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Brothers and sisters,

I do not think that there is a moment in the modern history of Egypt which needs the thought and mind of all its intellectuals and those capable of research and study as this moment of our struggle we are living today. This moment, brethren, needs every beam of light, every sound opinion and every effort. It needs all this and all that is in the interest of the homeland alone, inspired only by the interest of the people and taking into consideration the destiny of an Arab nation expecting each one to perform his duty, to shoulder his responsibility and to take part in determining its destiny.
I do not want, my brothers and sisters, to evoke enthusiasm, give courage or excite feelings and emotions; for this is not the time for it now and this is not exactly what we want from this distinguished gathering that represents the most progressive vanguard who meet here in this hall of Cairo University.

The University is the modern embodiment of a comprehensive tradition in the genuine civilisationary history of Egypt.

The moment is now for thought and organised planning. There is no need for anyone to arouse or move our feelings. Great battles and crucial moments need, beside profound faith in the aim and complete preparedness to sacrifice for it, organised thought and sound planning.

Power, whatever its size may be, becomes blind power, if it is not organised by sound planning.

Work, whatever the strength of its movement, may never reach its goal unless it is directed and guided by organised and sound planning.

Thought is the base and sound planning is the framework; then power can perform its task and succeed in this realm which is that of thought, and in this university explore its realms.

The moment is now, the moment means that we must find our destiny and contribute to your suspense of our objectives.

We speak about power, so we speak about purpose which is that of the past, we speak about power, we must be about purpose, our purpose is not other than the power that stems from its foundation, from organized will, from organized thought.

Brothers and sisters,
sisters, that I came to you tonight in an attempt, in the first place, to think together and explore the horizons of planning for the future.

The cause we are facing — by which I mean the intellectual cause and the cause of destiny — and about which I want to speak to you today, is a complicated and a dangerous cause — it is a cause of destiny.

I assure you that Egypt will not be a cause according to the common meaning by which the cause of Egypt was described in the past, for that era has passed. Egypt will not be a cause because its destiny will not be subject to the arbitration or the domination of others. Egypt does not need judges to decide its future because Egypt is capable, by God's will, of determining its future.

Brothers and sisters,

I wanted to make it clear that we face a cause in which we, and not others, are the judges. It is a cause of thought and planning, and not one for arbitration or judgement we ask from anybody, or domination we accept from another party or other parties.
It might have been a cause determined by others if we had accepted that in 1967. But on June 9 and 10 the people refused and the immortal leader, Gamal Abdel Nasser, by the great power of his people and nation and by the guidance of God Almighty — toiled and tried during the three and a half years since June, 1967 to change the situation. The situation has changed and we are now in a new position. The people, Gamal Abdel Nasser and the new army, the masses and the leader were able to drastically change the situation; until now we are no longer a cause placed before others. The cause is our concern and we are its judges. Consequently it is a free decision of our will if we can think it over and plan for it. For this reason I want your thoughts and your minds with me tonight because the homeland needs all this and a whole nation is waiting for it.

I do not want to raise my voice during this dialogue or to get impassioned because strong voices do not win battles and they are not necessarily an expression of capable power.

Perhaps it would be better to start resorting to the scientific method to which you are used and of which we are in dire need.
Let us begin diagnosing the problem we are facing now, then we study, one by one, the powers affecting it and probe the present situation we are confronting today, then proceed to the expected possibilities and the results subsequent to each of them. Perhaps you will agree with me that this is the right method and the sound programme.

What is the problem?

We face today world Zionism supported by the power of the United States which is one of the two big powers of today’s world. The Zionist movement which was initiated in the last century, as all of you know, and which held its conferences and defined its goals has made for its objective the creation of «Greater Israel» from the Nile to the Euphrates. I base this on the declarations of the officials in Israel so that we may be unbiased and scientific in our estimation. The last statement by the former Minister of Communications Weizman was «I do not know that there are any borders for Israel other than those defined by Theodor Herzl». We all know that he was the power behind the first Israeli Conference, and we know that the borders defin-
ed by Herzl are from the Nile to the Euphrates.

They planned and started work with extreme seriousness and dedication as the books of history state and as they themselves wrote.

You know that this movement continued to pursue the big powers since the last century in order to ally itself to them. First, Herzl went to the Sultan of Turkey and when he realised that power in Europe had shifted to Germany, he went to the Kaiser of Germany. When Germany was defeated and the centre of power shifted to Britain, Herzl went to Britain, and the Zionist movement remained in Britain after Herzl. When Britain, in turn, lost its strength and the centre of power after World War II was balanced between America and Russia, the Zionist movement was shifted to the United States.

Throughout all these phases: with the Sultan of Turkey, the Kaiser of Germany, the British government and now with America, Zionism never abandoned its main principle and its original objective. It wants to make itself an agent for any big power that emerges in this world so that it may be able to realise.
through this big power, its dream of establishing «Greater Israel.»

I do not want to dwell at length on this history, because you know it very well indeed. I simply wish to point out the main outlines of the problem we are facing today so that we may, together, diagnose it and prescribe the remedy.

World War I came to an end and the Balfour Declaration was issued, whose full meaning the Arabs, then, did not realise. Immigration to Palestine continued, the Palestinian people started their revolts and struggle until the beginning of World War II. Briefly then, the war ended and Britain, the Mandatory State over Palestine, gave Israel — instead of the U.N. Partition Resolution — the greater parts of Palestine in addition to the parts that they had already seized by means of guerrilla warfare. They gave them the greater parts and then they left Palestine. The 1948 war broke out and ended with the result which we know. Perhaps all of us were the contemporaries of these events and the Armistice concluded in 1949.

Israel refused, throughout every stage,
to define its borders and Ben Gurion admitted as much in his Memoirs. They do not want to define borders for Israel because their big dream is from the Nile to the Euphrates. It is the duty of every generation in Israel to realise as much as it can of this dream. As Moshe Dayan said, the old generation that preceded them attained the borders of 1949 and this generation established the borders of 1967 and the coming generations are expected to fulfill their mission planned by world Zionism at the first Basel Conference.

After 1948, Israel was not satisfied with its borders. According to the armistice, there were demilitarised zones which they occupied such as Om Al Rashrash zone in which they built Eilath Port; Al Auga was a demilitarised zone between us and they slowly occupied it in order to realise their big aim.

As I told you in this hall before, the aggression of February 28, 1955 should not be forgotten; it must be underlined because it was the prelude to the battle we are living today. In 1955, Israel attacked Gaza which was under Egyptian administration at that time. We asked America and Britain to give us arms for the Egyptian Army but they refused.
Their main condition was that we should accept the mutual security agreement which stipulated that we should not use American arms without permission from America. The aggression of February 28, 1955 — as I told you in this hall in 1969 — was directed against us because we attacked the Baghdad Pact and the western projects which aimed at containing us in this area.

Israel — according to the declarations of its ministers — is the first line of defence for American interests in the region. The United States gave a signal to Israel, only two months after we had signed the evacuation agreement. It ordered Israel to attack, and they told us that if we do not obey their wishes they will let Israel teach us a lesson. During the same year, we made the arms deal through which we were able to strengthen our Armed Forces. We got hold of weapons from the Eastern Bloc.

As I had previously said in this very hall in 1969, this was the beginning of the agreement breaking the arms embargo imposed on us which we concluded in September, 1955 and according to which we were able to provide our Armed Forces with new weapons from the U.S.S.R. and the Eastern Bloc.
Israel proceeded along its way to realise its big dream first by seizing any demilitarised zone. Then came the 1956 conspiracy.

What is it that happened between us and Israel, which drove it to attack us? The battle was between us and France and England over the nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company. The problem originally arose due to our desire to build the High Dam, the completion of which we shall celebrate, if God wills, in a few days. Israel seized the opportunity and joined the conspiracy. Israel — and we all know its secrets and the treaty between Ben Gurion and Britain — was determined to realise its main objective — that of expanding from the Nile to the Euphrates.

The tripartite aggression of 1956 resulted in the withdrawal of Israel, Britain and France.

Since then, Israel has not wasted one moment in preparing itself for the battle in the hope of realising its dream. It began to build up its Armed Forces and Air Force, dedicating all its potentialities and the assistance it receives from world Zionism for the forthcoming war... the war of 1967. We all remem-
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At such times, Zionism is in the habit 
of finding a big power to which it becomes 
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power was the United States. The 1967 ag-
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that we do not intend to attack. We did not want any trouble in 1967. However, when they said that they will enter Damascus, it was then quite possible for them to enter Cairo too. The United States declared that there will be no aggression, and asked whether we would be prepared to send the U.A.R. Vice-President to the United States. President Nasser agreed and the date — June 7, 1967 — was fixed for the arrival of our delegate to the United States. At the same time, Johnson told Israel to attack before the arrival of the Egyptian delegate on June 7.

We know that we came out very badly from the June 1967 battle. But our people, thank God, never lost their faith. They even rose on June 9 and 10 with more firmness, genuineness and faith.

These people who had nothing at that time but their faith rose and refused defeat. At the same time, America was carrying out its task at the U.N. because it had made a pledge to Israel, after the battle, to halt all attempts at a peaceful settlement and to hamper the efforts exerted by the world community so that no resolution can be reached.
We all remember the time we lived through after June 5. Goldberg, the U.S. delegate was a Zionist and declared that he was proud of being Zionist. The U.S. President Johnson and its Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, said that they did not know who had started the aggression... Then, when a resolution for ceasefire and withdrawal came to the vote, America intervened to refuse the principle of withdrawal.

We all remember this... America intervened with all its power, wealth and influence, it did the impossible until the ceasefire resolution came out without stipulating the withdrawal.

In November, 1967, the Security Council adopted a resolution worked out by Britain and accepted by all members of the Security Council, and which America had officially pledged to support and work for its implementation as a solution to the problem.

Then came Jarring whose mission lasted for a year and a half. He kept on travelling from here to Cyprus, to Jerusalem and Jordan. It was very obvious from the beginning that his mission was doomed to failure. All his ef-

forts were futile because Israel believed that it realised part of its great dream which is a step towards the fulfilment of the greater objective. It also thought that amidst our grief and defeat it could place us before an accomplished fact, take over whatever it likes and impose its conditions on us, we, the Arabs.

Strangely enough, Nixon said at his last press conference, four days ago, that had the Soviets not supplied the Arabs with weapons, and had they been more understanding with them (the Americans) it would have been possible to solve the Middle East problem. Nixon added that America supplied Israel with weapons because there was a flow of arms from Russia to Egypt and consequently America must maintain the balance of power in the Middle East.

This is a regretful state... Israel which came out of the war victorious with all its weapons, as well as the weapons it won from us, still needs new arms... But, if we, who lost everything, and on June 9 and 10 had nothing left except 5,000 rifles as President Nasser said before, attempt to get new arms to rebuild our Armed Forces, then we are changing the balance of power... Israel, with
all it has, what it seized and the supplies America sent to it, is afraid of the change in the balance of power... and so the U.S. tries to maintain that balance!

President Nixon had pledged in his election campaign to safeguard for Israel its superiority in arms, over all the Arab countries. But apparently he does not want to say this now and calls for the 19th century theory on the balance of power, which is the reason for providing Israel with arms.

When we accepted the Rogers initiative last summer, it included two points: the implementation of the Security Council Resolution and the resumption of contacts with Jarring — and a ceasefire period of 90 days in order to pave the way for this contact.

We accepted the initiative — America sent this proposal officially... and also declared officially that it would not deliver any kind of arms to Israel during the 90 days of ceasefire.

But to our surprise, Israel launched a propaganda campaign throughout the world alleging that Egypt had violated the ceasefire.
Then came the Arab Summit Conference to discuss the Jordan events, and the death of President Gamal Abdel Nasser and our period of pain and grief... The U.S. seized this opportunity to declare that the problem was not that of Israel's occupation of Arab lands... no... it is a question of Egypt's violation of the ceasefire !!!

Consequently, arms began to flow into Israel in violation of the declarations made by America that arms will not be delivered to Israel during the ceasefire period. This is the problem and this is where we stand today.

The question today is — what after the ceasefire and our acceptance to renew the ceasefire for another period in accordance with the resolution of the U.N. General Assembly ?

When Mahmud Riad went to the U.N. and raised the question there against America's will, he succeeded in attaining a resolution against America and Israel and that Jarring must present his report within 60 days, that is on January 5, 1971.

The problem today is not only that America delivers arms to Israel, but we hear the
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America withdrew its delegate. This was meant to pressure us during our period of grief in the hope that everything here would collapse.

America undermines the Big Four Power meetings so that they might not reach a positive result, while the world community stood paralysed and unable to act.

Meanwhile, Israel announces publicly and officially that it shall not abide by any resolution adopted by the U.N. or the Security Council. America does not hide its arms supplies to Israel. Artillery, tanks, aircraft and ammunition, everything is sent publicly, under the pretext that arms are pouring in on the Arabs and on Egypt from the Soviet Union. Let us keep our good will and intentions. Let us give chances to America and believe what

Israeli officials saying very strange things...

Mrs. Meir, the Israeli Prime Minister, and other ministers state that America told them not to withdraw from the occupied lands unless a contractual peace agreement is reached and that it supports their attitude 100% — while the world community stands paralysed before the problem.

At the meetings of the Big Four Powers, America withdrew its delegate. This was meant to pressure us during our period of grief in the hope that everything here would collapse.

America undermines the Big Four Power meetings so that they might not reach a positive result, while the world community stood paralysed and unable to act.

Meanwhile, Israel announces publicly and officially that it shall not abide by any resolution adopted by the U.N. or the Security Council. America does not hide its arms supplies to Israel. Artillery, tanks, aircraft and ammunition, everything is sent publicly, under the pretext that arms are pouring in on the Arabs and on Egypt from the Soviet Union. Let us keep our good will and intentions. Let us give chances to America and believe what
it says about wanting peace, a peaceful settlement in the area, as well as respect for the sovereignty of states.

How do we explain these words and the fact that machine-guns, the new Phantoms, anti-missile weapons and the new land-to-land rockets are sent to Israel from American ports? This news comes out from America and when we ask them about it, they say that they do not comment officially on any arms deals they make. Certainly all this is part of America’s psychological warfare.

I told Mahmud Riad when he was going to the U.N. to ask the Americans:

«What do you want? Come and let us put our cards on the table. It is evident that the problem is no longer Israel. The problem is America. What do you want?»

To this day, America has not answered... It only declares that it wants peace. Can peace be achieved while it supplies Israel with Phantoms and encourages it to occupy Arab lands? Is it peace to sit with Israel at the same table? This is not peace, this is surrender. But they say: You have lost the battle so you must accept some concessions.

America's problem is not the other side, but because of the reaction it would want to maintain it repeats the same official line of Dr. M. Nabil:

Are we surrendering, or being tricked into accepting this situation?

And so it seems that we are surrendering, and will never be able to sit in any peace talks with such behavior.

The Case for America’s Peace

After all, we have had that battle in 1967 and the battle is not over.

We insist on the 1967 war and will not accept any and must fight on every stage of it, not at the price of strong,
The only explanation I reached for America’s behaviour is that it wants us to accept the conditions imposed on a defeated people because we were defeated, lagging behind and would not be able to keep up with Israel. They repeated this many times, State Department officials said it, and it was said in part to Dr. Mahmud Fawzy at Eisenhower’s funeral. Are we ready to accept America’s logic of being treated as a defeated people, and so accept the conditions imposed on us?

Are we ready to accept their claim that we are an underdeveloped nation, and that we will never be able scientifically or socially or in any other field to keep up with Israel or with scientific progress and technology?

This is the only explanation I could find for America’s attitude.

At one time, one of Nixon’s advisers said that Egypt must not come out strong from the battle.

Well, now three and a half years after 1967 we are strong, economically, politically and militarily. Not only have we passed the stage of danger, but I can say that we are strong, economically strong. The construc-
tion of the High Dam is completed, and we have contracts for all other factories. We concluded the contract for the Iron and Steel Complex, and we already spent L.E. 85 million of its costs which are estimated at L.E. 400 million. We allocated L.E. 300 million for development and L.E. 560 million for the army, and we absorb and employ all the graduates.

It is true that sometimes things are tight but we all pay the price so that never again shall we kneel.

We have demands. Many people have demands and aspirations. The moment will come when all our demands and aspirations will be realised, God willing. The moment will come sooner than anyone can imagine.

I received the Soviet mission which explored for petroleum in Siwa, and if we leave ourselves to imagine the possibilities, we shall be amazed. Joy shall come after pain; we suffered much and grieved much over Gamal, and surely, God willing, things will improve.

Economically, we sometimes have difficult periods, but we survive. There are aspirations broader than what we dream of. Politically, we are standing firm on our feet... pressures did not make us change but the policy.

The Army is the pivot on its policy, opportune, consolidated. Syria, Libya, the fulcrum, the fulcrum.

Politically, contrary, we are standing firm on our feet. The Sudan may become another Gamal never die.

We have demands. Many people have demands and aspirations. The moment will come when all our demands and aspirations will be realised, God willing. The moment will come sooner than anyone can imagine.

I received the Soviet mission which explored for petroleum in Siwa, and if we leave ourselves to imagine the possibilities, we shall be amazed. Joy shall come after pain; we suffered much and grieved much over Gamal, and surely, God willing, things will improve.

Economically, we sometimes have difficult periods, but we survive. There are aspirations broader than what we dream of. Politically, we are standing firm on our feet... pressures
did not succeed in affecting us... pressures did not make us change our line of life and we are still the judges of our destiny. No one but the sons of this country will shape its policy.

The socialist transformation is continuing on its path, and our sons are offered equal opportunities... Our political line is being consolidated day after day, even more than that, Syria, Libya and the Sudan are talking about the fulfillment of the dream of the Arab nation.

Politically we are not weak; on the contrary, with the inception of the Revolution in the Sudan and the Revolution in Libya, it has become fully clear that the Arab nation will never die.

We came out strong, politically and economically. Militarily, we rebuilt our Armed Forces in three and a half years. President Gamal Abdel Nasser, God’s mercy be upon him, devoted every particle of his being in order to change conditions and balance matters; he worked day and night for this purpose.

Our strength today is to be taken into consideration. Our sons are becoming proficient
in the use of all the equipment of modern and electronic warfare. We cannot lag behind or stand still while the world moves on.

We came out strong from the political, economic and military battles. We say to the Americans on what did you base claims that we are not strong? Do you wish us to return once more to the Western world's spheres of influence? It is clear that Israel has objectives we all know of and America also has objectives and interests in this area. America is trying to preserve its interests and certain positions in the area.

It wants to liquidate all the regimes that stand for liberation and which do not follow the familiar pattern in the West.

Let us come now to the powers which affect the situation in order to follow up our study. We find Israel and I explained its attitude which is clear... insistence on expansion and the fulfilment of the Zionist dream, namely the establishment of «Greater Israel» from the Nile to the Euphrates.
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There is another thing which is very
strange: Israel took its requirements from the
budget of the U.S. Defence Department. This
means that Israel is part of the United States.

The israeli Premier and officials stated
that America told them not to relinquish the
occupied land unless a contractual agree-
ment is reached with the Arabs which means that
the israelis would sit at one table with the
Arabs and impose a settlement on them.

When the U.S. Secretary of Health came
to attend President Nasser’s funeral, and after
an hour’s discussion with him, he said that
Israel was keeping the land in pawn until an
agreement is reached... I told him that paying
is not accepted in our country and we
consider it morally wrong.

Israel lives on operations of demand and
payment, and the American military, political
and economic support... Israel lives on aid from
abroad... about L.E. 500 million are given to Israel annually from the outside world while America gives it everything... This is Israel's attitude and this is America's attitude.

We come now to the Soviet Union... In fact, I am interested in clarifying the attitude of the Soviet Union because it might be better in this battle to know all facts especially in this gathering of distinguished intellectuals.

Since the day we concluded the arms deal with the Soviet Union in September, 1955 until this day I can enumerate the attitudes of the Soviet Union. During this period I occupied different posts of responsibility and I can speak of things I saw and which took place before me, not hearsay. Their first stand concerned breaking the arms monopoly. They sold us arms without any strings attached, whereas Britain and America used to impose conditions.

The second attitude was in 1956... When the World Bank and the U.S. withdrew their offers to finance the High Dam, the Soviet Union proposed to finance the High Dam project.

Then when the tripartite aggression took place in 1967...
given to the world while this Israel's peace.

In conclusion... In our attitude better morally especially in the intellectuals.

Terrorists deal with us up to 1955 until the beginnings of the occupation and I can say that this took place for political and commercial reasons. They sold us everything, wherever there were conditions.

... When the Soviet Union took their place in 1956, the Soviet Union stood by our side politically and compensated us militarily.

In 1960, we began to implement the High Dam project; in 1964, the first stage was completed while in 1971, the second stage was completed. We shall celebrate the end of construction of the High Dam next Friday.

The industrialisation agreement included the establishment of 1,000 factories.

I believe that modern technology — available in the two big powers — is most vital and dangerous. It is well-known that all the equipment used in electronic warfare is found only in the United States and in the Soviet Union. Though France, England, Belgium and Holland may possess some of these weapons, only these two blocs possess complete electronic warfare capacity. What are we to do if we do not own the science of the modern age at a time when we are in the middle of a battle in which our enemy is using electronic warfare? The United States stood beside Israel in the battle and provided it with all electronic warfare equipment. As I told you before, electronic warfare capability has now become essential in war. Will the United States give
electronic warfare weapons or teach me technology? We know that it will tell us to negotiate with Israel. However, we will not negotiate with Israel and we will not accept to be a front defence line for the United States or for anyone else.

The most important thing that Soviet support has done is that it has enabled us to end the age of backwardness in order that we may no longer remain an underdeveloped nation and so that no one can force any conditions upon us.

In 1965, the United States suddenly cut off its aid to us, with which we used to buy our wheat and half our factories were threatened. We were supposed to discontinue our development plan to buy wheat. We found ourselves in a fix since with the hard currency we used to buy raw materials to operate our factories. President Gamal Abdel Nasser then left for Moscow in December, 1965 and explained the situation to the Russians, as our friends, without asking them for anything. During an official session at the Kremlin, Kosygin explained the position of the U.S.S.R.

They did not ask for a base, they asked nothing whatsoever from us. We were completely isolated in the Middle East, and negotiations were lost between the United States weapons and the United States and the Soviet Union in the Middle East. We saw no \textit{agreement} to provide us with"
We found that the U.S.S.R. would accept that we would not accept the United States.

We asked them for experts to train us in the proper use of the weapons, and they agreed. In November, 1967 they began to provide us with the weapons.

I wish to say that the hitting of the Abu Zaabal factory was considered by the late President Gamal Abdel Nasser a serious stage of escalation after they had hit the frontline and the second line. The losses incurred in the Abu Zaabal incident were intended to be greater; 800 persons were to be killed, not only 80. However, they were five minutes late in hitting the factory. Thus missing the train which was carrying the workers of the new shift.

President Nasser, on January 22, went on a secret visit to the U.R.S.S. and reached an agreement with the Russians whereby they provided the United Arab Republic with missiles to prevent the enemy from carrying his raids in depth and to defend the home-front.
The U.S.S.R. stood beside us and sent us the SAM-3 missiles.

I told the correspondent of the American Television that if Israel was worried about its security, it could get the Four Big Powers to safeguard its borders. He said that Russia would not agree to that; but I told him that now it would agree.

After we got the SAM-3's, they began to talk about «Russian occupation», as if the interested powers have become very solicitous about the Egyptian people! But, what about the bombs that were dropped on the Arab people? Why were they not so solicitous about the Arab people then?

I said that Roosevelt and Churchill hurried to Stalin in Russia to ensure his help against Hitler. That is to say that they deemed it right for them to receive that help, whereas it is wrong for us to receive it!

The Soviets stood by our side in the battle of the air-raids against our hinterland until these raids were stopped in February after the establishment of the missiles in their positions.
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and the air-defence have had first-hand ex-
perience of the jamming operations which im-
peded the functioning of wireless and radar.

The Soviets supplied us with the electronic
equipment and our sons are now fully trained
to handle this equipment, and electronic wea-
pons constitute an integral branch of our Arm-
ed Forces today.

I need not speak about the Soviet Union's
support to us, politically. The Soviet Union
does not take any political stand before con-
sulting us and receiving our consent. They ac-
cept what we accept and reject what we re-
ject. There was the last meeting with Aly
Sabry in Moscow, and everything proceeds ac-
cording to this agreement. But, what do we
give the Soviet Union; and what does the So-
viet Union ask us for?

Well, when Mr. Kosygin came here for the
funeral, they said that he asked us for this
and that... But, in fact, when Kosygin came,
he spoke to all members of the Higher Exec-
utive Committee who attended the meeting.
He said: «We support you because you main-
tain Gamal Abdel Nasser's line.» This is his-
tory, and we cannot speak differently. In our country, we are not used to dealing in a different way. In 1952, our will was liberated, and we are not prepared to give it up. Otherwise, we could have sat back comfortably and there would have been no need to fight any battles. As the Americans said, they would have opened to us their stores of «honey and butter».

Now, here are the positions of other powers: France, as you know, since the time of De Gaulle; after the incident of Beirut airport, and even after the coming to power of Pompidou's government — its position is based upon justice and understanding. We, on our part, try to do our best and we hope that France's position will remain unchanged. We strive to that end.

As for Britain, it has come out of the Suez War (which probably gave it a complex) as a second-runner to the big powers, and it became greatly dependent upon America — its policy had to agree with that of America. But, after the return to power of the Conservative Government — though it is strange that the Conservatives should have more courage than Labour — there was a noticeable improvement, no doubt. There were statements by Home interpreting the «territories» — which they did not mean the inadmissibility meant the withdrawal of territories. Before making any interpretation, Government there around the bush there or «the territories» of the Conservative along this line.

Moreover, all of Europe have begun to understand the situation. The picture stands the situation in Belgium and Holland — but the picture is complete.

Then, there is as well as the Americans adopt a true position than ever, of the strongest
Interpreting the Security Council's Resolution — which they drafted — to the effect that the inadmissibility of annexing land by force meant the withdrawal from all occupied territories. Before this, Britain abstained from making any interpretation. Under the Labour Government there was even some beating around the bush about the word « territories » or « the territories ». We hope that the policy of the Conservative Government will continue along this line.

Moreover, all the countries of Western Europe have begun to understand the situation. The picture has changed. Italy understands the situation and so does Spain. Belgium and Holland have their own commitments but the picture is no longer that of 1967 when there was complete support of Israel.

Then, there are the non-aligned countries, as well as the Afro-Asian countries. They all adopt a true position of support. The non-aligned countries in Lusaka took a stronger position than ever before and issued resolutions of support. President Tito, in fact, adopted a grand attitude, together with other leaders who were responsible for the adoption of one of the strongest resolutions yet adopted.
It was obvious that after three and a half years, and following our steadfastness, there has been a development that revealed the true intentions of Israel and had a great impact upon the positions of many countries whose previous positions were hard to change.

We come to the situation today. What is the picture? The picture today is that we have accepted a second ceasefire because the United Nations called upon Israel to withdraw and asked for an extension of the ceasefire; and we responded to it. But we immediately declared that we shall not accept any delaying or dilly-dallying thereafter. That is to say, if after the 5th of February there will still be no serious action for peace — serious action through drawing up a time-table — or else the Four Big Powers do not intervene effectively in order to bring about the withdrawal, we shall not renew the ceasefire.

Israel kept silent and tried to make an issue of the so-called violation of the ceasefire in order to alienate the world from the basic issue. Now, Israel has resumed its contacts with Jarring, pretending that its resumption of contacts with Jarring solves the problem; because they found themselves in a...
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our own strategy is that we must prevent the issue from dying out — to prevent the ceasefire from becoming an indefinite one, thus entering upon a cold war and letting the issue stand at that.

The alternatives which we face are:

- To accept further delay, i.e., on February 5 we accept a further extension of the ceasefire which may be for a period of 6 or 9 months instead of 3 months; and this will be a matter of «slow death» at which the issue will end; or

- To move politically as we do today. Political movement does not merely mean sending delegations to speak out; but we say that unless Jarring's contacts reach a new stage and reveal serious action on the part of the Security Council or at the Four-Power meetings showing assured progress towards peace, we shall not renew the ceasefire. Meanwhile, we must be prepared for every eventuality and work in every direction.

They began a cry about the «Luna» missiles and earth-to-earth missiles to prepare world public opinion for one of their strikes which would strike; skinned wide-awake can remain a half-foolies and let
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which they describe as a «pre-emptive» strike; and, therefore, we must keep our eyes skinned; our sons on the battle-front must be wide-awake the whole of the 24 hours. You can remain assured that our sons, in three and a half years, have raised their fighting abilities and received strenuous training.

The enemy claims that we are incapable; that if we did anything we will receive a blow. Naturally, they base themselves on the effects of the defeat or even its form. They say that we are now without Gamal Abdel Nasser and without the Eastern Front which has disintegrated. The psychological warfare which Israel launches against us includes their claim of superiority over all the Arabs combined together with America's unlimited support to it in arms and cash.

This is the picture of the situation as it stands today. The question which I have come to ask you, so that you may take part in answering it is: «Shall we accept the delay? ... (all present: No, No, No delay nor-dilly-dallying); «or, shall we act, move politically and face what the battle may bring in order to liberate our land and restore our dignity?» (applause and slogans of support).
I thank you for this response, and it will give me more pleasure if we can start as from now in our universities — especially in the colleges where political science is being taught — to form groups of study so that our universities may be able to take part in making political decisions through scientific and academic research, taking into account the new conditions and developments as they occur.

Brothers,

We are, to-day, among the land where we were, amongst the silence in the silence in the silence.

Brothers,

You must not fail to answer your brethren and the staff of your university. My voice has not been heard; but now it is the hour of you — the silence.
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