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Brothers and friends:

We meet for the first time on this good
land which begot Gamal while he is not
amongst us. I ask you to observe one minute's
silence in tribute to his memory.

Brothers and sisters:

You must have followed my speeches to
your brothers, the members of the teaching
staff of the four universities in Cairo Univer-
sity. My task will not be so difficult as I do
not need to repeat what you have read or
heard; but I would like to state a fact before
you — that I am happy, as ever I was before,
to meet you and enjoy the friendship and brotherhood which connect me with many of you as we were connected by the talk about the battle throughout the past stage of steadfastness.

I find pleasure, if only for this concept, to sit together, with you as one family, since you represent the Vanguard elite of our country which is passing now through a stage which I described before to our masses and to your brothers the members of the teaching staff in the four universities as a turning point in our destiny. We should sit together as one family because the issue bears on the destiny of all of us, and of the future generations. Our discussion must be free so that all of us can take part in taking the decision; because the issue does not concern one individual, or individuals, but concerns the whole people, the nation and the future generations; and you are responsible for their upbringing as well as for their enlightenment. Today, you are required, together with me, to exert yourselves and discuss matters in order to reach a decision.

I visited you before, and I had an interesting meeting indeed with some of your colleagues.
leagues. We spoke about political, military and economic steadfastness. I asked at that meeting that you should be responsible for a fourth kind of steadfastness — the intellectual steadfastness.

This was in the past stage, during the past three and a half years after we came out of the battle as wreckage. In order to build, we had to hold out in the economic, political and military spheres. The intellectual steadfastness was your responsibility as you are the cultured elite in this country. The three and a half years were years of bitterness and severe trial. But our genuine, strong and adamant people whom I have seen today and everywhere, rejected the defeat and, hence, we embarked upon the stage of steadfastness.

In order to take a decision together, I must place the facts before you.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser laid down the first bases of rebuilding the Armed Forces on June 11, 1967. The people came out on June 9 and 10 and on the following day Gamal began laying down the bases of rebuilding the Armed Forces. He was facing two tasks: the first was rebuilding the structure of our Armed Forces, and the second, was rebuilding the
I must state before you the fact that the Soviet Union sent us weapons as of June 10.

These weapons came to us by an air bridge from Moscow to Cairo, and also by ship to Alexandria. This immense supply continued throughout the two months of June and July.

We were supposed to assimilate these weapons in two years; but our friends were surprised when we mastered them in five months only. Without this supply it would have been impossible for us to establish a defence line against the weapons of our enemy. This was an unforgettable stance and I hope that you will not forget it. We should state all facts clearly and distinctly.

The military steadfastness continued and by the end of 1968 the Armed Forces felt a new strength and new blood. The artillery battles started in October 1968 and the enemy retaliated at Naga Hamadi. The military operations were suspended until defence arrangements were made against deep penetration. Our Armed Forces began the war of attrition which reached its climax in the Green Island battle in which the enemy, in retaliation for the Port Tewfik operation, tried to occupy the Green Island, but was defeated and sus-


tained heavy losses in the battles that took place on July 20, 1969.

At dawn on that day the enemy withdrew with losses that he could not conceal and at noon he threw his air force into the battle as a last resort against our artillery and our defence line.

This is, in brief, the account about our military steadfastness. As regards the political steadfastness, the United States in May 1967, and before the commencement of military operations on June 5, dispatched to us an official communication to the effect that it would guarantee the territorial integrity and the borders of the countries of the region and that it would not stand with folded arms in face of whoever starts a war. This was about May 21, 1967 and on June 5, Israel launched its aggression. This statement and that official document were forgotten and the United States moves began in the Security Council. For the first time in the history of the United Nations a resolution was passed providing for a cease-fire without any mention of the two warring parties returning to the pre-war borders. You know that the United States, with all its influence and power, managed to have a cease-fire
fire resolution adopted without calling upon the belligerent parties to return to the pre-war positions. This was not denied by Johnson who declared that he did not know who had started the war. The same was repeated by his Secretary of State despite the fact that the Israelis admitted, after the cheap victory they won, that they were the ones who started the war. But America did not admit that because its hope was to defeat the Arab armies; especially Egypt.

They thought that the defeat was enough to achieve the objectives of both Israel and the United States. As Ben Gurion said, they wanted to impose a peace treaty and achieve Israel's political objectives; and, consequently, America's objectives. The officials in Israel say that they constitute a defense line for America. But they could not achieve any political objectives, because the people went out on June 9 and 10. The credit for this goes entirely to the people; and we must be faithful to the people who rejected the defeat. Nevertheless, they said that the people's demonstration was but, the "death awakening"; since the matter would end by Israel's achievement of its objectives.
In November 1967, the Security Council adopted a resolution which we accepted and which stipulated in its preamble that no land must be acquired through conquest. This meant that Israel should withdraw.

We accepted this resolution as a solution to our cause, whereas Israel accepted it only outwardly. But, in fact, this outward acceptance meant for them that the resolution was merely an agenda for when we should come to them on our knees. Dayan declared openly that he was waiting at the other end of the phone for us to come asking for peace.

Jarring began his mission. We answered all the 13 questions which he put to us. Israel never answered the 18 questions he put to it, saying: «We want direct negotiations».

The year 1968 was a year of political pressure from America. Several attempts were made to exercise pressure against us, whether by threats, intimidation or temptation. Johnson’s objective was to restore diplomatic relations with Egypt. His argument was how could he interfere in our case with Israel when he had no diplomatic relations with Egypt. America’s object was to make a come-back to the area.
The United States lost its prestige here and the only gateway for its come-back was through Cairo. Therefore, it began its policy of threats and temptation, but the President did not respond to it... They endeavoured to scare us away from the Soviet Union claiming that we stood in danger from the Soviet Union and Communism. They even tried to convince us that they were concerned about our welfare!

For the first time the Soviet fleet had facilities in our ports to take what it needs against payment.

The Soviets supplied us with arms and stood by our side at the United Nations. They did not ask for anything except water facilities, instead of receiving these facilities from the Black Sea, since they had no ports of call on the Mediterranean.

President Nasser’s reply was «tell Johnson thank you for your concern, but you should not worry about us; we do not want any kind of trusteeship. Tell him also that these facilities do not include water only but other kinds of supplies. The Soviets had stood
The object behind the 1967 aggression was to destroy Egypt and liquidate the forces of liberation in the area. The aggressors thought that we were finished in 1967.

The United States strategy and objective, from the very beginning, was that after destroying Egypt it would become easy to liquidate the forces of liberation in the area. They began to take into consideration all possibilities for eliminating the liberal regimes in the area. But the inception of the two revolutions changed the whole situation in the area and foiled all their plans, especially as regards the Revolution of Libya which was considered a strong blow directed against America, because the latter did not expect the inception of such a revolution in Libya.

The inception of the two revolutions changed everything... the enemies were arranging for a coup d'état in the Sudan. We had all the information and figures about the money paid by Germany and one of the Arab countries for bringing about an imperialist counter-revolution in the area. We stood helpless at that time, unable to do anything un-
til the liberal Revolution of the Sudan and the Revolution of Libya broke out.

The year 1969 was characterised by the fact that God had wanted to compensate us for the sufferings and bitterness we lived through by the inception of the two revolutions. It would have been more logical of America to reconsider its policy at that time... America actually made a re-evaluation of its attitude but to the worse. It made a reappraisal of its attitude, yet not according to the logic of the world and history, or in line with Arab logic but according to its own logic by which it wanted to destroy Egypt as soon as possible in order to be able to liquidate the Revolution of Libya. The evacuation from Wheelus base was fixed for June 30, 1970; that is in the first six months of 1970, but we felt a suspicious move on the part of America late in 1969... The Americans reconsidered their attitude with the Israelis... When I say the Americans are our enemies, I mean to say they are our true enemies, not the Israelis; because Israel is but the first defence line of America's interests in the area.

They reconsidered their attitude and reached a decision. In the first week of December 1969, called for a resounding which, and of which 1970 was the result.
December 1969, President Gamal Abdel Nasser called for a political and military meeting during which an evaluation of the whole situation, and of what was expected to take place in 1970 was made.

After everyone expressed his view and discussed the potential events of 1970 and expressed his opinion on the enemy's plans and strategy, President Nasser said: «I think that the enemy will use his air force's superiority in the first six months of 1970 to settle the situation».

The Phantoms began to reach Israel in September 1969; the rate of supply was 4-6 planes per month. Before 1970 began, on December 25, 1969 to be exact, 264 Israeli planes raided our defence lines, though on June 5, 1967 the number of Israeli planes did not exceed 250 planes raiding 11 Egyptian airports. The 264 planes savagely attacked our defence line from Ismailia to Suez for 5 hours on end and threw thousands of tons of highly explosive bombs and delayed action bombs on our positions in a feverish attempt to destroy our morale and inflict the heaviest losses possible.

But our sons and brothers on the front operated the missile batteries and downed 11
Phantoms. On that day President Nasser was in Morocco. We needed 24 hours to make safe the delayed action bombs before exploding them, I gave orders to transfer the missile batteries from their positions. Our sons working on the missile batteries transferred their positions and when the Israeli planes came next day, to attack the missiles, they were not there. Then the President came and our plan continued during the whole month of January. As I said before, the enemy began to attack our defence line which extends 160 kilometers from Ismailia to Suez.

In the second stage they moved onto the second line — Tel El Kebir, Inchass, Dahshur and Wadi Huf. It was a comprehensive operation — both a psychological warfare and a raid in depth over the United Arab Republic; and they began to observe the consequences. They aimed at the home-front in order that they may realise their political objectives. This is the reason behind their raids in depth, and the basis of their strategy.

The third escalation was their bombing raid over the factory of Abu Zaabal which caused the death of 80 persons. However, the effect of this raid was exactly the opposite
of what they had expected. They did not expect us to invite foreign correspondents to come and look at the scene of destruction; the effect was that the whole world deplored this Israeli action.

On January 22, 1970, President Nasser set off on a secret trip to the Soviet Union, during which he reached an agreement with the U.S.S.R. whereby it accepted to provide us with the new Sam 3 missiles and to train our engineers on their use for a period ranging between three to six months. Thus, in forty days we were able to set up the missile bases at a cost of L.E. 40 million — that is, at a rate of L.E. 1 million per day.

According to the late President's request, I give my thanks to the students of the Faculty of Engineering, Assiut University for the efforts they exerted in clearing the ruins caused by the bombing of the Mankabad prison.

On March 15, 1970, the Sam 3 missiles were set up deep into our territories and the raids in depth came to a halt. We can therefore say that on March 15, we won the "battle of depth" due to the establishment of the new missiles on our defence lines.
After this stage, they diverted their whole attention to our defence line from Port Said to Suez, carrying out successive raids which on some days lasted 17 continuous hours with the number of planes reaching 180. The American initiative made its appearance then. All the parties concerned — Israel, the United States and the Soviet Union — predicted that Egypt will not accept it. However, President Nasser thought it out well; he said that the initiative includes two main points: the implementation of the Security Council Resolution and a ceasefire for a period of 90 days. Since we had formerly accepted the Security Council Resolution and had no objection to a ceasefire, there was no reason for us to refuse the initiative. Our acceptance put the Israelis and the United States in a dilemma. Israel does not want to accept the Security Council Resolution, since this will mean its withdrawal from all the Arab territories it occupied following the June 1967 war. On the other hand, Israel wants the ceasefire to continue by all means.

During the three months of the ceasefire we lost our immortal leader, Gamal Abdel Nasser. Before losing him we lost the whole Eastern front. After the battle which took
place in Jordan, the conference which Nasser held in Cairo to end the massacre between the Jordanian authorities and the Palestine Resistance, and our clash with Iraq. I can now say that the Eastern front does not exist anymore. However, there may be some hope in building it up again some time in the future.

El Sayed Bahi L'adgham gave me a very poor report on the situation in Jordan. He said that the whole thing was a premeditated conspiracy to liquidate the Palestinian Resistance once and for all, as well as the Palestinians living on the Eastern bank of the Jordan. This drove me to contact King Hussein in London and the Arab Kings and Heads of State in order that we may protect the remaining Jordanians and Palestinians.

We support the Palestinian Resistance movement and we consider it, as Gamal Abdel Nasser had once said, one of the most noble aspects of our Arab cause. Though the situation in Jordan is bad and causes the concern of every Arab citizen we still have hope that King Hussein will on his return set things right.

We lost Gamal Abdel Nasser on September 28, 1970; we also lost the Eastern front. Is-
rael and the United States took advantage of the conference and the sedition on the Eastern front and raised an uproar in the world, saying that Egypt had violated the ceasefire agreement and placed missiles on the front.

Right after the conference had ended, President Nasser died. As we were busy with the funeral arrangements, we did not face the uproar raised on account of the missiles. The world had forgotten everything, it forgot the crimes committed by Israel, it forgot the Arab cause, yet it remembered only one thing — that Egypt had violated the ceasefire agreement.

We sent Foreign Minister Mahmud Riad to raise the question before the United Nations General Assembly, which later issued a resolution against the United States and Israel.

Israel remained in isolation after this resolution was issued since it stipulated that the United Nations Secretary General shall submit a report to the Security Council on January 5 on the extent of progress made in the contacts with Ambassador Jarring.

What is the situation now? The situation
revolves around the United States and Israel. The United States has not said until today what it wants. I had asked this question before and told them in several ways: «Lay your cards on the table where I can see to say «yes» to this point and «no» on the other». We hear from Israel that America stands behind its refusal to withdraw an inch except by a contractual agreement and direct negotiations with the Arabs.

It is clear from America's behaviour that it provides Israel with everything and publicly supports it politically and on all other levels with no reservations whatsoever. In addition, there are the statements made by Nixon about an eventual confrontation that might result from that issue.

Then there is the question of the «balance of power» whereby America provides Israel with its superiority over all the Arabs put together. We did not receive an answer to the question of what does America want?

On the other hand, Israel tells us of America's stand towards it. It says «political boundaries» are different from «secure boundaries»; for while secure boundaries are
something, political boundaries are something else. America is behind all this, and Sisco, the U.S. Assistant Secretary of State, contacted Dr. Ashraf Ghorbal telling him that Jarring is just beginning his mission and we should be prepared to make some concessions. What do I have to make as concessions? I do not have any concessions to make except our land or independence.

Dr. Fawzi left for the United States to attend the funeral of Eisenhower and then he met Richardson who was at that time the U.S. Under-Secretary of State. Richardson told Dr. Fawzi we were defeated and should carry out discussions on the basis that we were defeated. America’s policy is clear today: it wants us to yield to the terms of defeat because we are a defeated nation.

Israel now asks for direct negotiations as well as a permanent and unconditional ceasefire; it asks for the negotiations to be moved to a place near to the Middle East crisis — that is the Israeli line of thinking. America follows the same line. It states that before anything else, there should be a renewal of the ceasefire period for six or nine months more instead of 3 months, so that Jarring may have a chance to consider the procedural matters.

Well, concerning that, Israel occupies the occupied before. I say that the initiative belongs to the Arab initiative in the formation of the Palestine basis. By that action, by the following the withdrawal to the borders between Israel and El Sheikh, Confrontation of Sinaï's military force and say no, the I say no, the no, the no, I want to write its destiny; say no. Concerning that, Confrontation of Sinaï's military force and dangerous or not.

I cannot say no, I say no, I say no, the no, the no, I want to write its destiny; say no. Concerning that, Confrontation of Sinaï's military force and dangerous or not.
Well, what is the opinion of America concerning the withdrawal of Israel to lands occupied before the June 5, aggression? They say that their views are found in the Rogers' initiative presented in December 1969. This initiative has some bearing on the Egyptian-Palestine boundary lines but is conditioned by the following terms: a complete withdrawal to the internationally recognised borders between Egypt and Palestine, the two sides — Israel and us — should agree over Sharm El Sheikh, Gaza as well as on the demilitarisation of Sinai. The Israelis say we want a military force stationed at Sharm El Sheikh, and I say no, then Israel says it will not withdraw. Later, Israel says give us Gaza and I answer no, I want to give it to its people to decide its destiny; so Israel says it will not withdraw. Concerning the third issue on the demilitarisation of Sinai, this is considered the most dangerous one.

I cannot demilitarise Sinai for this means that within six hours Israel would return once more to the Canal front threatening the Canal Zone and the Valley.
They, then, suggest the establishment of a demilitarised zone on both sides; my answer here is "no", and the Israeli answer is "no withdrawal".

When we tell them, then "give us your suggestions for withdrawal", they do not answer and only say that we have the Rogers' initiative.

In other words, we are faced with the acceptance of procrastination and a further extension of the ceasefire period to six or nine months more so that contacts may take their course. In this way Eban would present a working formula full of vague and beating-around-the-bush symbols which require months for their solution. Later, after these are solved they need arrangements for a ceasefire; then a time-table for secure boundaries and then they need political borders. Time will thus pass without reaching any results. Is this a solution?

Another solution is to refuse to renew the ceasefire period unless some progress has been achieved, i.e. the Big Four Powers together with Secretary General U Thant submit a serious schedule for withdrawal. Without this we will not renew the ceasefire period for
one hour more because this would lead us into new labyrinths and would finally lead us to the same abyss into which went the Palestine cause, the solution of which would take at least 20 years.

American-Israeli propaganda has been trying to make the world believe that not accepting to renew the ceasefire period after February 5 means that I would wage war on that date. By this kind of talk, they are in fact trying to influence public opinion in the West, exploiting the hatred the Western peoples have for war as a result of their tremendous sufferings from it.

I did not say I will declare war on February 5, but I declared that I will not commit myself to a ceasefire after this date and will not renew the ceasefire period; which is very different from the declaration of war which the pro-Israeli Western papers are talking about.

We have no alternative; yet if you have a solution, let me hear it though I tell you that after studying the situation thoroughly, only these two solutions remain. So, what is your opinion?
(Applause and cries of: «We do not accept any procrastinations»).

It is most important to inform you that Israel still has undeniable force which it could use in inflicting losses on our side. However, we reached the decision that as brave people we have to endure everything. In 1956, we faced a situation very similar to the one we face now and we refused the ultimatum and waged the battle. This time, there will be more pain and more sacrifice but I have no doubt that we will win the battle with God’s will.

During its long history Egypt had sustained tremendous sufferings, yet Egypt had stood firm and was always the grave of all invaders. Our simple, good, stubborn and solid people will never integrate with the occupation forces. Egypt retained its nationalism and we retained our relentless firmness and faith.

I am sure of winning victory in this battle, the victory for which we are ready to pay the price.

The Vietnamese peasant whose only weapon is his rifle stood firm in the face of the American arsenal of arms and forced America to withdraw from his land.
We, Egyptians, have lived long on this land and will die on it, as our fathers and forefathers did since the beginning of life and as our offspring will do to the end of this world. We will retain our independence and our pride whatever the wounds, bleeding and sacrifice may be and even if we bleed, our heads will remain high and upright.

May God guide your steps.