In the name of God,

Before beginning my talk to you from this place, where we were used to listen to Gamal Abdel Nasser, I ask you to stand up with me for one minute in tribute to his memory.

Brothers,

I wish to congratulate you; and, in your person, I wish to congratulate all the workers in our Republic. I congratulate you, brothers. I wish the whole of Egypt had been with us as we entered Helwan today, and seen what we have seen. I wish the whole Arab nation were with us and shared this experience, seeing what we have seen. I wish also the whole world had been with us to see and know. Indeed, I will not hide from you that I wished both friends and foes in this world were with us and saw this area which had been once a small winter resort — now become a base of heavy industry. The place that had been known as a place of relaxation and laziness has become a volcano erupting with activity and labour. The quiet and dormant area between the Nile and the
hills has become a heart throbbing with life and the lofty apex of progress.

Here, in Helwan, is the base of heavy industry in Egypt, the Arab world, the Middle East and Africa. Here, in fact, is the greatest industrial complex within the borders of this entire area in the world.

Here stands now the Iron and Steel Complex which was established at a total cost of L.E. 340 million. Here, too, is the Iron and Steel Factory which was one of the first and largest projects undertaken by the Revolution.

Here are the aeroplanes works, rolling mills, the coke works, electric power stations, electrical industries, spinning and weaving factories, cement works, factories of maritime transport units, railway wagons factories and a variety of factories engaged in military industries.

Here and until now we have £500 million (pounds sterling) in investments. Here, behind the machines, stand 104,000 industrial workers whose salaries reach L.E. 40 million yearly.

Here stands the new fertilizer factory whose inauguration we have attended today. It was set up to make use of the gases generated by the coke factory, and will produce 200,000 tons (20.5%) of nitrogen fertilizers, (15.5%) of ordinary.

This factory has 20 million, its establishment of the idea of integration. The steel industry needs the coke industry. The use of gases will not go to the fertilizers industry.

Here, too, brother factories that have factories that are under construction; a new age to be fulfilled before and many other aspirations of hearts or a lesson a lesson.

In addition to what we have brought to you today, and before you that I intend to tell you about to you today, a plan of the overall plan to develop the basis of an integrated steel similar to what has been done in Shubra El Kheim.
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This factory has been built at a cost of L.E. 19
million, its establishment being a true reflection
of the idea of integrated realisation. The iron and
steel industry necessitates the establishment of the
coke industry. The residues of the coke industry
of gases will not go to waste but will be directed
to the fertilizers industry instead.

Here, too, brothers, wherever we look stand
factories that have already been built or others
that are under construction; a new life for our
nation; a new age towards which we proceed; hopes
that are fulfilled before our eyes and by our hands
and many other aspirations which are a hope in our
hearts or a lesson and a trend in our minds.

In addition to all these facts which I pointed
out to you today, about Helwan, I want to state
before you that I issued a decree to carry out an
overall plan to develop the district of Helwan on the
basis of an integrated and comprehensive plan
similar to what had been achieved in the district
of Shubra El Kheima. Therefore, I agreed on the
following:

First: The 10% profit revenue allocated to
central services in the companies established in
Helwan, is to be allotted to carry out the projects necessary for the development of the area.

Second: Industrial establishments, local administration and political organs are to take part in laying down the plan necessary for the district of Helwan.

Third: The Deputy Premier for Production responsible for it is to work for and supervise the implementation of the programme. As for other industrial areas in the Republic, the same thing will be applied in every area for which a development plan has been completely studied, as happened here in Helwan.

This, my brothers, is Egypt and these are the people of Egypt; Egypt which fights at the same time, and the people of Egypt who carry their arms all the time. The enemies of Egypt, the enemies of its people and of its glorious Arab nation believed that by force they can obtain all what they want; but, brethren, they were unable to do so.

It is true that they have occupied part of our land, but we are struggling for liberation. However, they were not and will not be able to occupy an iota of our will.

Our will has been and will continue to be — with God’s assistance — a free, militant and constructive will, because the enemies of the Fatherland, when they were defeated in the first instance. When they began to conquer again, they began to conquer, and the battle of theorarily and the battle of the hearts of the people of Egypt and the enemies of the people and the Fatherland remained — and the battle remains. This is because the enemies of Egypt have not learned the lesson. They are still the same.

This is Egypt, and this is the Arab land. This is the Arab land and the people. Egypt which fights today; here we make life and death, here we make life and death for the battle, for the Fatherland, for the nation. The battle of our land preoccupies us — our will is the battle of our land and the people.

Brothers,

Construction did not begin in Helwan, nor did it begin in any part of the Egyptian Republic until the Fatherland was free and the people were free. The Fatherland has a definite objective: the freedom of the nation and the Fatherland, and the people.

Constructive work, because the battle has not been completed yet. We, the people of Egypt, have not yet achieved our objective of freedom. We are still in the battle, we are still in the struggle, and we will continue to be in the battle until we achieve our objective.
This is Egypt, and these are the people of Egypt. This is the Arab nation, and this is its bulwark and base. This is the aspect of our struggle today; here we make life and there, on the battle front, we defend life. We want nothing except our Arab land. All we want is to build life, on this Arab land, for the nation living on it. All our fight has a definite objective: the liberation of the land, the freedom of the nation and the freedom of construction — for life is a close tie between the land and the people.

Brothers,

Construction did not preoccupy us, to the exclusion of the battle, nor did the battle preoccupy us to the exclusion of construction. As a matter of fact, the battle is for construction, just as construction is for the battle. If we let the occupied part of our land preoccupy us to the extent that we do
not continue the progress we are building, we would be handing over to the enemy what he wants. Also, if we dedicate all our efforts to continue development and construction only, and forget about the occupied land we would be achieving, in one way or another, the enemy’s objective.

We must forge ahead in both fields — this is the lesson taught us by Gamal Abdel Nasser when he expressed it in his well-known words: “a hand for construction and a hand carrying arms and fighting”.

This is the history of our entire people. This is our history with the Revolution since Gamal Abdel Nasser led it. Our battles for building life never ceased, neither did our battles in defence of this life; however, we should admit that now we are waging the fiercest of all our battles in defence of this life. At the same time, we must wage our strongest battle for the building of life.

Brothers,

Truth can never be hidden or covered up behind smoke-screens set off by propaganda, the designs of political manoeuvres, or stories of quiet or tumultuous diplomacy.

Brothers,

While speaking of the external situation, I recall that on this day last year, which fighting did not shake the entire world.

Brothers,

On this same day, President Gamal Abdel Nasser addressed his people, asking for two things:

First: That President Nasser address his people again, asking for two things: “We shall believe him if he asks for us to withdraw; or, (second) but at least to stop supporting us with arms.” Then, the answer came after one month, the answer which was called: “The initiative was based on this day last year, which fighting did not shake the entire world.”
that on this day last year, on May 1st 1970, from a place similar to this one, and after three years in which fighting did not stop for one moment, you heard the hero and martyr of this nation, Gamal Abdel Nasser, initiating a large-scale attempt to test intentions and to provide a last chance for a peaceful settlement before the crisis should reach a state of total explosion, the effects of which will not be confined to the Middle East alone, but will shake the entire world.

On this same day last year, Gamal Abdel Nasser addressed his appeal to Richard Nixon, asking for two things:

First: That President Nixon should ask Israel to withdraw; or, (second) if President Nixon could not do so — as Abdel Nasser said in his own words: «We shall believe him regardless of our own views; but at least to stop supporting it and supplying it with arms». Then, the situation evolved.

The battle is not limited to the fighting front; it is fought on several fronts.

When President Gamal Abdel Nasser made that appeal on this very same day last year, America's answer came after one month or more. This was the answer which was called the «Rogers' initiative». The initiative was based upon the withdrawal of
Israel and a cease-fire for a period of three months, during which contacts should be made through Jarring, the representative of the United Nations, to solve the question on the basis of the Security Council Resolution of November, 1967 to which we had already agreed.

We accepted Rogers' initiative and said we will see. Israel was taken by surprise by our acceptance of Rogers' initiative. But before that, twelve of its Phantom planes, with which it imagined it could dominate the air, were shot down and before that also the war of attrition was afoot. But Israel does not want to accept the withdrawal. When it was taken by surprise by our acceptance of Rogers' initiative and it accepted it, and there was a cease-fire in August 1970, it began to search for a means by which it can get rid of the entire initiative in order not to implement the withdrawal. Israel's policy, as all of us know, is based on acquiring land, on expansion and imposing its conditions on the Arab nation. At first, and we should be fair, the United States hesitated a little to go along with Israel when Israel started reiterating that Egypt had violated the cease-fire agreement by introducing new missiles. Where were the missiles which downed the twelve Phantom planes before the cease-fire? Were they not there before the cease-fire?

As I told you, the United States hesitated but then it went back to its initiative, however, had proposed contacts with Jarring in order to implement the withdrawal. It started propagating throughout the world that Egypt had violated the cease-fire agreement by introducing new missiles in order not to implement the withdrawal. This was the whole initiative. The whole initiative openly stipulating that we had violated the cease-fire agreement by introducing new missiles. Where were the missiles which downed the twelve Phantom planes before the cease-fire? Were they not there before the cease-fire?

In these painful circumstances, in particular, America thought that it is better to carry on, that our dissension will rage amongst the leadership of Gamal Abdel Nasser, who was strong pressures. They measured throughout the world that Egypt had violated the cease-fire agreement by introducing new missiles. Where were the missiles which downed the twelve Phantom planes before the cease-fire? Were they not there before the cease-fire? Israel said that it would not accept the initiative, however, had proposed contacts with Jarring in order to implement the withdrawal.
As I told you, the United States hesitated a while, but then it went back to its former plan of getting on with Israel, supporting Israel and backing Israel. It started propagating throughout the world that we had violated the cease-fire agreement by introducing new missiles in the Suez Canal zone, therefore it was we, and not Israel, who violated the initiative. The whole episode was a pretext for Israel to find an outlet so that it might not put into effect the commitment stated in Rogers' initiative openly stipulating the withdrawal. The United States supported it.

In these painful circumstances or rather in these circumstances, in particular, Gamal Abdel Nasser died. America thought that we would not be able to carry on, that our front will collapse, that dissension will rage amongst our people and that the leadership of Gamal Abdel Nasser, eternal, colossal and magnificent as it was, shall leave behind it a vacuum that could never be filled.

So, they found it propitious to exert on us strong pressures. They made it public throughout the world that Egypt had violated the cease-fire and Israel said that it would not contact Jarring. The initiative, however, had provided for Israel's holding contacts with Jarring in order to implement the
Security Council Resolution and carry out its withdrawal.

Israel never held contacts with Jarring and everybody abroad waited to see what the people of Egypt would do and what Egypt would be up to.

The cease-fire term was due to expire in November last and, as you know, hardly 40 days had elapsed since the death of Gamal Abdel Nasser. I therefore, convened with our political bodies and with my colleagues and we agreed that we refer the cause to the United Nations and make our stance known to the entire world. So, Mahmoud Riad left and raised the issue at the United Nations and he was able, with a remarkable effort, to win our cause and to make the United Nations or rather its General Assembly pass a resolution recording our stance and the stance of Israel and asking Jarring to submit a report, in January, on the progress of his contacts.

In this battle, America had to withdraw its resolution. We won that battle, but in response to the will of the world community — which stood by us and passed that resolution and which, for the first time, defined things very clearly — we agreed to extend the cease-fire term for another three months to expire on February 5 last.

Israel, however, did not follow the General Assembly resolution and put forward to the entire world a report containing just anything. The parties concerned and contacts, Israel only a few months after the cease-fire was scheduled to expire, in the week of January last, handed in a report containing just anything, of course, never held contacts with Jarring.

They speak from the hallowed halls kept receiving a flow of messages, of course, the position never changed. It was bolstered by it and bolstered it but we were bringing pressure to bear on the world finding a peaceful solution.

Then, on February 4, before the second cease-fire was set to expire, I made public our position to the National Assembly, namely, to continue withholding fire in accordance with Rogers' initiative. We gave the world in appreciation to the world community in appreciation to the world community, and the stance of Israel was completely asked to submit a report, in January, on the progress of his contacts.

We made public our position to the National Assembly, namely, to continue withholding fire in accordance with Rogers' initiative. We gave the world in appreciation to the world community in appreciation to the world community, and the stance of Israel was completely asked to submit a report, in January, on the progress of his contacts.
Israel, however, did not react. But as the General Assembly resolution provided that Jarring should put forward to the Assembly and to the entire world a report concerning his contacts with the parties concerned and the progress of these contacts, Israel only a few days before the term was scheduled to expire, namely, during the first week of January last, handed in a memorandum containing just anything, only to prove that it had held contacts with Jarring:

They speak from the logic of conceit. Jarring kept receiving a flow of memoranda and America's position never changed. It supported Israel, stood by it and bolstered it but maintained that it was bringing pressure to bear on Israel because it was seeking a peaceful solution.

Then, on February 4, that is only one day before the second cease-fire term was due to expire, I made public our position from the forum of the National Assembly, namely, that we would accept to continue withholding fire for one month of our own free will and not in accordance with the Rogers' initiative. We gave that one-month extension in appreciation to the world community, after the stance of Israel was completely exposed, and we asked the world community and the Big Four, and America in particular, to determine their positions,
because the situation was becoming critical and there was no solution. There was no other alternative: either a peaceful settlement or war was inevitable.

In my speech before the National Assembly on February 4, 1971, I presented an Egyptian initiative to set things in motion. Withdrawal will naturally be carried out in two stages. If the first stage of withdrawal — east of the Canal — is to be implemented, we are prepared to clear the Canal and open it to international navigation.

I laid down conditions for this initiative, on the basis of clarifying our position before the world community, and particularly before West Europe, which failed to understand it throughout the past twenty years.

We were actually able, through the Egyptian initiative, as you have all heard from foreign broadcasts, as you have read and known, to change our political position. During the last 22 years, and until today, since the very hour in which the Palestine cause arose, this is the first time that our constructive position has appeared before the world. Even the United States acknowledged this and, in his letters to me, President Nixon has precisely stated the clarity and positiveness of our position.

For the first time over the last two messages: one to us and one message he sent to Israel he a pledge complete withdrawal from
June 4 borders; naturally, the in.
He sent us a similar message ask our commitments under the Solu solution in return for Israeli withdrawal, as you all know, the Reso accepted, as you all know, the Resolution since 1967. We are saying that we accept. We are our commitments under the Solu tion, provided that Israel fulfills its withdrawal from the Arab terr ed Jarring forthwith. But Israeli Jarring because he had only one accord to the Security Council Resolu Israel — have to withdraw. So are you prepared to do so? Yes, Egypt, you have to fulfil this the Security Council Resolution... to fulfil them or not?

We answered saying that:

But Israel did not answer...
for the first time over the last 22 years, we have refined our position.

Dr. Jarring came and was encouraged. He sent two messages: one to us and one to Israel. In the message he sent to Israel he asked it to state or pledge complete withdrawal from Sinai to the pre-1967 borders; naturally, the international borders. He sent us a similar message asking us to implement our commitments under the Security Council Resolution in return for Israeli withdrawal. We have accepted, as you all know, the Security Council resolution since 1967. We answered immediately saying that we accept. We are prepared to fulfil our commitments under the Security Council Resolution, provided that Israel fulfils all its commitments under the Resolution, foremost among which withdrawal from the Arab territories. We answered Jarring forthwith. But Israel did not answer Jarring because he had only one thing to say: « According to the Security Council Resolution, you — Israel — have to withdraw. So answer this question, are you prepared to do so? Yes or no? And you, Egypt, you have to fulfil this and that article of the Security Council Resolution. Are you prepared to fulfil them or not? »

We answered saying that we were prepared. Israel did not answer at all. Instead of
answer.ing, instead of even keeping silent, it wrote to Jarring replying to our own answer which we had sent to him. We were not even talking to them. It was Jarring who was speaking to us, and we were answering him. Yet, they replied to our own answer to Jarring. But they did not answer the main question until February 21, when Israel announced in an official document that it would not withdraw to the June 4 lines. So the matter was finally clarified. Israel said: «I am not withdrawing to the June 4 lines; so you, whose lands I occupy, are welcome to liberate your land by force. But I am staying ». 

During this time — as I have already told the National Assembly on February 4 — I left no stone unturned in order to find a way to a peaceful solution and absolve our conscience before God, history and our coming generations. America said: «Give us a chance to try and convince these people and advise them »; for, according to them, the Americans could not exercise pressure on Israel! 

The whole thing was ridiculous, of course. We were to believe that America which supplies Israel with everything — from the loaf of bread to the Phantom aircraft — could not exercise pressure on Israel.

Well, let us believe the results. We only want results. 

Now that the situation has changed with Israel refusing to answer, Jarring took upon himself to leave there. He went back, once more, to his post. The question was frozen. The world will stand quietly by; the world will not pressure on Israel; politically, nor would anybody be able to do so until it moves. It wants to impose its will.

Nevertheless, America said: «Give us a chance ». I agreed. I had no objection to a chance, but we wanted specific things.

You have heard in the speech of Rogers, the U.S. Secretary of State, what he was saying; he wants you to follow the situation and take action accordingly.

He arrived in Istanbul, where he announced that he was coming to the Middle East, substituting Jarring’s mission, in order to achieve something through which he is undertaking.
Well, let us believe them; but we wanted results. We only want results.

Now that the situation has come to that point, with Israel refusing to answer Jarring, the latter took upon himself to leave the United Nations and go back, once more, to his post in Moscow. Thus, the question was frozen. The whole question came to an impasse. Israel thinks that by taking such an attitude the question would be frozen and the whole world will stand quietly by; that we would not move politically, nor would anybody be able to do anything until it moves. It wants to impose its conditions.

Nevertheless, America said: «Give us a chance». I agreed. I had no objection to giving them a chance, but we wanted specific results.

You have heard in the past few days that Rogers, the U.S. Secretary of State, is coming. I want you to follow the situation.

He arrived in Istanbul, or perhaps Ankara, where he announced that he was coming here. Even before arriving in Ankara, he declared in London that he was coming to the Middle East, not to substitute Jarring’s mission, but with the hope of achieving something through an American effort which he is undertaking.
He said openly that the only hope remaining for America to set the cause in motion — is the question of reopening the Suez Canal included in our Egyptian initiative. He added that he was coming here, also that he would visit Israel. I was informed of this visit and welcomed his coming. I welcomed his coming with an open mind in order to speak with him; but I would like to tell you before his coming, so that you may know and rest assured, that there are many things running in my mind. I am thinking of the battle of 1967, of the American pledge which was made on May 23, guaranteeing the security of the border-lines of the area and stating that it would oppose the aggressor. After Israel won, this pledge was buried and forgotten.

On my mind too is the fact that at the very time in which the President of the United States was contacting us and saying, let us discuss the problem, this same President Johnson gave the signal for Israel to start its attack; he was fully aware of the Israeli plan.

I am also thinking of the fact that they had prepared the whole operation at the United Nations and the Security Council. They brought an American Zionist called Goldberg and made him head of the American delegation there.

For the first time in a Zionist Jew was appointed as a delegation at the United Nations, while America was ruled by one in the State Department, counsellor at the White House, who knew of the Israeli plan.

I am thinking also that the Abu Zaabal factory was attacked at a time of the President of the United States was saying, let us discuss the problem. The American sent us a cease-fire or else continue, adding that it can be observed.

I remember very well what happened at the Abu Zaabal factory, for my children at Bahr El Beiri were American, the planes were American, the pilots were American, the planes were Israeli. I do not know how many there were, but I have one here.

However, I tell you that in the sake of peace, and in the sake of every single life of the lives on the front, I will receive Rogers and we will talk with him. I know what I have to do; this, yet I will be open-min...
For the first time in the history of America, a Zionist Jew was appointed head of the American delegation at the United Nations while at the same time America was ruled by the two Rostow brothers, one in the State Department, and the other a counsellor at the White House.

I am thinking also that on February 2, 1970, the Abu Zaabal factory was bombed, and following that incident America sent us a message advising us to cease-fire or else the raids in depth will continue, adding that it cannot stop Israel.

I remember very well, and will never forget, what happened at the Abu Zaabal factory, and to my children at Bahr El Bakar school. The bombs were American, the planes were American and some of the pilots; one of them was caught and is still here. He has a dual nationality, American and Israeli. I do not know how many are over there, but I have one here.

However, I tell you that in spite of all this, for the sake of peace, and in the hope of preserving every single life of the lives of my sons on the Canal front, I will receive Rogers and will be open-minded with him. I know what I have in mind. I know all this, yet I will be open-minded.
As for the initiative concerning the Suez Canal, we shall be clear on this point and before you I will repeat my words so that they may be heard by the entire people, by America, and by Israel, so that they know what our limits are. We will neither bargain nor surrender.

First: The basic principle which the United Arab Republic upholds, and will continue to uphold under all circumstances, is that no peace is possible with the continued Israeli occupation of the Arab lands and the existence of aggressive, expansionist tendencies. Such tendencies are plainly demonstrated in the whole comportment of Israeli policy as well as the public statements and official documents issued by the directors of this policy. The harmful effect of these tendencies was not limited to the Arab situation and Arab right alone, but went so far as to infringe upon the United Nations itself — upon its Charter and resolutions.

Second: The United Arab Republic has opened, and continues to open, every way before peace. This has been demonstrated in two specific stands:

1. — The United Arab Republic's acceptance of Ambassador Gunnar Jarring's proposals; whereas Israel refused even to answer his proposals.

2. — President A...
2. — President Anwar El Sadat came forward with an Egyptian initiative, in his speech on February 4, indicating the possibility of reopening the Suez Canal to world navigation in return for a partial withdrawal of the Israeli forces.

Third: The Egyptian initiative still stands; but it should be understood by all parties that the proposed partial withdrawal, according to that initiative, does not constitute either a separate or a partial solution; it is a procedural move which is physically tied up with the full solution on the basis of implementing the Security Council Resolution, with all its items, foremost among which is the withdrawal from all territories occupied after June 5, 1967.

Fourth: So that matters may be well-defined when putting this proposal into effect, it is important, so that we may be clearly understood, that the United Arab Republic reaffirms its conception as follows:

1. — As soon as the partial withdrawal, which is the first stage of the all-out withdrawal, starts, the United Arab Republic is ready to start clearing the Suez Canal.

2. — With the practical application of this, the United Arab Republic will accept extending the
cease-fire for a definite period during which Ambassador Gunnar Jarring would be able to put the time-table for implementing the Security Council Resolution.

3. — The U.A.R. Armed Forces will cross the Suez Canal to undertake their national responsibility on the eastern bank of the Canal. I repeat it again, so that they may hear it there: the U.A.R. Armed Forces will cross the Suez Canal to undertake their national responsibility on the eastern bank of the Canal. But the United Arab Republic, being solicitous for peace, is ready to accept practical arrangements realising the separation of the belligerent forces during the defined cease-fire term.

That is the period availed to Ambassador Gunnar Jarring to work out all items for resolving the crisis along with the time-table for implementing them foremost among which is the complete withdrawal from all Arab territories in Syria, Jordan, Gaza and Sinai.

If this period should expire without achieving any tangible progress, the Egyptian Armed Forces would be entitled to maintain the freedom of action with complete adherence, so far as principles and laws are concerned, to the necessity of the complete liberation of the entire occupied Arab territory.

Fifth : The United rejects any discussion of Sinai; but it is prepared with the Security Council demilitarised areas, provided on both sides of the Canal.

Sixth : The United States will not allow any party whatever, any Israeli presence at its form may be. It only proposes which have been to parties — regarding the withdrawal of Israeli troops in the area of Sharm El Sheikh — a possible talk which is neither when a crisis of such difficulty is tackled, nor when a nation — such as this which has long annals of struggle does not take...
Fifth: The United Arab Republic absolutely rejects any discussion concerning the demilitarisation of Sinai; but it is fully prepared, in accordance with the Security Council Resolution, to accept demilitarised areas, provided that these be established on both sides of the borders.

Sixth: The United Arab Republic would not allow any party whatever, to raise the question of any Israeli presence at Sharm El Sheikh, whatever its form may be. It considers that the suspect proposals which have been propagated by some parties — regarding the lease of Sharm El Sheikh to Israel for a definite period or the participation of Israeli troops in the U.N. Emergency Force at Sharm El Sheikh — are tantamount to irresponsible talk which is neither permissible nor acceptable when a crisis of such dimensions as the Middle East crisis is tackled, nor when it comes to the calibre of a nation — such as the United Arab Republic — which has long annals of staunch national struggle.

I am repeating it so that our stances should be quite definite and clear because, as I have told you, I welcome him and I will open a dialogue with him.

But I have to heed the past. I have a definite position before our entire people. As I told you, the struggle does not take place only at the battle-
front. It has a large spectrum on the battle-front and there is the political aspect which I have already referred to. In this connection, I must dwell on the positions of the Big Four.

As regards the stance of America, which I have already reviewed, I will ask Mr. Rogers while he is over here, to define it clearly.

We appreciate America's efforts and attempts to reach a peaceful settlement. If these attempts are actually sincere, we thank the United States wholeheartedly, but we require that America should clarify its stance completely and define it in full.

The Egyptian initiative which America said it would work on has been defined on our part. Israel gave America its reply in this respect, but the latter has not communicated it to us as yet. I shall make a point of its communicating it to us while Rogers is over here. This will naturally take place. But what I am keen to know is the stance of America much more than the reply of Israel which I know in advance.

I will then put to the people with frankness, as customary, the stance of America.

As for the rest of the Big Four — France still maintaining its honourable stand which conforms with the justice. I seize this opportunity to direct to Pompidou of France the gratitude for their representation in his person by justice and a conscious power in the world.

The third is Britain which has taken place in declaration of its international peace for that Israel is fierce in its radical change in Palestine. There is a change from the anterior Government. There is a change from the anterior Government to Labour Government and to Labour Government there being an independent policy, in doubt that a change in attitude, and we welcome.

Now remains the Big Four. In this respect I need
efforts and attempts at settlement. If these attempts fail, I think the United States should be the first to say that America should try and define it in full. This is what America said it would do on our part. Israel has our respect, but the latter has not, as yet. I shall make the change of attitude to us while Rogers is here. I told them that the Conservative Government was more courageous than you and your Labour Government because it succeeded in adopting an independent policy for Britain. There is no doubt that a change has taken place in Britain's attitude, and we welcome and encourage this change.

Now remains the attitude of the Soviet Union. In this respect I need a whole day or rather days if
I have to enumerate the stands of the Soviet Union beside us not only now and in the battle, but before the battle and during the battle. Let me relate them quickly. Building the High Dam at the time when the United States' Secretary of State made a statement saying that Egypt was a bankrupt country and its economy cannot afford to build the High Dam. On July 19, 1956, Mr. Dulles made this statement in which there was an insinuation to the Egyptians to the effect that if you get rid of Gamal Abdel Nasser, we shall build you the High Dam.

But, he said officially in this statement, and this was an official document, that Egypt was bankrupt and its economy cannot support building the High Dam.

The High Dam was built at a cost of L.E. 400 million and with the assistance of the Soviet Union. Egypt did not go bankrupt. The new Iron and Steel Complex cost L.E. 400 million. Here there are £ 500 million (pounds sterling). This is in addition to 1,200 other factories which have been built and all the rest that is being done.

We built the High Dam, set up 1,200 factories and more with Soviet economic aid. Politically, the Soviets are standing by our side. There were the dark days of June 1967. Remember that in these dark days it was not only our fortune; there were gloated over our misfortune.

The Soviet Union in the dark days of two and a half minutes by the time and 11, a plane loaded with arms which landed at our airports. The Soviets established an office between Moscow and Cairo, besides that they tell us, as usual and as others, the interests and the price and deliver anything? Nothing did they sent us arms in order that we can defend our feet. They did not sign a contract except in November, five months after sending us arms and after the defence line on November 2.

Following this, they said the contracts of the arms we are saving a friend... When the contracts, they said : 100 million sent from us because you are in a disaster has befallen you. We are sharing the price and the interest on the receipt. Then we signed the contract.
of the Soviet Union in the darkest days, it was not only our enemies who rejoiced at our misfortune; there were some of our kin who gloated over our misfortune.

The Soviet Union in the darkest days sent every two and a half minutes by the clock, since June 10 and 11, a plane loaded with 10 tons of weapons which landed at our airports. It was an air bridge. The Soviets established an air bridge between Moscow and Cairo, besides the ships. They did not tell us, as usual and as others did, come, what are the interests and the price to be paid before we deliver anything? Nothing of this happened. They sent us arms in order that we may stand on our feet. They did not sign any contracts with us except in November, five months after they began sending us arms and after we had built our first defence line on November 23, 1967.

Following this, they said come, let us sign the contracts of the arms we sent you as a friend saving a friend... When they were writing the contracts, they said: 100 million roubles are a present from us because you are our friends and a disaster has befallen you. We shall write the rest of the price and the interest on it; we shall prepare the receipt. Then we signed the contracts. The Soviets shared our misfortune and shared our sufferings.
at the time when, as I told you, some of our kin rejoiced at this misfortune. They stood by our side and supplied us with arms; they left us until we built up the first defence line on November 23, 1967 and then they began to conclude contracts with us and discuss the terms of the price, instalments and re-imbursement.

This was in the darkest days. Not only this; in the world community, at the United Nations, in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, they stood with honour and honesty, they stood as a power seeking peace.

The Soviet Union is, in fact, seeking peace because through peace construction can be achieved. It wants to build its country more and more. It stood by our side, politically, in the world community, and as I told you, at the United Nations and in the Security Council, in all the international discussions it stood beside us with honour and honesty. When the raids in depth started against us in 1970, I told you, if you remember, that in the first six months of 1970 the United States' and Israel's plan was to destroy us through the air force. If you remember in the meetings which we held from Aswan to Alexandria, I told you so, and this plan was actually put into effect when they hit our first line and entered deep in our country.

In January 1970, Gamal Abdul Nasser was killed. May mercy be upon his soul, let us say. The Soviet Union sent us the most modern kind of missiles; they never hesitated in sending them to defend the depth of the Red Sea and to declare openly on our side. When President Nasser gave us this example once before in all the world community, at the United Nations and in the Security Council, in all the international discussions it stood beside us with honour and honesty.

Israel may dictate its conditions at that time, so that we might not have the opportunity, as the other parties had, to attend President Nasser's funeral and gain military deals which were supposed to be on a later date.

From the economic point of view, it is important for me to mention only one example. Dr. Aziz Sidky signed a contract of 100 million with the Soviet Union for five years. During these five years, the steel industry in Egypt shall expand and there will be thousands of employees.
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at the time when the Soviets, God's friends, had built up the first missile, the first nuclear missile. If then the Soviet Union had been re-imburse by our nation I would have said, 'Thank you. You, the Soviets, did it, but it was not a bad idea, for it was better than the call that we all agreed to.

Today, you all know that we were empowered by the institutions to go ahead and as far as it serves the interest taken by our nation and which Abdel Nasser took.

I want to tell you of the union which has taken place, and I would like to refer to Abdel Nasser.

In October, at the time of a new batch of Israeli officers, this batch and it went spectacularly by the news agencies, a batch of Israeli officers collapsed completely. That was the eastern front which Abdel Nasser died.

I come now to a very important aspect, namely, the Arab one.
The Arab aspect, in my estimation, is the most important aspect of the battle's call since the day when we all agreed there is no call which is more sacred than the call of the battle.

Today, you all know of course that I have been empowered by the constitutional and political institutions to go ahead with the tripartite union as far as it serves the interests of the battle undertaken by our nation and realises its aspirations for which Abdel Nasser never ceased to struggle.

I want to tell you the story of the tripartite union which has taken place. But before doing so, I would like to refer to the period in which Gamal Abdel Nasser died.

In October, at the graduation ceremony of a new batch of Israeli officers, Haim Barlev addressed this batch and it was reported world-wide, particularly by news agencies. Barlev addressed this batch of Israeli officers in October 1970, a few weeks after the death of Gamal Abdel Nasser, and told them that the future of Israel was a very rosy one and asked them to look forward to it. He said that the eastern front was disintegrated and had collapsed completely. Iraq, he said, was out of the battle, King Hussein has liquidated the Palestinian Resistance which has become ineffective, whereas
Syria was preoccupied with domestic affairs; hence the eastern front was eliminated. As regards the western front, Barlev said, Gamal Abdel Nasser was dead and Egypt would never restore its strength and will never be what it was during the era of Nasser.

The will of the Arabs, Barlev went on, was disintegrated and will become still more disintegrated with the death of Nasser.

He then reassured the new batch of Israeli officers which passed out in October 1970 that a prosperous future was in store for them and that the battle has become only a question of time until Israel is able to impose or to secure what it wanted.

This took place in October last year, a few weeks after the death of Gamal Abdel Nasser. The picture drawn up by Barlev, to be sincere with ourselves, was actually a true picture at that time. The eastern front was disintegrated and remains so still. When I say the eastern front I mean Jordan, Iraq and the Palestinian Resistance because we have called Syria a northern front.

Up till this very minute, the eastern front is still disintegrated. That we must admit. Iraq has completely walked out. The Palestinian Resistance has been hit twice; the first time in September when Abdel Nasser was still alive and when he organised the personal strike on June 5, 1967 against Hussein.
organised the Conference. The second time was since October last: slowly but according to plan. And that is the reason why I differed with King Hussein.

There is nothing between us and King Hussein personally. On the contrary, we appreciate his stand on June 5. We shall never forget his stand on June 5, 1967. We harbour no enmity towards King Hussein, but the problem lies in the conflict and what is happening to the Palestinian Resistance and the onslaught upon it, as well as our constant warnings against what is happening to the Palestinian Resistance.

We are continuing along our path after Gamal Abdel Nasser as we have agreed and as the people have decided. I state before you that there is no enmity whatsoever between me and King Hussein and I do not want any hostility or any battle. On the contrary, I believe that, at this stage, there should be a concentrated Arab action with every person who can contribute to the battle. The only point of difference, as I told you, is the process of liquidating the Resistance and pouncing upon it; also the provocative elements surrounding King Hussein and putting into his mind that we are plotting against him, or that we want to have the
Palestinian State, or anything else and so on. Every
day they put a new idea before him.

The Jordanian army, for which we all have the
utmost respect, is not standing on the frontlines, in
its natural position, facing Israel.

The Resistance was hit and is prevented from
acting. Our disagreement revolves around this.

I pray to God and hope that we may be able,
in the next stage, to reach a solution to this problem.
As I said before, there is no personal enmity
whatsoever with King Hussein and there is no
intention at all that relations become tense with
King Hussein personally for any reason except what
the provocative elements surrounding him may
cause.

I return to our words and Barlev’s words which
I have already recounted to you. The eastern front—
yes, it is disintegrated until today because the
Jordanian army is not on the frontline until this
hour. The Iraqi army has completely withdrawn;
the Palestinian Resistance was hit and has lost its
effectiveness. It is carrying out operations, but with
less effectiveness than could have been.

In that case, Barlev’s argument would be right.
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after Abdel Nasser. He forgot that after Abdel Nasser, 34 million Abdel Nassers filled the vacuum, and quickly. He did not take this into account. As quickly, too, President Hafez El Assad was able to carry out the wonderful correction operation which he undertook in Syria, thus bringing Syria in, to shoulder its Arab duty in the battle.

So Syria took its place in the battle, and we — the thirty-four million people — stood up after Abdel Nasser and resolved to continue together after his march to the end. We are 34 million people with all that we possess.

One of the principal criteria upon which Israel bases its strategy, which was mentioned in books published by it, is that the Arabs are in a state of disintegration and conflict. This is an undeniable thing which was published throughout the world. It is one of the items upon which Israeli strategy is based — the fact that the Arabs are in a state of disintegration and more, they are in a state of conflict. Israel is the only party which benefits from Arab disintegration or conflict. So, Israel is troubled not by unity or union, but even by mere solidarity among the Arabs. Any solidarity between two Arab states troubles Israel, let alone unity or union.
Thus, after the revolution of the Sudan broke out on May 25, 1969 and the revolution of Libya on September 1, 1969, there was the Tripoli meeting that was attended by Gamal Abdel Nasser. There was a project; but we had decided after the experiment with Syria that we should draw a lesson from the secession that took place and that our action should be founded on a scientific basis. It might require longer steps and a longer time, but it is guaranteed one hundred per cent.

The formula of the Union of the Arab Republics stipulates that each Republic will remain intact with all its institutions. When any number of these strong units gather together and create a certain constitutional form it will establish a strong union because each of its units is strong. The greater union will, undoubtedly, be stronger, and will prevent sensitivities and as I told you we will avoid the mistakes of that experience. During Abdel Nasser's life we agreed that this would be the form of the future union and that it would be a principal strategic goal. During Abdel Nasser's life we agreed that it would be in the form of a union of the Arab Republics and not a merger.

Gamal Abdel Nasser went to Tripoli and at the meeting there were the Sudan, Libya and Egypt.

Gamal Abdel Nasser had the Arab Republics in mind. The minutes of these meetings was not possible to reach the Charter was signed instead very briefly.

Another meeting was during which was presented the Arab Republics. Syria was present, represented by Atassi who proposed to Gamal Abdel Nasser that he return, he said, he had Damascus and declaring.

What I mean to say is the unity, even the mere establishment for Israel constitutes a basic upon which its very existence actually thought of the United, maybe because he was good, the idea was postponed. Renewal of Damascus.

This is the culmination of the forty years of Nasser's death. We met him in real: at our second meeting, Syria...
Gamal Abdel Nasser had the project of the Union of the Arab Republics in his pocket. I have the minutes of these meetings at the Presidency. It was not possible to reach this Union, and the Tripoli Charter was signed instead. I am relating all this very briefly.

Another meeting was then held at Benghazi during which was presented the project of the Union of the Arab Republics. Syria was present at this meeting as well as Egypt, the Sudan and Libya. Syria was present, represented by Nur Eddin El Atassi who proposed to join the Union. President Gamal Abdel Nasser thought about it; even on his return, he said, he had thought of leaving for Damascus and declaring the Union from there. What I mean to say is that the idea of union or unity, even the mere expression of Arab solidarity for Israel constitutes a blow to the basic strategy upon which its very existence depends. The President actually thought of the Union but for some reason, maybe because he was going on a trip to Moscow, the idea was postponed. He left for Moscow instead of Damascus.

This is the culmination of the work which we began on the fortieth day after Gamal Abdel Nasser's death. We met here at the Sheraton; then at our second meeting, Syria joined after President
Hafez El Assad’s movement and later at the last meeting.

Our last meeting at the Sheraton was originally a meeting between Egypt, Syria and Libya, a result of the Sheraton meeting held in January, and it was agreed that we were to meet in Tobruk.

Even in January we all agreed, while here, to proclaim the shape of the state on February 22 which coincides with the first unity (with Syria). This was meant to tell the whole world that, in spite of all intrigues, unity would be restored. President Hafez El Assad proposed that the shape of the state be proclaimed on September 28 which coincides with the date of the death of Gamal Abdel Nasser and the secession between Egypt and Syria thus rendering an implication to the two occasions.

That was what we agreed upon last January 15. The Sudan participated with us fully, in all steps, and contributed to everything. But it has its own circumstances and state of affairs. As we have agreed upon and as we said in our agreement, the move should be a voluntary one and consideration should be given to each other’s circumstances. The day will come, however, when this is deemed propitious. But the Sudan is a constituent state in this Union whether it is a druple one.

As I told you, the proclamation of the state was for February 22 and the proclamation of the state was scheduled for later on, Syria was proclaimed, Al Assad had some presidential elections and affairs, etc.

Anyway, this week, I visited Tobruk (Libya) and met with President Num, Tobruk, I visited the tripartite meeting to coming over to Cairo if the condition fit it. Otherwise, we were to meet in Tobruk, as it has been between Egypt, Syria and the Sudan.

However, President of Cairo and we met, the bases of everything...
As I told you, the proclamation of the shape of the state was supposed to take place last February 22 and the referendum and establishment of the state was scheduled for September 28. But, later on, Syria was preoccupied and President Hafez Al Assad had some matters to tackle: the Presidential elections and the re-shaping of the state of affairs, etc.

Anyway, this was deferred until we agreed to meet at Tobruk (Libya). Before that meeting at Tobruk, I visited the Sudan and talked things over with President Numeiry. When I told him about the tripartite meeting, he said he would not object to coming over to Cairo so as to hold a meeting, the four of us. So, I sent a message to President Kazzafy and another message to President Assad and we agreed that we convene, the four of us, in Cairo if the conditions in the Sudan should permit it. Otherwise, we would hold a tripartite meeting in Tobruk, as it had already been agreed upon between Egypt, Syria and Libya.

However, President Numeiry came over to Cairo and we met, the four of us, and worked out the bases of everything. But as regards the timing,
President Numeiry said it was a bit early, on his part, because he had several matters to deal with on May 25. As I told you, we had to give due consideration to each other's circumstances and we had to stand by each other without embarrassing anybody.

President Gaafar Numeiry left for a visit to Moscow, and we left for Benghazi where agreement was reached on the establishment of a union state of the Arab Republics.

There are two points left, and it seems that I have taken too much of your time. I want to speak briefly because I feel that I imposed a little upon you. I want to speak about the structure of the new state, my vision of it and my vision of the battle today.

The position in which we find ourselves today; who created this position? After the 1967 defeat, and after the terrible blow suffered by our Armed Forces, they imagined that they would be able to dictate their will upon us. But all credit goes to the people of June 9 and 10. We must never forget these memorable days in our history and life. When we come to write down the history of our Revolution, or the history of the whole new construction, we must record this date in pure gold in memory of the people of June 9 and 10.

The whole people were induced — the people we defeated and to say to post, continue the threat, continue the threats, though we lost 80,000 soldiers was to be as Gamal Abdel Nasser's soul, said one day.

In spite of ever on June 9 and 10; was the instinct of genuineness which the defeat.

This is the history of battle broke out but years and a half we are completing the position of our Armed Forces, the people of June 9 and 10; I am not threatening the tone of threats but I am more that the strength of some up which we achieve think twice now.
The whole people, nobody can allege that the people were induced to go out on that day. No — the people went out spontaneously to reject defeat and to say to Abdel Nasser: Remain in your post, continue the battle and we are behind you, though we lost 80% of our weapons. Not a single soldier was to be found between Suez and Cairo as Gamal Abdel Nasser, God's mercy be upon his soul, said one day.

In spite of everything, the unarmed masses rose on June 9 and 10; nobody urged them to do so; it was the instinct of the people, their solidarity and genuineness which made them go out and reject the defeat.

This is the history which we must record. The battle broke out but later on we stood fast for three years and a half with Gamal Abdel Nasser, and we are completing the other half of the fourth year. We stood fast politically, economically and militarily, so that the tone of the enemy today is different. I am not threatening, and I am not inclined to threats but I am more inclined to action. I am saying that the strength of our Armed Forces today, the position of our Armed Forces today and the buildup which we achieved today in the military field, are the reasons which make the concerned parties think twice now.
Before, they used to think about when were we going to surrender? No — today they think twice about the battle, and as I told you, I am not threatening — I am inclined to action. I say very simply, and I said it before, and all the parties as of now know it: an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. These words are known to all parties and I repeat it before you an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, raids in depth for raids in depth, and napalm for napalm.

I say that your Armed Forces, thanks to this people's stand on June 9 and 10, thanks to their determination and will, have reached the stage whereby I can stand today and declare to the world at large, after the 1967 defeat, that our criterion is an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, raids in depth for raids in depth, and napalm for napalm.

But I want you, brothers, to be aware of the fact that this, in my estimation, is one aspect of the battle which we are waging. Do not ever think that this constitutes the whole battle. No. The battle is much more serious. The battle implies that we must never allow ourselves to lag behind again. I said at the last Cabinet meeting which I attended that we should use this battle as a starting point for building the new state as was the case in the Soviet Union, when we considered the battle to begin work in science. We worked for the homeland, for national dignity.

Today, brothers, it is the powers. It must be more serious. It must be beyond any Cabinet meeting. It is only a military battle. It is the necessary battle, in our belief, in our faith, based on the battle for the homeland.

In other words, the Armed Forces I cannot leave, I must tell him. He must be a marksmen, he must be a weapon; I cannot leave him, of the age.

Since I cannot leave him...
the Soviet Union. In 1941, the Soviet Union suffered a greater defeat than we suffered; and it considered the battle then a starting point, and it began working and constructing on the basis of science. We, too, began to build for the sake of the homeland, for the sake of our sovereignty and national dignity.

Today, the Soviet Union is one of two superpowers. It reached the moon, it reached a very high technological level, and realised everything that is beyond any man's mind to imagine. I said at the Cabinet meeting, and I call upon you to bear witness as the people of Egypt that the battle is not only a military battle; another aspect of the battle is the necessity to build, the modern state. In my belief, in order to build our new state it should be based on two inseparable principles, science and faith.

In other words, when I want to arm my Armed Forces I cannot give a soldier any kind of weapon and tell him go and fight, and if you die, you will be a martyr. I must give him the best kind of weapon; I must provide him with the electronics of the age. I must live our age and not lag behind.

Since I am in the age of electronic warfare, I cannot leave my son without the means of electronic
warfare to face an enemy who has electronic warfare — this is the building of our State. After I supply him with electronics and after I realise for him the highest standard of science in this age, by the effort and sweat of all of us, I can tell him go and fight; saying: nothing will happen to us except what God has destined for us. I cannot send him with a club and say: nothing will happen to us except what God has destined for us.

As I told you, the construction of the State must rely on two bases: science and faith. Here, I must revert once more, and reiterate before you, by virtue of my historic responsibility, that we have entered the age of electronics. Electronic warfare has been introduced to our Army. The Soviet Union gave it to us. If we had engaged ourselves in research for tens of years, we would have reached it, but after tens of years, by which time they would have outstripped us by scores of years. No. The Soviet Union has introduced us to this age, I must give credit to whom it is due.

But, as I told you, the military aspect is not the only one to which science should be applied. It should be applied in the construction of the new state; in all its branches; in agriculture, industry, the economy, in the departments, and the organisations. The bases must be science and faith.

I mention the weapon which we were devoid of fast. We tried to rally the forces of France here and by the effort and sweat of all of us, we tried to rally the United Arab Republic, to rally the Arab People, to rally the Arab Republic. This was due to the constitution. I
I mention faith lest we forget it. It was a weapon which we tried on June 9 and 10, when we were devoid of everything but faith and we stood fast. We tried it in November, 1956 when the air forces of France, England and Israel were attacking us here and bombing Sinai while the people were rallying around Gamal Abdel Nasser in the streets. This was due to faith; science and faith.

I consider our responsibility in the coming stage is to build up the new State because if we lag behind or close our eyes again, what took place in 1967 will be repeated. This we shall never permit. This is not only on the military level as I told you, as this is only one aspect of the battle, while the modern State based on science and faith should be built in all other branches of life.

I am looking forward, after we have become part of the new State of the Union of the Arab Republics, to what I have felt from the great masses of our people, so that names might not be mixed up, and after we have maintained with honesty, dignity, struggle, sweat and effort, the name of the United Arab Republic, to go back to the name of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

This necessitates the amendment of the Constitution. I am thinking, and I put my thoughts
before you and the decision is yours, because the people are the origin in everything — why shouldn't we avail ourselves of this opportunity and set up our permanent constitution? Let us set up a permanent constitution that shall define everything in our life and even clarify the forthcoming features of our society, their construction, guarantees and limits. I am thinking of the coming stage and shall prepare, in this respect, that which I am able to present to the people, God willing.

On the other hand, I want to state before you that the Revolution next July, God willing, will be 19 years old, and getting on to its twentieth year. We must codify the Revolution, we do not at all need to take exceptional measures. Let me state before you that, despite all that happened, despite the battle we are passing through, the catastrophe that befell us with Gamal Abdel Nasser's death, the circumstances of the war, all that we are living in from psychological war to imperialist pressures and all that you hear, I want to state before you that until this day, I have not resorted to a single exceptional measure. On the contrary, we have begun to liquidate all exceptional measures so as to place the authority in the hands of the Judiciary; this being the process of codifying the Revolution. Everything must be governed by law. The protection of every individual's socialist solidarity, the protection of every individual's responsibility in all the decision. Hisham Nasser said, responsible before God, responsible before himself — a responsible, responsible individual in the stage and in the life.

These words, Today, I have decided that the choice of the President of the Republic, of the people and of the people's unity, and the starting point that I have been loyal to be loyal to, to be loyal to the people.

Thought
of every individual, every measure and of our socialist society is essential. If our laws cannot protect our socialist society then we must do away with them and lay down new laws for its protection.

One last thing, my brothers; I would like to speak to you with all clarity about defining the responsibility of the leadership in taking the political decision. Here I remember what Gamal Abdel Nasser said: I am responsible before God, responsible before the people and responsible before myself — a responsibility of conscience because I am responsible for everything that happens as President of the Republic elected by these people at a crucial stage and at a stage of great development in our life.

These were the words of Gamal Abdel Nasser. Today, I have the honour to state before you that the choice of the Egyptian people of myself as President of the Republic was a pledge between the people and I, to safeguard together the national unity, and consolidate it, in preparation and as a starting point for the battle of destiny. I have taken the pledge with conviction and gratitude. I have been loyal and will continue, with God’s help, to be loyal as long as I remain in my position which the people wanted me to be in.

Though I have become President of the Repu-
blic in circumstances which you know, and are aware of the extent of their complications, difficulty and the greatness of the responsibility; though the loss of our mentor and leader, Gamal Abdel Nasser, increased this complication and difficulty and in spite of the extraordinary circumstances through which our country is passing and which were unprecedented in its history — in spite of all this I was very anxious, until now, not to resort at all to taking any exceptional measure. I was even keen to abolish and liquidate the exceptional measures which were necessitated by the march of the Revolution believing, on my part, in the consciousness of our people and their holding fast to their Revolution, on one hand, and deeply believing in the necessity of the codification of the Revolution and the supremacy of the law, on the other hand. I do not claim that I have reached, in this direction, the end of the road which I have determined to follow, but I am confident that I have put my footsteps on its start.

We must complete the dimensions of national unity which has enabled us to persevere in this conflict until today, especially since the battle calls for it. The participation of all the people on all levels and throughout the nation with its different sects, categories and individuals in the formulation, the follow-up, and the decisions connected to guarantee of all the shoulder, behind the preparing to wage that is not far off.

For this reason, that national unity Revolution and all throughout our history enabled us to persevere against the various various shapes and pressure and psych first and foremost, in consequence following the 10, astounding our Zionists.

I believe we have this national unity and our efforts towards also be an integral part of the efforts which of our sons who are the most honourable
the follow-up, and the implementation of the serious decisions connected with the battle, is a sure guarantee of all the people’s stand, shoulder to shoulder, behind their courageous Armed Forces, preparing to wage the battle of destiny. This day is not far off.

For this reason, dear brothers, I go back to say that national unity is the architect of the July 23 Revolution and all the revolutions that took place throughout our history; national unity is that which enabled us to persevere over the last 19 years against the various imperialist conspiracies, the various shapes and forms of economic and political pressure and psychological war. It provided us, first and foremost, with the magnificent persistence following the 1967 defeat. It expressed itself and appeared in a wonderful aspect on June 9 and 10, astounding our enemies, the imperialists and Zionists.

I believe we have never stood in such need for this national unity as much as we do today.

Our efforts towards asserting this unity could also be an integral part of our military effort and of the efforts which we are exerting for the sake of our sons who are waging the military battle — the most honourable and most violent battle at one
and the same time — on our behalf and on behalf of the future generations.

Gamal Abdel Nasser said — and we, too, repeat it after him — that the people is the master; the people is the leader; and the owner of the country. It is the people who will wage with its Armed Forces the battle of its life, with all its responsibilities and the sacrifices which it imposes. Thus, no individual or group — whoever the individual or group may be — has the right to assume for himself or themselves a separate capacity apart from the people's capacity, nor to claim for himself or themselves a position from which to impose his or their will on the masses, nor to hide behind slogans or machinations in an attempt to form positions of power through which to impose his or their guardianship upon the people, since this people, together with Gamal Abdel Nasser, have toppled all positions of power so that the people alone may remain master of its destiny.

Before I conclude my speech, I want to tell you that you must be proud of your Armed Forces. I held six meetings with the commanders of our Armed Forces, all those who will enter, who will cross, and who will plan.

I would have liked to place before you a picture of which you will be proud, but I shall put it off until the picture the people will have made after their sacrifice will have been given to the people.

Have faith in your Armed Forces. I told them — and I told them in them. Be free, be proud, be free.

Let us continue to build and defend our country behind our Armed Forces. We possess love, our force possesses love, our nationalism possesses love, our science possesses love, our love possesses love.

Brothers, the people is the master, the people is the inspiration, the people possesses the unity, the people is our inspiration and our unity, the people is the rejection of selfishness, the rejection of materialism, the rejection of all positions of power on liberty, the rejection of all positions of power on the homeland, the rejection of the economic, the rejection of the intellectual, the rejection of the workers, the rejection of the landlords, the rejection of the feudal, the rejection of all positions of power on the economy and the rejection of all positions of power on the intellect. Our people possesses love, our people possesses love.

Our people possesses love, our people possesses freedom, our people possesses freedom, our people possesses freedom. Our people possesses love, our people possesses freedom, our people possesses freedom.
until the battle is finished because behind this picture there are acts of heroism, manhood and sacrifice which are beyond description.

Have trust in the members of your Armed Forces. I informed them of your trust in them and told them — and they hear me now — of your hope in them. Be one line behind them.

Let us stand, at the next stage, in one line behind our Armed Forces, with our hearts, our love, our feelings and emotions and with everything we possess.

Brothers, we are marching on our path with the unity of our people and our nation, with the inspiration of our people and our nation and with the capacities of our people and our nation. We rejected subjugation and trusteeship; we insisted on liberty and fought to realise it; liberty of the homeland, liberty of man, freedom of the alliance of the people's working powers, political liberty, economic freedom, the gains of the farmers and workers, and preserving the democratic spirit. There shall be no return to the domination of capitalism and feudalism; no acceptance of any form of intellectual terrorism which suppresses freedom of opinion.

Our people, with God's will and providence, will overcome this crisis. It will emerge victorious and
strong. It will emerge, with God's will, with a sense of pride and self-confidence, along with a confidence in its principles and with a deeper faith in the values of its struggle as well as in the means adopted by it in the Arab struggle for the sake of these values.

The banners of freedom will never fall on this great and pure soil. The banners of civilisation will never lag behind nor will they come to a standstill. They will fly ever higher and ever stronger, with God's will. A pointer to this is derived from the annals of history and our experience with history is but an indicator to the future.

Indeed, Gamal Abdel Nasser was right when he said in his last speech: We are proceeding towards our target, namely, the liberation of the occupied territory; and our motion towards achieving this target is not a shackled motion but rather a free and open one, abiding by the principles of our struggle.

May God guide you and may God's peace and mercy be upon you.