to be few in the midst of many. And so it is today.

118. Our struggle to exist has not ended. Israel has never menaced Egypt's existence, but since 1948 Egypt has openly fought against Israel's right to be. Israel's experience since independence does not permit it to disregard that fact. Too many of our young men have given their lives because Arab States try to deprive Israel of its independence. Too many of our children have been killed because Egypt did not want them to be free. Egypt would have the world disregard everything except a line drawn through a desert—a line which in the 1949 Armistice Agreement Israel and Egypt agreed was "not to be construed in any sense as a political or territorial boundary, and is delineated without prejudice to rights, claims and positions of either party to the Armistice as regards ultimate settlement".² Egypt bases its case on the alleged sanctity of that line. Israel bases its case on the sanctity of human life, on the right of the Israeli people to exist, on the need to ensure that the Arab States abandon their desire to destroy it, on the obligation to try to free future generations from the necessity to fight endless wars of survival.

119. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

120. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): I owe it to my colleagues the Foreign Ministers of the United Republic of Tanzania and Nigeria to say how deeply and sincerely I was moved by their statements. I should like to explain to my colleague from the United Republic of Tanzania why in my statement I avoided mentioning the Council's earlier warnings

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 3.*

that it would have to take measures under the Charter to put an end to Israel's aggressions and attacks. I did not do so because I have not flown over mountains and seas to come here and try just to assert rights or ask for measures which I know beforehand will be blocked. I have tried to search not only for what is right but also for what is pragmatically possible. For the situation is so dangerous, so historical—indeed we feel we are carrying the burdens of millions of people, their future and their destiny—that in all humility my voice has to be as low as possible. However, I assure Africa of my appreciation, appreciation that will never be forgotten—not by me, not by my Government, not by the people of Egypt, and not by all those Africans who have long suffered and are now emerging to take the position which is theirs. The voice of these 41 States is still ringing in my ears, and I hope in yours also, and it will have its effect.

121. Yesterday I heard a sentence about distortion by misquotation. Today I have heard a whole exercise in how it is done. I needed that, because yesterday in this Council, in this chamber, I said—and thank God there is a verbatim record—that it is within the framework of the United Nations that we put our case. I then said: "Egypt accepts to have any talks without prior conditions. But do not let us be fooled." [1717th meeting, para. 46.] Two prior conditions are laid down by Israel. If they remove them, then this statement will be true. First, Israel has officially notified you, the Council, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, through Ambassador Jarring, that it will not withdraw to the pre-5 June boundaries: to wit, it will have to take a part of Egypt and a part of Syria and a part of Jordan. That, I said yesterday, is one pre-condition. I also said—and this can be checked in the verbatim record—that another pre-condition is the pre-condition of occupation. Then followed my statement that even if an agreement were obtained under occupation it would be obtained under duress and would be null and void. I am now saying that again. It is being said by all members of my mission; they have said it in the past, and we say it again. Without these pre-conditions, the road within the framework of the United Nations is open for peace.

122. If I have hurt someone by showing that the slogans with which he was fighting were taken from him, if this allegation that Israel is ready for negotiations without pre-conditions is shown to be only a way of deceiving people and trying to cast shadows upon people's thinking—if that now has been shown in its complete truth, then I have no apologies to make to anyone. But I should like to repeat here again, with all the feelings of responsibility which I hope everyone around this table will share, the three points I should like to leave with this Council.

123. First, we have accepted and we accept all United Nations resolutions pertinent to the so-called question of the Middle East, including the resolutions on Jerusalem, on the rights of the Palestinians and on the ways to try to find peace on the basis, as suggested now, of the Charter and the principles of international law.

124. By the way, I put a request to the President yesterday which perhaps he has forgotten. I asked the President whether he could ask the representative of Israel

what Israel thinks of the principle of the non-acquisition of territories by force, that is, of any territories, small or large. Perhaps we can establish now what Israel can or cannot claim under that principle.

125. We say that we have accepted and do accept all the resolutions of the United Nations. If those resolutions mean ending the occupation and usurpation of territories by force, then that is the way to free the will of those who are under occupation, so that they can be valid interlocutors with the United Nations.

126. Secondly, I have, modestly I think, requested that no obstacles be put in that path, either positive or negative—that is, positive obstacles by commission or negative obstacles by omission. One obstacle would be the establishment of the so-called new facts by Israel in the occupied territories. That is an obstacle to any solution. A second obstacle to peace would be providing the aggressor, the occupier, with the means to sustain its occupation. I do not want to appear fussy, but I say that the United States Government has never really asked the people of the United States whether or not they want to underwrite and guarantee the conquests made by Israel. A third obstacle—that is, the negative one—would be the failure of the United Nations to provide, in keeping with the Charter, assistance to the victims of aggression in freeing themselves and assistance to those seeking to enjoy the rights that belong to everyone.

127. Thirdly—and this is obvious in every resolution, in every debate and even in every statement made outside this Council and outside the United Nations—the problem of the existence of the Palestinian nation cannot be wished away. The argument over whether it does or does not exist is really a futile exercise. There are 2.5 million Palestinians who have the right to self-determination, exactly like the right that was sought and guaranteed in the 1947 resolution [General Assembly resolution 181 II] to the Jewish State. They have the right to live in peace, within secure, recognized boundaries, in the fixing of which they should be partners. They have the right to know where they live. This is not only the spirit, but even the letter, of many United Nations resolutions. In any event, these are the facts of life, if we want to look at and think of the facts of life.

128. Those are my three points.

129. The Council cannot end this debate without replying to the questions that I put yesterday: Could it have been that the Council wanted the international boundaries to be breached? Did the Council intend to partition Egypt between Egypt and the Jewish State? Did the Council intend to partition Syria between Syria and the Jewish State? Did the Council try or intend to partition Jordan between Jordan and the Jewish State? If everyone concedes that the reply is in the negative—and I am sure it is—then again we have a block on the road to peace.

130. It is with a heavy heart and the greatest sense of responsibility that I say again that we are patiently waiting to see what light will come out of this Council. A green light, a faint green light, opening the door to living sovereign and free, would enable us to develop our

resources and to try to improve the conditions of the Egyptians, thus making them better citizens of the world. If there is no light, I repeat again that we shall be living in a cold world, in which everyone will have to fend for himself.

131. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I call on the representative of Israel to speak in exercise of his right of reply and I should like to put to him the question raised by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt concerning his attitude to the principle of non-acquisition of territory by force or the threat of force.

132. Mr. GEKOAH (Israel): The reply to the question will be found in the statement I made yesterday if the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt will study it.

133. I should only like to recall that in my earlier intervention I drew the Council's attention to the fact that Minister El-Zayyat has come before it and suggested, and indeed requested, that the Council should change resolution 242 (1967) in two central points: one, to replace the need to establish secure, recognized boundaries in agreement between the parties by the Egyptian diktat to restore the old provisional line of 1967, and two, to replace the call which appears in resolution 242 (1967) to arrive at a just settlement of the refugee problem by a provision which would refer to the so-called rights of the Palestinians, implying the dismemberment of Jordan. In his reply the Foreign Minister of Egypt did not refer to the first point to which I drew attention. I should like, however, to express my appreciation for his confirmation of the second point which I emphasized, and that is that when Egypt speaks of Palestinian rights it refers to a situation which would necessitate the dismemberment of a sovereign State Member of the United Nations, Jordan.

134. I repeat what the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt said in his last words: "They"—the Palestinians—"have the right to live in secure and recognized boundaries in the fixing of which they should be partners."

135. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt.

136. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): There is an exercise in a conspiracy of silence by which perhaps the existence of the thousands of Palestinians under Egyptian trust in Gaza is completely forgotten. Secondly, about the arms agreements and the reservations made about the green lines, that is, about the armistice lines, they were entered at the request of Egypt because we did not implicitly or explicitly wish to recognize anything that Israel has obtained by force of arms after the partition of 1947 and the borders allotted to it by the United Nations and recognized as such by the United States, the USSR and all other countries which recognize Israel.

137. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I call on the representative of Jordan.

138. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan): Reference has been made to the territorial integrity of Jordan. I feel that I must make a very brief comment about the territorial integrity of Jordan, but what is more important is that Jordan as a national entity is based on objective factors and on factors of consent, agreement and common destiny which are stronger than any transient factors or considerations. But it is curious, in the light of the situation on the ground, that the Israeli representative should pose as the defender of the territorial integrity of Jordan.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.