

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SEVENTH YEAR

1662nd MEETING: 10 SEPTEMBER 1972

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1662)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 9 September 1972 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10782);	
(b) Letter dated 10 September 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10783)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SECOND MEETING

Held in New York on Sunday, 10 September 1972, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. HUANG Hua (China).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Belgium, China, France, Guinea, India, Italy, Japan, Panama, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1662)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 9 September 1972 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10782);
 - (b) Letter dated 10 September 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10783).

The meeting was called to order at 5.40 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 9 September 1972 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10782);
- (b) Letter dated 10 September 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10783)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its previous meeting, and again with the Council's consent, I invite the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon to take places at the Council table in order to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and the practice of the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. H. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. E. Ghorra (Lebanon) took places at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): I wish to recall that the Council is seized of two draft resolutions, one submitted by Guinea, Somalia, and Yugoslavia, contained in document S/10784, and the other submitted by the United States of America, contained in document S/10785.

3. It is my understanding that the majority of the members of the Council are in a position to explain their vote after the vote on draft resolution S/10784. Therefore, it is my intention to put that draft resolution to the vote if there is no delegation wishing to speak on the matter at this stage.

4. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I shall not waste time by indulging in compliments to you, but I simply must take the occasion to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council and to say how confident we feel of the manner in which you will conduct our deliberations.

5. I have asked to speak now in order to introduce, on behalf of the delegations of Belgium, France, Italy and the United Kingdom, amendments to the draft resolution submitted by Guinea, Somalia and Yugoslavia [S/10784]. I understand that these amendments are being typed, translated and readied for circulation, but I might perhaps read out their text¹ to the Council so that it can be informed what they consist of.

6. After the first preambular paragraph, we propose the insertion of a second preambular paragraph reading as follows:

"Deploring deeply all acts of terrorism and violence and all breaches of the cease-fire in the Middle East"

7. In the operative paragraph, we would replace the words "the parties" by "all parties" and the words "cease immediately all military operations" by "take all measures for the immediate cessation and prevention of all military operations and terrorist activities". The remainder of the paragraph would remain unchanged. Thus, the whole paragraph would read as follows:

"Calls on all parties concerned to take all measures for the immediate cessation and prevention of all military operations and terrorist activities and to exercise the greatest restraint in the interest of international peace and security."

¹ Subsequently circulated as document S/10786.

8. I do not think I need explain the reasoning behind the introduction of these amendments at great length. I believe it will be clear, for we are meeting under the shadow of terrible events. Once more violence has erupted within the Middle East context, and, once more, the horrors of terrorism and of reprisal have fallen upon innocent victims. The nature of the connexion between the tragic killings at Munich and the incidents described by the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon will be fiercely argued. But whatever that may be, whatever the relationship of cause and effect, whatever the justification or lack of justification, the resort to force against national or international law is to be condemned. We cannot condemn the one kind of violence and condone the other. We cannot accept the trend that seems to be on the increase in many parts of the world today for people to take the law into their own hands. We feel very strongly about this in my own country, and my Foreign Secretary has addressed himself to this theme in the past two sessions of the General Assembly. None of us can feel ourselves immune from these dangers, my own country included. We have therefore been gratified to see that the Secretary-General himself has been moved by recent events to propose this subject as an additional and urgent item for the coming Assembly.

9. With this background I think that the Council will see the reasoning behind the amendments which I have just submitted in the names of our four delegations.

10. Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Following the statement just made by the United Kingdom representative, I should like to say—although my delegation is in fact one of the sponsors of the amendments—that it entirely supports those amendments, which I believe will greatly enhance the possibility of adoption of the basic draft resolution.

11. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): The sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document S/10784 have had an opportunity to study the proposed amendments submitted by the delegations of Belgium, France, Italy and the United Kingdom. The sponsors appreciate the motives which compelled those delegations to move the amendments. Yet they feel that if these amendments were accepted they would alter the whole purpose, the whole thrust of the draft resolution which we submitted this morning. The draft resolution, as has already been pointed out, neither condemns nor condones the acts of violence that have characterized the Middle East situation ever since this problem came to the attention of the Security Council. We feel that there is a pressing need for this Council to go ahead with the very first step in the process of reaching an acceptable formula and a solution to the Middle East problem—that is, to contain the situation by calling for the immediate cessation of all military operations. In this regard when we speak about "military operations" we are speaking about the armed forces of Member States of this Organization. It is important that we not be deflected from our main target and that we concentrate first of all upon regulating relations within the membership of this Organization. Each Government represented here has direct control over its armed forces. It is important that those Governments be committed to ordering their armed forces

to cease further military operations against the territory of others.

12. Accordingly, the sponsors hope that in the spirit in which the draft resolution has been presented, the Council will waste no further time but will act favourably and express itself unanimously.

13. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): My delegation as one of the sponsors of the draft resolution would like to indicate when any amendments such as those just proposed by the four delegations are not acceptable.

14. First, the three-Power draft resolution is an interim text. It deals with the situation now at hand. It asks all parties² to cease all military operations and to refrain from any future ones. Several speakers have already explained quite amply why it is our duty first to vote and, we hope, adopt this draft resolution now without any delay. Then, if the Council wishes, the roots of the crisis and all the circumstances bearing upon it can be discussed and decided upon.

15. The second reason is our deep reluctance to add to our simple draft resolution any amendment that would directly or indirectly link the attacks of one State upon another State with the terrorist acts committed in Munich. We do not wish anyone for any reason to think that we somehow understand or accept or see any justification for using the so-called right of self-defence as a pretext for an organized State to attack another State with its massive military force because extremist groups do this or that.

16. As I have already said in my statement this morning, the feelings and views of the Yugoslav public, its Olympic bodies and its Federal Secretariat of Foreign Affairs on the deplorable acts perpetrated in Munich against Israel's athletes have been clearly spelled out. But our draft resolution deals with something else; stopping and preventing military action which is being undertaken or envisaged in the region of the Middle East now. We simply cannot put these on an equal footing without jeopardizing some of the foundations on which we must base ourselves in our conduct of international life.

17. Mrs. CISSE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): The draft resolution contained in document S/10784, submitted by the delegations of Somalia, Yugoslavia and my own country, is the minimum text that the Council can adopt in circumstances of this nature. We ask for the immediate cessation of military operations. The amendments proposed by the four Powers so weaken our draft resolution that the very idea that we have voiced of an immediate cessation of military operations is considerably watered down by them. That is why my delegation believes, like the other sponsors of the draft resolution, that these amendments are unacceptable.

18. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): My delegation does not intend to discuss this subject at length. It will be recalled that when the three-Power draft resolution was submitted

² Subsequently, the Yugoslav delegation submitted a modification whereby the words "all parties" would be replaced by "parties". See paragraph 67 of the present meeting.

my delegation supported it. We supported it because we are faced with a situation of naked aggression on Member countries in which civilians have lost their lives. Furthermore, there are threats coming from the aggressive party that more people will be killed. So we thought that it would be fitting for this Council to stop this situation from deteriorating and to ensure that more innocent human lives in both the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon were not lost. For that reason we supported the proposal as put forward.

19. It is regrettable that certain elements are being injected into this straightforward question of security. We reject that, because it creates more complications in the whole situation, in addition to exposing more human beings to death at the hands of Israeli aggression. For that reason we are not talking about other issues. Some people have been trying to inject this question of terrorism, but it all depends on what is meant by terrorism. We have not yet defined "terrorism", and there are all sorts of terrorism that we can talk about.

20. So this is not the moment, really, to go into a prolonged discussion which would give a chance to the aggressor to kill more innocent people. For that reason we refuse to accept any amendment to the draft resolution submitted by Guinea, Somalia and Yugoslavia.

21. Mr. SEN (India): Mr. President, we offer you our congratulations on being the President of our Council for the month of September. The event is of more than ordinary significance in that a representative of China is presiding over the Council for the first time in the last 23 years of the existence of the United Nations. My delegation will extend to you its full co-operation in your conduct of the business of the Council.

22. May I on this occasion express our great admiration and appreciation for the work done by the representative of Belgium, Ambassador Longestaey, who guided our work for the whole of August with such skill, determination and patience.

23. Now we are met here to discuss two specific complaints brought to us by two Member States. Those complaints of aggression by Israel are not new, and this year alone we have dealt with similar complaints on three different occasions.

24. The pattern of Israeli activities has been clear for some time, and we have drawn repeated attention to it. Briefly, the Israeli attitude seems to be that either the Arabs must accept Israeli terms for peace and security in the Middle East—and some consider them terms of surrender—or Israel must maintain by force what it has gained by force.

25. The Security Council, as well as the General Assembly, has discussed this problem repeatedly, and as a result a framework for a solution was worked out in resolution 242 (1967). That resolution has not been carried out, and yet a cease-fire was arranged and has now been repeatedly, blatantly and even cynically broken by Israel.

26. No one has questioned the fact that on 8 and 9 September the Israeli armed forces rained death and

destruction on several parts of the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon. We do not know what, if any, justification Israel has for this conspicuous violation of international law and of the cease-fire. But this morning's statements by some speakers showed that somehow those actions have been taken as a reprisal for the tragic events at or near Munich a few days ago.

27. Let us examine a little this new application of the old and totally untenable doctrine of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.

28. Should there be any doubt about the Indian reaction to the events in Munich, let me read out some of the statements made by the Indian authorities.

29. On 6 September, when he first heard of these events, the official spokesman of the Ministry for External Affairs said:

"The act resulting in this tragedy was senseless and condemnable. It remains so, whatever the disappointments and frustration leading to it. There is no justification for dragging terrorism into the arena of sports. India's support for the Arab cause is well known, as we believe that justice is on their side. The vast majority of the nations of the world also support the Arab cause, including the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. But terrorist activities of this type are deplorable, and damage the very cause which is sought to be advanced."

The same day, the Prime Minister of India, who was in Bombay, said:

"This shocking and senseless violence cannot but be condemned in strongest terms. Such a dastardly act of hatred can never solve any problem."

30. I have many similar statements in front of me from various people, but I think what I have said is enough to show our sympathy for the victims of Munich and for their families and friends.

31. It is equally clear that we condemn those activities, and we do not see how the Arab cause, however just, can be served, far less furthered, by such methods. But those who would concentrate only on this linkage obviously cannot ignore that the present situation in the Middle East is due to a whole series of events beginning even from those days before Israel was established.

32. Now, it is not possible for us to select only two links in a long chain and neglect the others. If we are to consider the entire chain of events, we are ready to do so, but that will take time and certainly will not prevent the immediate threat that Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic face at the moment.

33. Secondly, the tragedy at Munich took place six days ago. Yet no attempt was made then to bring it before the Security Council, nor are we certain that this is a subject for the Council since that subject is terrorism by private groups and not by States. In any event, only recently the Secretary-General has suggested a new item for considera-

tion by the forthcoming session of the General Assembly, and there will be ample opportunity to deal with this subject at a proper time. Meanwhile, we should do nothing which would divert attention from the gravity of the threat Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic are encountering and are likely to continue to encounter.

34. We condemn terrorism, but one has to recognize also the frustration and desperation that lie behind such terrorism and has to take action to remove their causes. Besides, the Arab terrorists do not perhaps forget the terrorism which has bedevilled the history of the Holy Land, particularly in the second quarter of the twentieth century. We also have to be realistic and remember the political situation in the various territories in that part of the world.

35. Lastly, we must draw a distinction between the acts of terrorism by private groups and the acts of military vendetta by organized governments. Surely we have the right to expect a better standard of behaviour from governments than from fanatics, however devoted they may be to their causes.

36. It is for those reasons that we shall vote for the draft resolution submitted by Somalia and co-sponsored by two other delegations.

37. The amendments proposed to that draft resolution suffer from some of the defects I have mentioned. The United States draft resolution is unbalanced for reasons I have given, and is entirely silent on the recent Israeli attacks.

38. Those are the views which will guide our voting.

39. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, we wish to congratulate you on presiding over the Security Council during the present month. We also wish to congratulate the representative of Belgium for the work he did at the head of the Council last month.

40. A few days ago the Panamanian Government expressed its deep sorrow and categorical condemnation over the massacre of 11 athletes from Israel at the Munich Olympic Games.

41. Today world public opinion is moved at seeing that reprisals for the Olympiad crimes have left a sad balance of desolation and death in the territories of Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic. My delegation does believe that these acts are closely linked. The sufferings caused to innocent victims in both cases must give rise to indignation and sorrow among all civilized persons of the world.

42. For humanitarian reasons Panama appeals to wisdom and good judgement on both sides to avoid a recurrence of such acts. Because of the violence of the last few days there can be no doubt that the situation in the Middle East has become more serious and, in so far as possible, Panama would like to help in the search for peaceful solutions for that tormented region of the world where we have such good friends.

43. For the reasons I have just given I should like to say that we would support any draft resolution that with equal emphasis would condemn terrorist acts and attacks of reprisal which have been carried out and that will at the same time ask the parties to the conflict to refrain from committing any other acts of violence.

44. My delegation was instructed to abstain on the draft resolutions, in documents S/10784 and S/10785—the only documents before the Council until noon today—because neither was considered to be well-balanced. We felt that a useful purpose would never be achieved with that kind of draft resolution. We seek respect for the territorial integrity of the Arab States and we want the Israelis to be able to live free from fear.

45. The Panamanian delegation would want this debate to conclude with as constructive a statement of the Council as possible. Fortunately the amendments to document S/10784 proposed by the delegations of Belgium, France, Italy and the United Kingdom and now circulated as document S/10786 seem to be a step forward in the right direction and we shall therefore vote in favour of them.

46. The truth of the matter is that with the original draft resolutions we were confronted by one-sided documents that, even if they had been adopted, would have been of little or no value because they were not fair. Although it may be somewhat embarrassing to admit it, the parties to the conflict in the Middle East, because of the true or imagined support that may be offered them here by the great Powers, are very often encouraged to follow the road of confrontation rather than the path of peace which Panama seeks.

47. In the light of the tragedies that have afflicted both sides and the atrocities that the world has witnessed, my Government joins other Governments that are less committed and involved, such as those of Belgium, France, Italy, and the United Kingdom and we trust that Guinea, Somalia and Yugoslavia will be willing to accept the amendments of those countries in order that we may arrive at a resolution that is more balanced and more humane.

48. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The development of events at this Security Council meeting sheds a certain light on the position of those who at this morning's meeting insisted that we postpone the voting. An attempt is obviously being made to defend and justify the Israeli aggression against the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon. This coincides entirely with the position of the Israeli Government. In an attempt to set up a propaganda smoke-screen and camouflage their own banditry, the Israeli rulers have been saying, as they usually do, that these new acts of aggression were a reprisal for the activities of the Palestine resistance organizations. This is a reference to the distressing and tragic events which occurred in Munich and which darkened the atmosphere of friendship, mutual respect and comradely co-operation and competition at the international Olympic Games. These events are deeply to be regretted. The official organ of the Soviet Union—the Committee on Sports of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—issued a statement on this matter expressing its deepest regret.

49. However, to put these events on the same footing as the new acts of aggression on the part of Israel would simply mean covering up and encouraging the aggressive policy of the Israeli maniacs. These artificial, outrageous attempts of the Israeli aggressors to justify war, military action, air raids, tank attacks, the murder of peaceful, innocent human beings—children, women and old people—*flagrantly violate all the rules of contemporary international law and the Charter of the United Nations and constitute a failure to comply with decisions of the Security Council, which is a principal United Nations organ and which more than once in the past has warned Israel of the inadmissibility and unlawfulness of so-called reprisals and has categorically condemned it for attacking its neighbours on the pretext that it was taking what it claimed were retaliatory measures.*

50. In the discussions in the Security Council on the questions of the piratical attacks of Israel on Arab countries, the delegation of the Soviet Union has already stressed the inadmissibility of putting on the same footing, from the point of view of international law and international responsibility, acts of terrorism committed by private groups of persons representing not States but only themselves and acts of aggression organized, planned and sanctioned by the Government of a State, in this case Israel. Aggression—a piratical attack by one State against another State—has always been, is and will continue to be an international crime, as a result of which many people perish and valuable property is barbarously destroyed.

51. The Security Council must, as the Soviet delegation has already declared, indignantly reject, as entirely unfounded, any references whatsoever on the part of Israel and its supporters, protectors and patrons to certain events at the Olympic Games in Munich in order to justify this provocation. The Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon cannot bear any share whatsoever of the responsibility for those events, and in particular for the acts of terrorists. In the present case it is quite clear that what we are dealing with is a calculated provocation by Israel, which no artificial pretexts can justify.

52. The Israeli Government has committed an international crime. It has ordered its armed forces and air force to intrude into foreign territory and to invade the air space of other countries, bombarding peaceful villages in the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon. To draw a parallel, speaking from an international point of view and on the plane of inter-State relations, between a single act of terror committed by persons who are in an exceptionally desperate situation and the policies and acts of an unrestrained bandit and aggressor is really tantamount to camouflaging and condoning aggression and relieving the aggressor of responsibility for the murder of hundreds of innocent people. Only a Hitler could justify such actions on the part of Israel.

53. In the light of what I have said, the Soviet delegation supports the position of the sponsors of the three-Power draft resolution. It rejects the proposal that we should equate crimes deliberately premeditated and organized by a State and its armed forces with an isolated—and, as everyone admits, profoundly regrettable—action on the part

of individuals. The most important point, as already explained by the sponsors of the three-Power draft resolution, is that their proposal is designed to put an immediate end to the war and the hostilities that have once again been undertaken by the aggressor, Israel. It is the duty of the Security Council to vote immediately and without further delay in favour of this proposal. All further considerations, points and proposals can be examined subsequently. Today, despite the Israeli holiday, the Israeli armed forces are continuing military operations and people are dying. The Council's task is to call an immediate halt to that tragedy; once that has been done, we can proceed to discuss the various other questions that are of interest to particular delegations or groups of delegations.

54. The Soviet delegation therefore supports the position and proposals of the sponsors of the three-Power draft resolution and the position of those delegations which favour that text, as well as the intention of the President of the Security Council to put that draft resolution to the vote immediately.

55. Mr. OGISO (Japan): At the outset my delegation wishes to extend its sincere congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of September. We believe that under your guidance this Council will be led to fruitful achievements.

56. In listening most attentively to the statements of the parties concerned and in reading various reports made available to us through the news media and other means, my delegation has been deeply disheartened to note that serious incidents of appalling magnitude have once again erupted and engulfed the already highly sensitive area in the Middle East. Both Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic have been made targets of reprisals on an extensive scale and to an unusual degree. Israeli air forces penetrated deep into the territories of these two countries on 7 and 8 September as part of their apparently large-scale and well-planned military operations. A series of Israeli military actions has resulted in the loss of a sizable number of innocent lives and heavy damage to property in various Arab cities and villages. In turn the Syrian Arab Republic also has launched an air attack on the Israeli-administered Golan Heights, according to its announcement.

57. Whatever the reason or justification might be, my delegation strongly holds that such military operations should be stopped and violations of the cease-fire should be halted. My delegation urgently appeals to the parties concerned to refrain from any further military actions in the area. My delegation therefore supports the draft resolution contained in document S/10784, submitted by Guinea, Somalia and Yugoslavia.

58. When faced with a similar case in the past, my delegation consistently and repeatedly expressed its regret and abhorrence of all acts of violence, particularly indiscriminate attacks which result in the loss of innocent lives. My Government censures, in the strongest terms, all acts of violence and terrorism regardless of their origin or motive.

59. Immediately after the recent shocking and tragic incident at the Munich Olympic Games, the spokesman for

the Government of Japan emphatically expressed a denunciation of the terrorist acts that had taken place at the Olympiad, which represents the peaceful arena of sport and friendship for all the nations.

60. I believe it is also opportune for my delegation to place on record at this juncture its welcome of the initiative taken by the Secretary-General in calling for the consideration of measures to prevent terrorism under a new agenda item of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

61. In this sense my delegation can also accept the amendments proposed by the four European countries and contained in document S/10786.

62. As we have observed time and again, the vicious cycle of action and retaliation has become to our deep regret, almost a fact of life in the Middle East. However, this tragic escalation of violence breeding violence should be severed somewhere. This recurrence of violence in the Middle East has once again demonstrated the urgent need for eliminating the very source of tension and insecurity in that area. In this connexion, my delegation stresses the importance of the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which has remained unimplemented for almost five long years, in order to bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

63. Before I end my remarks I should like to ask the representative of Yugoslavia, through you, Mr. President, for clarification on one point in his statement. In explaining draft resolution S/10784 he said that "all parties" should cease immediately all military operations. I wonder whether he meant that the three sponsors of that draft resolution are ready to accept the amendment in paragraph 2 (a) of the proposal of the four European Powers [S/10786] which would replace "the parties" by "all parties". This is simply a request for clarification.

64. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): My delegation will vote in favour of the amendments. They are the very least that is required of the Council if it is to address itself to the problem as it exists. We would have preferred to see a more specific mention of the shocking events that took place in Munich and their causal relationship to the events in the Middle East. Nevertheless, these amendments are a step in the right direction.

65. Many public statements have been made condemning the Munich massacre, and now we have a chance to substitute our heartfelt votes for our heartfelt statements.

66. I would hope that the Council might take this significant and historic step of standing up against terrorism, terrorism which clearly contributes to the lack of peace in the Middle East.

67. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia) (*interpretation from French*): I wish to reply to the representative of Japan, who asked for some clarification. I am sorry that I led him into some confusion when I made my statement in English. I think it followed from the tenor of my entire statement that Yugoslavia as a sponsor of the draft resolution could

not accept the amendments and that therefore the draft resolution stands without change.

68. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): The list of speakers is now exhausted and we shall proceed to the vote. I shall first put to the vote the amendments submitted by Belgium, France, Italy and the United Kingdom and contained in document S/10786. Those amendments relate to the draft resolution contained in document S/10784.

69. Mr. SEN (India): If the sponsors have no objection, I would suggest that we vote on each of the three amendments separately.

70. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): The representative of India has requested a separate vote on each of the amendments submitted by Belgium, France, Italy and the United Kingdom. As the sponsors of the amendments have no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

71. I shall put to the vote first paragraph 1 of the amendments contained in document S/10786.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, Belgium, France, Italy, Japan, Panama, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: China, Guinea, Sudan, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: India, Somalia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The result of the vote was 8 in favour, 4 against with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 was not adopted, having failed to obtain the affirmation vote of nine members.

72. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): I shall now put to the vote paragraph 2, subparagraph (a), of the amendments.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, Belgium, France, India, Italy, Japan, Panama, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: China, Guinea, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

The result of the vote was 9 in favour and 6 against.

Paragraph 2, subparagraph (a) was not adopted, two of the negative votes being those of permanent members.

73. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): I now put to the vote paragraph 2, subparagraph (b), of the amendments.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, Belgium, France, Italy, Japan, Panama, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: China, Guinea, India, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

The result of the vote was 8 in favour and 7 against.

Paragraph 2 subparagraph (b) was not adopted, having failed to obtain the affirmation vote of nine members.

74. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): I now put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Guinea, Somalia and Yugoslavia [S/10784].

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, Belgium, China, France, Guinea, India, Italy, Japan, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Panama.

The result of the vote was 13 in favour, 1 against with 1 abstention.

The draft resolution was not adopted, the negative vote being that of a permanent member.

75. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): I shall now call upon representatives who wish to speak in explanation of their votes.

76. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): My delegation did not lightly decide to vote against the three-Power draft resolution. Our support of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and our abhorrence of violence are a matter of record. Our support for this Council over the many years is also a matter of record. We are, however, deeply convinced that the Council would have done neither the parties nor itself any good by adopting a draft resolution which ignored realities, which spoke to one form of violence and not another, which looked to effect but not to cause.

77. We do not countenance violations of international law; we do not countenance terrorist acts. We seek and support a world in which athletes need not fear assassins and passengers on aeroplanes need not fear hijacking or assassination. We seek a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. We shall continue to work towards those ends.

78. It was said here today that we might be making a constructive move if we could contain the situation by calling for a cessation of all military operations. But can anybody suggest that the situation today is unrelated to the Munich massacre? It is related. It is directly related. The fabric of violence in the Middle East is inextricably interwoven with the massacre in Munich. Is it not a double standard to suggest that States must control their own forces—a point we readily grant—but that those States need

not control irregular forces in their territory—forces of murder, forces of terror?

79. We have been walking a very dangerous path by our silence on terrorism. We invite more terrorism by our silence on the disaster at Munich. Do we indeed wish to invite more Munichs? We had hoped that all nations would deplore terrorism, deplore it by statement and by vote also.

80. It is for those reasons that we voted against the draft resolution.

81. Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, permit me first of all to convey to you my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. I am convinced that under your enlightened leadership the Council will be in a position to discharge speedily and effectively the task conferred upon it under the Charter—that is, the maintenance of international peace and security.

82. I should like to take this opportunity to express my feelings of profound gratitude for the very kind words which you, and many of my colleagues have been good enough to express to me.

83. In voting in favour of the draft resolution proposed by the representative of Somalia, my delegation has obviously wanted to demonstrate the concern of the Belgian Government following the tragic events that have occurred in the Middle East and continue dangerously to increase tension in that part of the world. It is indeed the duty of the world community, and first and foremost the Security Council, to put a stop to, or to avert, any operation or military activity which is liable to jeopardize international peace and security.

84. We associate ourselves with the sponsors of the draft resolution, therefore, and call upon the parties concerned to refrain from continuing military operations and, hence, to seek by peaceful means alone a fair and lasting solution to their dispute. But we cannot conceal our surprise at seeing the Security Council reject, by the proper majority, the amendments which were presented by the four European Powers. They had the merit of balancing the original text, which passed over in silence another fundamental problem: a recrudescence of acts of blind terrorism. When my delegation first saw the Somali draft, we noted with regret and distress that no measure, no provision was contained in it to call a halt to these indescribable acts. The world community has never experienced so much spontaneous indignation and so much repugnance as when it learned of the massacres which took place first at Lod and later at Munich. No consideration can possibly justify, and certainly not pardon, these attacks which stupefied and horrified the whole world.

85. As far back as June, during the examination by the Council of the Middle East crisis, following incidents which had taken place at the Israeli-Lebanese frontier, the representative of Belgium reminded the Council of the responsibility assumed by Governments with regard to the activities of the Palestinian fighters and asked that a provision be included and arrangements concluded in order

to contain and control effectively the activities of these fighters [1649th and 1650th meetings].

86. I think that today the Council should have taken a further step forward and called upon all Governments of Arab countries to settle the problem of terrorism without delay. We hope that the Governments concerned, with which my Government maintains friendly relations, will cease any technical, financial and logistic support which they are giving to the terrorist groups, properly so called, and will refuse to provide them with arms and information permitting them to organize acts of sabotage and terrorism against human life and public or private property, both in Israel and in any other country in the world.

87. Of course—and I want to repeat this clearly—the object of the European amendments was simply the groups that indulge in blind terrorism as their only weapon. While regretting that those amendments were rejected by 7 of the 15 delegations making up the Council, my delegation does very much hope that the Council will continue its work and will succeed in reaching an agreement on a resolution that will lay down appropriate measures to put an end to acts of terrorism, properly so called.

88. Mr. SEN (India): I have already explained at some length our general attitude to this problem. We are not against establishing a cause and effect chain. In fact, one can ask why Munich happened. We can go backwards and backwards and backwards. But we are faced with the immediate problem of the Lebanese and Syrian complaint and I shall explain my votes on the three amendments moved by the European Powers.

89. We abstained on the first paragraph because, as I have said, while we deplore terrorism and violence and all breaches of the peace, this amendment would have balanced the two actions, although one came from private groups and the other from a Government.

90. When it came to substituting "all parties" for "the parties" we agreed, because in our view "all parties" is more comprehensive and possibly applies to people who are not even in that area.

91. We opposed the last subparagraph partly because of this balancing feature of the sentence and mainly because it implied that the Governments are in a position to prevent all terrorist activities. That is the principal reason for our opposition.

92. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): Again we have witnessed a deeply tragic course of events, as we have so many times in the past. Our meeting has come only two or three days after another organized and premeditated attack of the air force of Israel against its Arab neighbours, taking as a pretext another event, which took place in Munich, committed by a private group.

93. As far as the event which occurred in Munich is concerned, let me recall once again, from the outset, that Yugoslavia's condemnation of this event has been clearly expressed, both officially and unofficially. I could quote from statements, but I do not judge it necessary to do so

at this moment. The events of Munich cannot have, in our view, any direct connexion with what has been happening in the Middle East for years. No possible balance can be drawn between the events in Munich and what is happening in the Middle East, with the constant aggressive escalation of military activity.

94. The Yugoslav delegation had more than one occasion to contribute its views here—and there are, despite some differences, quite a number of commonly held views among us—on the essential characteristics of the Middle East crisis. There reigns an unchanged state of affairs shaped by the occupation of Arab territories and long-festering inhuman conditions for more than a million Palestinians, either denied basic human rights of living on their own hearths or subjected to maltreatment of all kinds, or both.

95. The Middle East is one of the few regions of the world where there are no changes for the better, where all attempts to turn the situation around in the direction of a peaceful solution of terrible problems have so far failed, and where an intolerable situation is permitted to fester, accumulating a most dangerous explosive potential—ruining not only peoples and countries of the area, but directly endangering the peace in the whole Mediterranean basin and, indeed, directly endangering international peace as a whole.

96. The Middle Eastern crisis is one of the hotbeds of war that is constantly present on the United Nations agenda, the United Nations having direct responsibility for changing the seemingly inexorable chain of catastrophes into the so desperately needed break in such a course of events. One of the major reasons why that has not been permitted to happen is the constant refusal of Israel to respond positively and affirmatively to so many resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Further, the aggression has become the constant, I would say the normal, mode of Israeli behaviour. Only two months ago we again were faced with the familiar situation of peaceful villages bombed and destroyed, innocent villagers killed, non-combatant persons kidnapped.

97. There is no doubt that that general situation prevailing in the Middle East—I have tried to describe some, although not all, of its characteristics—is the cause of today's instability.

98. Having said that, we have to stress what we have already stressed many times, that is, that we must reject the Israeli concept of a self-arrogated right to conduct major aggressive military operations against the territories of its Arab neighbours.

99. Whatever one thinks of the events in Munich—and we reacted to them in no uncertain terms—we are of the opinion that we must be very clear and unequivocal in condemning official terrorism over the heads of peaceful villagers and refugee camp populations, particularly when conducted by a constituted Government, army and State.

100. What is the right thing for us to do in this situation when we are faced once again with a melancholy chain of events? Of course, we think that the constant escalation of

Israeli aggression, which occurs regularly and which represents the systematic terrorizing of the innocent populations of Arab countries and Palestinian refugees, must be strongly condemned. There is no justification for Israeli aggression, aggressive acts and threats against Arab countries—acts and threats which are contrary to the principles of the Charter.

101. We must above all go back to the real causes, to the roots, of the Middle East situation. With undiminished conviction we still believe that the speediest and complete implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which was unanimously adopted, is the way in which we can find the path to peace in the area. We had hoped that the Arab States' agreeing to it; accepting the principle of the right to live in peace, of territorial integrity and security for all States in the area, without exception; agreeing to the cease-fire and to some other changes in the situation there would be matched by the other side—especially since it was Israel that told us many months ago that if the Arab States did that, then Israel would be willing to move along more flexible lines. Well, the opportunities created by the efforts of so many went unutilized because of Israel's refusal to agree to the principle of withdrawing from the territories it conquered in 1967.

102. The latest developments—the Israeli attacks now in process—constitute a most unfortunate and grave setback. But we must go on endeavouring to break the vicious circle of events and start moving from the brink of the abyss where the Middle East has been permitted to hover much too long.

103. Mr. de la GORCE (France) (*interpretation from French*): Once again there is ground for deploring here the chain of violence and reprisal. The French position on this matter is well known: we condemn all acts of violence. That is why the highest authorities of my country—the President of the Republic, the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs—have expressed their indignation at the events in Munich.

104. If we condemn terrorist activities, we also condemn, and for the same reason, acts of reprisal. To try to justify one by the other must inevitably lead to the most deadly outbidding, to blind destruction of human lives, to constantly increasing dangers to international peace and security and the security of persons; and the possibilities of achieving peace are again reduced and made more distant. That is our position of principle.

105. In the case before us, the most urgent task as far as the international community is concerned is obviously to put an end to military activities and prevent their recurrence. That was the objective of the appeal contained in the draft resolution submitted by Guinea, Somalia and Yugoslavia. The operations carried out these last few days by the Israeli forces have caused severe loss of human lives and considerable material destruction on the territories of the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon, two countries with which France is tied by deep and ancient bonds of friendship. Ambassador Ghorra and Ambassador Kelani have expressed their apprehension as to the renewal or the continuation of these operations, and we have no difficulty in understanding their feelings. However, it appeared to us

desirable that some reference be made in our resolution to the over-all series of acts of violence that had led to the present situation. That is why we sponsored the amendments proposed by the European members of the Council.

106. Be that as it may, the French delegation could not fail to support the three-Power draft resolution. We deeply regret that the Council was unable to issue an appeal intended to reduce tensions in the Middle East, to put an end to the use of military force and to save human lives.

107. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Security Council has met urgently today at the request of the Syrian and Lebanese Governments in connexion with new, serious acts of aggression committed by Israel recently against those two Arab States. Israel is continuing its piratical policy in the Middle East.

108. The representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon have informed the Council of the fact of mass bombardments by the Israeli air force of peaceful Syrian villages where a large number of Arabs live. These barbarous bombings have resulted in the death of many peaceful inhabitants and considerable material damage.

109. The fact of the intrusion of the armed forces of Israel into the territory and air space of the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon is confirmed by official reports of the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and also by reports in the press and from information agencies.

110. All these piratical actions by Israel against neighbouring Arab States are cynically acknowledged and even blatantly advertised by the highest official representatives of Israel. In Tel Aviv, threats are being uttered against other Arab States.

111. Accordingly, the Security Council has been faced with an obvious fact: the continuation and further expansion by Israel, a State Member of the United Nations, of aggressive actions throughout the region of the Middle East. The Council has to deal with a deliberate and specially planned policy by Tel Aviv, the purpose of which is by no means the establishment of peace in the Middle East but on the contrary, the continuation by Israel of active military operations against neighbouring Arab States.

112. The aggressor—Zionist Israel—which five years ago unleashed a war against the Arab countries and annexed some of their territories, not only does not intend to return these territories to their legitimate owners for the sake of establishing peace in the Middle East but, on the contrary, is continuing its piratical attacks on Arab countries, intruding deep into their territory and inflicting suffering and death on their populations.

113. The new aggressive acts by Israel against the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon, and the persistence of the insane Israeli maniacs in attempting through the use of military force to carry out their annexationist designs in the Middle East and compel the Arab countries to capitulate before the aggressor, clearly reveal the Israeli ruling circles

as enemies of peace in the Middle East and as war criminals who constitute a danger to the whole of mankind.

114. In an attempt to set up a propaganda smoke-screen and camouflage their own acts of banditry, the Israeli rulers are once again, as is their normal course, alleging that these new acts of aggression are undertaken as "retaliatory measures" in connexion with the actions of the Palestine resistance organizations.

115. However, these artificial outrageous attempts to justify war and the barbarous murder of peaceful Arab citizens are in flagrant defiance of all norms of international law and are a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a failure to comply with decisions of the Security Council—a principal organ of the United Nations, which has warned Israel repeatedly in the past of the inadmissibility and illegality of so-called reprisals and has categorically condemned Israel for attacking its neighbours on the pretext of what it calls "retaliation."

116. In the discussion in the Security Council on the question of the bandit-like attacks of Israel on Arab countries, the Soviet delegation, as has already been pointed out, has stressed the inadmissibility of placing on the same footing, from the point of view of international law and international responsibility, acts of terrorism committed by a private group of persons who do not represent States but only themselves and acts of aggression organized, planned and sanctioned by the Government of a State—in this case Israel. As has already been pointed out, aggression—the piratical attack on the part of one State against another—has always been, remains and will continue to be an international crime as a result of which people die and valuable property is barbarously destroyed.

117. It is precisely this crime of an international character which is being committed by the Government of Israel in ordering its armed forces and its air force to intrude into the air space and territories of other countries and to bomb peaceful villages in the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon. To draw a parallel, speaking from an international point of view and on the plane of inter-State relations, between a single act of terror committed by people who have been placed in an exceptional, desperate situation and the policy and actions of an unbridled aggressor would mean in substance camouflaging and justifying the aggressor and removing responsibility from the guilty party for the murder of hundreds of people.

118. A majority in the Security Council has in point of fact condemned these new acts of madness on the part of the Israeli rulers and the aggression and new acts of violence, murder and destruction undertaken by them against the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon. Israel has been repeatedly condemned and at today's meeting it has drawn down upon itself the severest possible international condemnation, which should have been given expression by the Council.

119. The distressing and tragic event which occurred in Munich and which cast a pall over the atmosphere of friendship, mutual respect and comradely competition at the international Olympic Games is deeply to be regretted.

The Olympic Games, by tradition dating back to ancient times, are supposed to promote the strengthening of mutual understanding, peace and friendship among peoples. The incident at the twentieth Olympic Games was particularly distressing because it entailed the loss of many lives.

120. As has already been pointed out by the Soviet delegation, a statement issued by the Committee on Physical Culture and Sports of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, the Olympic Committee of the USSR and the Soviet delegation to the Olympic Games expressed their deep regret at the tragic incident which occurred on 5 September. This statement declares among other things that:

"Soviet sports organizations and public opinion consider that acts of terrorism are incompatible with the spirit of co-operation and mutual understanding among peoples which lie at the very foundation of the international Olympic movement. Soviet sportsmen are determined now and in the future to promote the implementation of the lofty Olympic ideals."

121. Anyone who feels sincere rather than hypocritical regret about this distressing event cannot, however, close his eyes to its underlying causes or fail to reflect on ways and means of avoiding a repetition of such incidents in the future.

122. Everyone can see quite clearly that the reason for what happened in Munich lies in the fact that, alongside its brighter aspects, such as the Olympic Games and a certain easing of tensions, contemporary international life continues to have its darker sides. There are still hotbeds of aggression and the threat of war; wars are being waged; aggressors continue to occupy the territories of other countries and to attempt to entrench themselves in those territories and reap the fruits of annexationist wars.

123. As is well known, it is precisely a situation such as this that has persisted up to now in the Middle East. The Munich incident is just one more episode, one more consequence of the war of aggression which was launched and is still being waged by Israel against neighbouring Arab countries and of the hostility and hatred between Arabs and Jews which was engendered by this war and by all the rest of Israel's criminal policy and piratical actions in the Middle East. In the final analysis, it is simply the result of the policy of aggression and virtual genocide being pursued by the Israeli authorities with regard to the Arab people of Palestine. The shots which rang out in Munich, if we view them in the light of the events of recent years in the Middle East, represent only a tragic outburst in that sea of fire, murder, terror, violence and destruction which has extended so far into Arab territory as a result of Israel's aggression and its continuing occupation by force of the land of neighbouring Arab peoples in defiance and in violation of decisions of the General Assembly and Security Council.

124. It is well known that even before the official proclamation of the State of Israel the Zionist annexationists, in order to intimidate the Arab population, accompanied their expansion in Palestine by such bloody

misdeeds as the Deir Yassin massacre of April 1948 when, as a result of a terrorist operation on the part of Zionist cutthroats, more than 250 completely innocent Arab inhabitants were murdered. As a result of the Arab-Israeli war of 1948-1949, about one million Palestine Arabs were forced to abandon their homeland and to seek refuge from the Israeli murderers in neighbouring Arab countries. In June 1967, as a result of the aggression of Israel, they were joined by hundreds of thousands of new refugees. In the 25-year history of its existence Israel has indeed not ceased its armed provocations against neighbouring Arab countries, and each act of provocation has taken a tremendous toll of human lives in Arab countries. Israel's war of aggression against its neighbours in 1967 claimed tens of thousands of new victims in the various Arab countries. On the admission of the former Chief of Staff of the Israeli Army, now the Minister of Trade and Industry, General Bar-Lev, in the period between the aggression of 1967 and January 1972 Israeli armed forces violated the cease-fire and made incursions into the territory of Arab States 5,270 times.

125. The Munich incident is a direct consequence of the fact that Israel is stubbornly continuing its policy of aggression in the Middle East. In this connexion, the Security Council must also take into consideration another very important fact. The Government of Israel and the elderly lady who heads that Government enthusiastically welcomed the actions of the Munich police, who laid an ambush on 5 September at a United States military air base near Munich, and opened fire on a helicopter containing Israelis and Arabs. It is, after all, precisely as a consequence of that action that the tragic deaths of all the Israelis and Arabs in the helicopter occurred. The Israeli Government and the lady in question approved of that action by the police. Accordingly, in considering the matter of responsibility for the distressing events in Munich, we cannot ignore the facts I have mentioned, which have now become well known. They form a very important link in the chain of events which led to the Munich tragedy. If it were not for the position adopted by the Israeli Government and its head, the Israelis and Arabs who were in that helicopter might today be in another country, and would without any doubt still be alive. The Israeli side, by acting as it did, in fact passes sentence of death on all concerned.

126. Israel is refusing to withdraw its troops from the occupied Arab territories; it is seizing and appropriating Arab lands, terrorizing and driving from them the indigent Arab population and sabotaging a peaceful settlement. It is violating the Charter of the United Nations and the decisions of the Organization. It is precisely the Israeli Government and the Israeli military establishment which have elevated to the level of State policy and practice of military piracy, violence and mass terror against the Arab peoples of the Middle East, including the people of Palestine, and they bear the total responsibility for all the consequences flowing from those illegal and totally unjustified actions of theirs, which manifest themselves, in one form or another, not only in the Middle East region but also in other parts of the world. It is therefore precisely the aggressive circles in Israel and the Israeli Government which bear the major responsibility both for the loss of human life in Munich and for the deaths of many thousands of Arab citizens and Arab patriots struggling for the just cause of liberation of their homelands.

127. To prevent a recurrence of events like the one in Munich, just one thing is necessary: that Israel comply with United Nations decisions, that it halt its aggression in the Middle East, that it withdraw all its troops from occupied Arab territories, and that it respect the legitimate rights of all the peoples of the Middle East, including those of the Arab people of Palestine. This undeniable fact has been acknowledged even by such an openly pro-Israeli United States newspaper as *The New York Times*, which was forced to admit in a recent article, "The seeds of terrorism", that the only means which in the final analysis could be adopted to put an end to Palestine terrorism was to find some way or other of settling the deep-seated conflict which engendered it.

128. It is quite clear that as long as Israel continues its present policy of aggression against the Arab peoples it is futile and naive to suppose that the Arab peoples will reconcile themselves to Israeli occupation and to the arbitrary rule and oppression brought to their lands by the Israeli annexationists. And the sooner the ruling circles of Israel, as well as those who support Israel and give it their patronage, understand this, the better it will be for Israel and the people of Israel, the neighbours of Israel and the cause of peace in the Middle East, and for international peace as a whole.

129. The provocative, aggressive actions of Israel against the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon dangerously exacerbate a situation in the Middle East which is in any case very tense. They continue to preserve a hotbed of military danger in the region and create a threat to international peace and security. This flagrant act of provocation was in point of fact condemned by an overwhelming majority of the Security Council in the draft resolution which was put to the vote. A majority of the Security Council by their votes rejected as completely unfounded all attempts on the part of Israel and its supporters to justify this act of provocation by relating it to the events at the Munich Olympic Games. The Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon, as the Soviet delegation pointed out in the course of the procedural debate, cannot be held in any way responsible for those events, and in particular for the acts of terrorists. It is quite clear that what we are faced with in this case is a deliberately planned act of provocation on the part of Israel, and no artificially invented motives can possibly justify it.

130. Israel once again has brazenly and cynically challenged the Security Council, the United Nations and the peace-loving forces of the whole world. We must bring the aggressor to his senses; we must get him to cease his armed provocations against Arab States and withdraw his troops from all occupied Arab territories in order to attain a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), dated 22 November 1967. This was required by all the States of Africa in the resolution adopted in Morocco. This was demanded by all the non-aligned countries in a resolution recently adopted at Georgetown, Guyana. This is a demand which was reaffirmed by the countries of the socialist community at the recent Crimean Conference. Today, 13 out of the 15 members of the Security Council in substance voted in favour of that very same thing: the cessation of

aggression on the part of Israel. In conditions where Israel is sabotaging a peaceful settlement on the basis of decisions adopted by the United Nations and is stubbornly persisting in a policy of undermining international peace and continuing its aggression against other countries in the Middle East, the need arises to adopt appropriate measures against the aggressor in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Under Chapter VII of the Charter, if the measures adopted by the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace have proved inadequate, the Council is authorized to apply the appropriate sanctions. Therefore, should Israel continue to ignore the position of the absolute majority of Members of the United Nations and the decisions and demands of the Security Council, it will be necessary to apply sanctions against Israel as an aggressor. That is what is required by the Charter and by the interests of all peace-loving countries, and it is something which must be done for the sake of peace and security and for the benefit of all people of good will.

131. The whole world will be amazed by the fact that at today's meeting the United States prevented the adoption of a just resolution warning Israel and requiring the immediate cessation of its aggression against the Arab countries. As everyone understands, this was done for domestic reasons; nevertheless, the United States did bring about the rejection of a just proposal for which 13 members of the Council had voted. By vetoing the adoption of the draft resolution sponsored by Guinea, Somalia and Yugoslavia, the United States has assumed a heavy responsibility for the further dangerous development of events in the Middle East. //

132. Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The constant and permanent objective followed by Argentina in the Middle East has been the search for peace, a peace based on justice and equity. Unfortunately, the possibilities available for the achievement of such a peace are extremely sparse and rest on very fragile foundations. Unfortunately, too, every time we glimpse encouraging signs on the horizon, something happens to cast shadows on our search for peace. But this should not discourage us from continuing our efforts. We therefore consider that it is the primary responsibility of the Security Council to avoid armed outbreaks or episodes which because of their duration or their gravity might in any way threaten the possibilities of peace, however tenuous these might be.

133. The draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Guinea, Somalia and Yugoslavia was headed in the right direction since it was designed to avoid a recurrence of military events like those of the last few days and it also called for a cessation of all types of military operations carried out by any State, whether it is one of the Arab States or the State of Israel. In one word, it called for an immediate cessation of all warlike acts, and "the greatest restraint in the interest of international peace and security". That was the reason why the Argentine delegation voted in favour of the three-Power draft resolution and we are sorry that it failed of adoption.

134. Having said that, may I recall what has been stated by many delegations in the Council, that there are no such

things as isolated episodes in the Middle East. Everything and anything that occurs in that region follows a relation of cause and effect. Therefore, we are justified in wondering whether the attacks of the Israeli air force against the populations or the settlements of the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon would have taken place had the deplorable terrorist activities of 5 September in Munich not taken place.

135. The Argentine Government publicly and in the most categorical terms condemned the criminal acts committed at that time not only against the Israeli Olympic team, not only against all those who participated in the Olympic Games, but against all those of us who seek to see co-operation replace confrontation in the world.

136. The terrorist acts, regardless of their underlying reasons of the pretexts adduced for them, regardless of where they happen, are inexcusable and must be censured outright. What happened in Munich must not and cannot be an exception; it cannot and must not be overlooked. It was for those reasons that we also supported the amendments proposed by the delegations of Belgium, France, Italy and the United Kingdom, since we were convinced that they reflected a situation that the Security Council should in some manner condemn.

137. More than once the Argentine delegation has very clearly expressed its views regarding what we consider reprisals, excesses in the exercise of self-defence or simply in the commission of acts of aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States. We have time and again stated, and we reiterate today, that while we condemn acts of terrorism, we also condemn acts of reprisal, since they flout the Charter and they are contrary to the purposes on which this very Organization rests.

138. When an act of terrorism is committed, those who fall are innocent. When acts of reprisal are committed, the victims that fall are innocent. In neither of these cases is any good purpose served. The only thing that is threatened is the possibility of achieving peace and this is all the more dramatic when it occurs in or around the Middle East.

139. Having explained the vote of my delegation, I once again wish to appeal to all the parties in this sad conflict of the Middle East, which has lasted only too long, to renew their efforts to achieve that just and lasting peace called for in resolution 242 (1967), which the majority of the Members of the United Nations supported.

140. Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy): On behalf of the Italian Government I cast an affirmative vote on the draft resolution submitted to this Council by Somalia and co-sponsored by Guinea and Yugoslavia. I did so in order to respond to the appeals we had heard this morning from the permanent representatives of two countries—Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic—with which Italy entertains most friendly relations based on a firm tradition of mutual esteem and co-operation. It would have been impossible for us not to take due account of the suffering of innocent people, of the blood shed by women and children and the tragic toll of human lives.

141. My vote, therefore, hardly needs detailed explanation, particularly since in the past we have consistently condemned all acts of warfare and reprisals carried out in violation of the generally accepted rules of international law and of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. It was in that spirit that this morning I raised some queries on the wording of the operative paragraph of the three-Power draft resolution, because my delegation felt it important to avoid the casting of doubts on the validity of the assumption on which our decision would be based and to make it clear that the Security Council's injunction also covered any further military action.

142. I must immediately recall, however, that military operations are only one aspect of the spiral of violence which has been plaguing the Middle East for years and which has, little by little, spread to other regions, particularly Europe, through senseless initiatives undertaken by terrorist groups in sheer contempt for human life.

143. This morning when we gathered here in sorrow at the death of many human beings killed in Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic, world public opinion was still stunned by the tragic massacre committed at the Olympic Games. It has been maintained that there is no connexion between that act of terrorism, as well as previous acts, and the matter brought before this Council. Perhaps such a contention rests on sufficiently firm legal grounds, but certainly if we were to go along with that we would be moving in a moral and political vacuum. Any act of violence aimed directly at defenceless civilians and leading to the loss of innocent lives is a blot on the conscience of mankind. And this Council—an organ of the United Nations—must act as the collective conscience of mankind.

144. My Government, like many others, must respond to public opinion. The Italian people reacted with horror and indignation to the hideous crime perpetrated in Munich; so did the Italian Government. The President of the Italian Republic, in a message, stated:

“This criminal terroristic act is to be condemned all the more strongly as it offends those universal values of peace and brotherhood among peoples that inspire the competition of the Olympic Games.”

145. This morning I addressed an appeal that the text of the three-Power draft resolution be improved, in an earnest attempt to make it acceptable to everybody. We deeply regret that the amendments submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the four European members of the Council were not approved. I must strongly state that if notwithstanding the non-acceptance of our amendments I voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document S/10784, I had particularly in mind that that text calls on the parties concerned not only to cease immediately all military operations but also to exercise the greatest restraint in the interest of international peace and security. My delegation interpreted that second request by the Council as implying that the Governments concerned should take all necessary action to prevent the activities of terrorist organizations.

146. Our position must not be construed as implying indiscriminate criticism, but we feel that all the Governments concerned should be prompted to take all possible measures for the full implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter and of the provisions of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. May I, in this connexion, recall the two declarations solemnly and unanimously adopted by the General Assembly on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, namely, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States [*resolution 2625 (XXV)*] and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*] which contain specific reference to the duty of every State to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts in another State, or acquiescing in organized activities within its territory directed towards the commission of such acts.

147. Mr. President, as I refrained this morning from congratulating you, I should like to say now that the accession of the People's Republic of China to the presidency of the Security Council sets a new milestone in the history of the United Nations, which it is to be hoped is a milestone of peace and co-operation. As for you, Sir, your impressive record as a diplomat and as a man is well known. We are confident that, through you, we shall benefit from the millenary tradition of wisdom and wit of the great Chinese people. I also join previous speakers in warmly congratulating Ambassador Longerstae of Belgium on the successful completion of his responsibilities during the month of August.

148. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): Mr. President, perhaps it is not too late to express my delegation's profound satisfaction to see you in the Chair, now that the legitimate right and position of your great country and people have been vindicated. Your assumption of the presidency of this august Council symbolizes for us the inevitable victory of every people on earth which perseveres in the fight for its dignity and freedom, whether in the Middle East or in Africa. The great values of endurance, perseverance and unyielding struggle for which your great country and people have been known during their long history stand as a source of inspiration and hope for all freedom and liberation fighters in the world.

149. I also avail myself of this opportunity to welcome most heartily the new representative of Guinea, Mrs. Jeanne Martin Cissé, and to assure her of the unreserved co-operation and support of my delegation, which has always enjoyed full understanding in this Council with the Guinean delegation on questions of liberation and justice.

150. We have met today to consider the specific complaints of Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic against Israel, which elected to use its armed forces in killing civilians in both Lebanon and Syria on Friday, which happens to be a religious Moslem day and a day of recreation, and also on Saturday, which was a Jewish holiday. We were informed by the President of the Security Council today that the representative of Israel has declined to participate in this debate in deference to the Jewish

holiday. To kill civilians on a Saturday and to decline to participate on New Year's day is, if not a twist of irony and a paradox, no less than the usual display of contempt by Israel for this Council.

151. We know in this Council that Israeli aggression against Arab countries has evolved into an incorrigible addiction. Indiscriminate atrocities on a large scale against civilians have become a permanent habit of the trigger-happy Israelis. That is no wonder, since they are fed with ultramodern weapons and since no law or power, including the power of this august Council, could deter them.

152. In our view the attacks on civilians in both Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic are just parts of a series of acts which are flagrant violations of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Israel knows this, and pretensions notwithstanding it has today chosen not to appear before the bar of international opinion.

153. My delegation does not intend to labour a point which has been ably presented by the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon. The point is that a Member State of the United Nations has carried out unprovoked attacks against the territories and civilians of other Member States of the Organization, as it has done before. It continues to declare its intention of carrying out further attacks against those States. If ever there was a need for the organ of the United Nations charged with the primary task of maintaining international peace and security, as this Council is, to act, then this is the occasion. That is why, we submit, Israel must not be allowed to believe it can indulge in repeated transgressions of the Charter and still not be accountable to the international community. We have asked that Israel refrain from the use of threats and abide by the rules of international law.

154. That is why we agreed to go along with the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Guinea, Somalia and Yugoslavia. We feel, as we have explained, that the killing should stop. Otherwise, we should not like to take responsibility on this question.

155. It will be noted from our brief statement that we did not want to inject any other events into this question, which is a straightforward one, that is, a question of aggression, which the United Nations does not allow. It is most regrettable that other incidents, like the Munich incident, have been injected into this debate and have made it more complicated. We have explained that the question of Munich and similar questions are irrelevant to the present situation. For that reason, we have refrained from going into the very long and black history of Israel, which has been the source of aggression and terrorism against the Arabs, and in particular the Palestinians, for many years, including the last two or three days. We have not gone into that.

156. But if we are to ask ourselves who is responsible for terrorism, who has really perfected terrorism and applied it against the Arabs, the answer is: Israel itself. The Haganah has become the Israeli army. This is well known to everybody. The mass killings in Deir Yassin and elsewhere are very well known to everyone. As recently as last Friday

and Saturday, dozens of people were killed. We did not want to go into all that. We did not even want to go into the question of Munich. But we have heard a version from a member of this Council of the situation that took place at Munich. We all know that the Palestinians took those people in order to exchange them for prisoners who are illegally held by Israel. We know that for more than 24 hours none of those Israelis were touched. But we know at the same time that during those 24 hours there were direct negotiations between two capitals about whether or not somebody should start shooting at the Palestinians and the rest of them at random during the night. And yet publicity in various places attacked the Arabs even before anything happened, even before the shooting started from the other side. We have heard in this country and elsewhere, in various capitals, the media speaking about the aggressive Arabs. But the Arab countries were not involved in that particular situation. We know all that.

157. We all realize how much that incited Israel to carry on aggression. And that is what happened. This time it was directed at the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon, which had never been involved in this question of Munich.

158. But in spite of what has been said concerning the Munich situation—and history one day will correctly fix responsibility on the parties that committed those acts—we did not want to inject that question into the debate and make a sentimental and emotional appeal, which we know very well can threaten the lives of more people in the Arab world. We know that Israel does not need to be incited to do those things.

159. No one, of course, condones the killing of innocent people, and we should certainly not do so here. We want to prevent more civilians from being killed. That is why we supported the three-Power draft resolution to appeal to the countries concerned—even though we did not mention which countries—to stop all military acts in order to prevent further killing.

160. Someone asked why Sudan was not a sponsor of the three-Power draft resolution. We would have wanted more. We would have wanted the Council to condemn, as it has already done, aggression by one State against another. But we supported the three-Power draft resolution because we did want this intermediate step to be taken by the Council.

161. As I have said, I did not want to dwell on the question of Munich. The incident took place on 5 September, and Israel and its sympathizers and friends have had enough time to bring that question to the Security Council to be dealt with on its own merits. But they knew the weaknesses of that case. They knew it was not a clear-cut question where they could put the blame on those whom they call terrorists but who happen to be Palestinians and freedom-fighters. That is why they did not bring it. Even Israel did not care to bring the matter here. It is the habit of Israel to attack whenever and wherever it likes. It has the power to do so. It has been supported by various quarters. Therefore, it is doing so.

162. We refuse to allow that type of argument to be brought into this particular question. That is why we have refrained from doing so.

163. From what I have said it is easy to see why we voted against the proposed amendments. We feel that while some people are genuine in expressing their sentiments, this is not the place to act on sentiments. We are judging an action. In any event, we respect their feelings and what they might think is fitting. We did not think that this was the occasion to bring in the case of Munich or to express sympathy. There are other places for that, and many countries have expressed sympathy outside this Council.

164. We thought these amendments were injected in order to delay the adoption of the draft resolution proposed by Somalia, and that is why we voted against them. On principle, we rejected the amendment of the draft in any way, because our business had to be completed very quickly before more lives were lost. That is why we objected and said no to the amendments.

165. We are also very sorry indeed to find that in a case of aggression such as this a permanent member of this Council would use the veto in order to stop a movement to call for the ending of aggression and the sparing of human life. That is very regrettable, because we rely upon such Powers to help in the maintenance of peace. Let them argue the way they argue. We have heard much said about special situations which do exist in the United States. We have heard much during the campaigning period. And, as I have said, Arab diplomats have been threatened in the United States because of those statements and others made by citizens of that country. We have all heard it, but even so we have not said a thing. But it has been brought into this debate. It is not important in so far as the threats for the Arab diplomats in the United Nations are concerned; it is important in that it gives *carte blanche* to Israel to go ahead with the aggression it has declared it is going to continue.

166. We would have liked permanent members really to deter Israel from continuing any kind of aggression, and therefore that veto, whatever reason is given for it, is most regrettable and we think it can be dangerous to a large extent. It is, unfortunately, dangerous to peoples of countries that happen to be peaceful and have done nothing to deserve all the lives they have lost in the last few days. For that reason we were sorry that the Guinea-Somali-Yugoslavia proposal was not adopted.

167. I do not want to speak any further on this issue, but this is, of course, a chance for me to remind this Council that the danger still exists. Israel has said it, and we know it usually carries out its threats. And whatever may happen we must consider the positions we have taken at this particular meeting.

168. Mrs. CISSE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): When, this morning, on a Sunday, the Security Council was called into emergency session, the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon expressed and showed great faith in the international community, through its most important body. Those countries trusted our Council, and expected us to protect the innocent lives particularly of women and children in the future. When they put before the Council the draft resolution contained in document S/10784, the sponsors also felt they were responding to the hopes of the civilian populations of Syria and Lebanon. We profoundly

regret that that draft resolution was rejected by the Council because of the negative vote of one of its permanent members.

169. Certain reasons adduced here have tended to link the unfortunate events at Munich with the repeated acts of aggression of Israel against Syrian and Lebanese territory. As we have already stressed, the Lebanese and Syrian Governments cannot be held responsible for acts committed in Munich. We hope that the rejection of our draft resolution calling for the re-establishment of peace in the Middle East will not be exploited by Israel as a victory that allows it freedom to embark on new escalations and the commission of new acts of aggression against the peaceful territory of Lebanon and Syrian Arab Republic.

170. My delegation voted against the amendments submitted by Belgium, France, Italy, and the United Kingdom because we felt that adoption of the text of our joint draft resolution was the least the Security Council could do in the present circumstances.

171. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): For the reasons I gave when introducing the four-Power amendments, my delegation would have greatly preferred to see the amendments we co-sponsored incorporated in the draft resolution, and we believe that it would have thereby given a more realistic reflection of the circumstances and the atmosphere in which this meeting is taking place.

172. Nevertheless we do not feel that we can fail to support, when it comes to a vote, a call for an end to military operations which have undoubtedly taken place, together with a call for restraint in the future. What my delegation would like to see above all is a greater observance of restraint by all parties so that the basic problem of the Middle East, which underlies all the incidents we have been discussing, can be approached by the path of conciliation rather than that of force. That is why we voted for the draft resolution.

173. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): My delegation must express its deep regret that the draft resolution it had the honour of sponsoring with Guinea and Yugoslavia was vetoed by the United States. It is a distressing situation because from the whole course of the debate it seemed quite clear that no delegation could honestly oppose the contents of the draft resolution. Some wanted more; yet when the draft was put to the vote they felt they had to support it. The United States wanted more, but, because it could not get it, decided to veto the draft.

174. Now, if my colleague Ambassador Baroody were here, he would have said, "If you cannot get what you want, settle for what you can get". I had hoped that that would be the position of the United States, particularly since there was no compromise on principle. Here we were upholding an important principle of the United Nations. What is it? To stop military operations, military aggression wherever and whenever they occur.

175. What is the result of the veto? It is that the United States has given the green light to Israel and to any other

Member in the area to continue with military operations. This is a most regrettable position.

176. There has been considerable talk about terror and terrorism. Yet the term lends itself so easily to all kinds of interpretation that it would be difficult for my delegation at this stage to attempt to say what each delegation means by the word "terror". I would prefer the term "violence". My delegation is indeed against all acts of violence for the sake of violence. Now, situations do arise where violence, however regrettable it might be, perhaps becomes justifiable in pursuit of a legitimate cause or in pursuit of legitimate defence.

177. Is it not violence when aeroplanes are sent to bomb a homeland? The reports before the Council [*see S/7930/Add.*]—reports submitted by United Nations military observers—give evidence of children having been killed. In one incident alone, seven children were killed. There have been no expressions of grief about those children, or about the many men and women who have died as a result of the air bombing.

178. Now, I am not saying that what has happened in Munich is to be applauded. By no means; it was violence. Violence occurred there, and, indeed, it is a tragedy that it occurred at such an international gathering. But at the same time we must not lose our perspective. We should not confuse the issues. Today we have met here to discuss solely and purely complaints lodged by two Member States of the United Nations against a series of aggressions committed against their territory by another Member State.

179. This morning my delegation explained that our primary duty today was not to try to analyse the situation or to pass judgement, but to stop military operations, to stop the killings that are taking place as a result of aerial bombardments. If this Council cannot muster a unanimous vote to call for an immediate cessation of such killings, then I do not think we have a right to continue to exist.

180. It is our hope that the Council will not give up consideration of this question. As other members have pointed out, our statements today were not meant to prevent a discussion of what happened at Munich. Indeed, that is an entirely different subject. The United States draft resolution before the Council [*S/10785*] addresses itself almost specifically to that question. If it wishes to stand by its draft resolution, why does it not put it to a vote? Why should it wish to confuse the issue to which we have addressed ourselves today with another issue?

181. No, I think that in a case of this kind we must not just indulge in politics. We should first of all prevent the war situation that is continuing now in the Middle East, from continuing. When the other party to this question is present in the Council, then we can perhaps continue with our discussion fully and constructively.

182. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): I shall be very brief. In right of reply, I should like to point out, in direct contravention of what has just been said here, that the United States did express its grief over the loss of lives in the Middle East. Perhaps the Ambassador of Somalia was

out of the room when I spoke. Perhaps he has not had an opportunity to study our draft resolution carefully; it of course deplores the loss of life on both sides.

183. I would say also that it is never easy for a permanent member to cast a negative vote. It is an awesome responsibility. Two other permanent members here today cast negative votes, thus vetoing a very important amendment that would have made part of the three-Power draft resolution more acceptable to many of the countries represented around this table. But the Ambassador of Somalia has selectively overlooked this and singled out my country. On this issue we are happy to be singled out.

184. My problem, as I leave this Council tonight, is that I appear to be miles apart from the representative of Somalia in terms of conscience, in terms of what Munich meant. And that is the sorrow of the moment, not the fact that three permanent members here today elected to cast negative votes.

185. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): I did not misunderstand or misinterpret what the representative of the United States said earlier in explanation of his draft resolution. But anyone who has knowledge of what has taken place in the Middle East recently and who has carefully studied the draft resolution could not say that it is at all a balanced one. That may be one of the reasons why it was not pressed to the vote.

186. We know that a great deal of distress has been expressed in the Council about what happened in Munich. But because of the way that feeling is articulated in the United States draft resolution, I am sure that text would not have commanded the votes, because it is not reflective of the whole situation. Is it not senseless to send squadrons of planes over defenceless camps and homes and bomb people? Is that not senseless? Why is not mention made of that in the United States draft resolution, if there is a desire for a balanced resolution?

187. I did not want to indulge in any judgements. What I was hoping was that if we could not get all that we wanted today, at least on one point there was complete unanimity: that military operations, conducted with government approval, which can be halted by the authority of a government, must be stopped.

188. It is difficult for a government to try to exercise control over fanatical groups, over individuals, living not only inside their homeland, but outside their homeland. But it is surely within the realm of possibility in fact for a government to prevent its own war machine from going into action. That was the thrust of the draft resolution which my delegation and the delegations of Guinea and Yugoslavia put forward.

189. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): As the representative of CHINA, I would like to make the following remarks on the serious incident of the recent armed aggression committed by Israeli Zionism against the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon.

190. Firstly, since 8 September, again in defiance of world condemnation, the Israeli Zionists have brazenly sent out

large numbers of aircraft to penetrate deep into Syrian and Lebanese territory and carried out wanton bombing, wounding and killing many inhabitants, including no small number of women and children. This is another serious crime perpetrated by the Israeli Zionists against the Arab people. This is utterly intolerable to all the countries that defend the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and all the people who uphold justice.

191. What evokes even greater indignation is that not only have the Israeli Zionists refused thus far to implement the resolutions adopted by the Security Council not long ago, but they have intensified the ceaseless expansion of their aggression against the Arab countries. The Chinese delegation expresses utmost indignation at and strongly condemns these barbarous and unscrupulous crimes of aggression committed by Israel against the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon in open contempt of the Security Council resolutions.

192. Secondly, the Israeli Zionists have never ceased their aggression against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples. Indeed, they have committed countless and appalling crimes against the Arab peoples. In the two decades and more since 1948, they have launched three large-scale wars of aggression against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples, slaughtering innumerable peaceable inhabitants and razing countless villages to the ground. A million and more Palestinian people have lost their homeland, leading a destitute and miserable life. They have been compelled to take up arms and wage a just struggle to recover their homeland and restore their national rights. All justice-upholding countries and peoples of the world show deep sympathy for their sufferings and actively support their just struggle.

193. The facts are crystal clear. The history of the Middle East since the Second World War is one of incessant aggression and expansion by Israeli Zionism and of the continuous fight of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples against aggression and expansion. Justice is entirely on the side of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples. It is utterly futile for Israeli Zionism to make itself appear as an innocent victim and to seek this or that excuse for its aggressive acts. Israel has tried to use the Olympic incident as a pretext to expand its war of aggression against the Arab countries. This cannot be tolerated in any way. The occurrence of the Olympic incident is unfortunate. We have never been in favour of such adventurist acts of terrorism. But the root cause of these incidents lies in the frenzied aggression committed by Israeli Zionism over a long period against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples. We firmly oppose Israel's using this incident to subject the Palestinian people to renewed persecution and slaughter and make fresh war provocations against the Arab countries. History is bound to prove that no force on earth can prevent the Palestinian and other Arab peoples from winning final victory in their just cause. The aggressors may run rampant for a time, but they can never escape from their utter defeat.

194. Thirdly, we hold that, in order to defend the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council must, first, severely condemn

Israeli Zionism for its aggression against the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon and demand that Israel must immediately stop all its aggressive acts and compensate for all the losses incurred from its aggression and, second, ask Israel earnestly to implement the relevant Council resolutions and ensure against the recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

195. The Chinese delegation has just voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Somalia and two other countries. However, the Chinese delegation deems it necessary to point out that this draft resolution fails to condemn Israeli Zionism for its aggressive acts against the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon. We have reservations in this respect. However, the Chinese delegation cannot but point out with regret that as a result of the veto of a permanent member even such a minimum draft resolution could not be adopted. The Chinese delegation expresses deep regret at this.

196. Fourthly, the Chinese Government and people have always firmly supported the Palestinian people and the Arab Governments and peoples in their just struggle to restore their right to national existence, recover their lost territories and defend their state sovereignty and territorial integrity. We are deeply convinced that with the sympathy and support of the people all over the world, the heroic Palestinian and other Arab peoples will certainly strengthen their unity and persevere in their struggle to win continuous new victories.

197. Before concluding my statement, and speaking as PRESIDENT, I should like to express thanks to the many representatives who congratulated me on my assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the current month. I believe I shall obtain the active support and co-operation of all the States members of the Council in fulfilling my work during my presidency.

198. I now call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. 97th veto

199. Mr. KELANI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Permit me to make some observations on the result of the vote. The draft resolution submitted by the representatives of Guinea, Somalia and Yugoslavia [S/10784] obtained an overwhelming majority—13 out of 15 votes—but it was not adopted because of the negative vote of a permanent member of the Security Council. This draft did not conform to the requests I made to the Council this morning, when I invited it to compel Israel to cease forthwith all military operations, to condemn Israel for its aggression and to adopt all appropriate measures with a view to preventing a recurrence of aggression. This draft resolution, which failed, placed on the same footing the aggressor and those that suffered the aggression, Syria and Lebanon. It did not determine who was the aggressor and did not condemn him; it merely called for a cessation of military operations.

200. How could Syrian or any other State in the world, including the members of the Council, not defend itself against direct aggression aimed at its territory by the armed forces of another State? Syria is showing restraint and

respects the cease-fire resolution. However, like all other States, it cannot allow the enemy to continue its aggression and permit the massacre of hundreds of peaceful citizens. That is why my Government asked for the convening of the Council in order to safeguard peace and security in the Middle East.

201. The problem of which the Security Council is seized has nothing to do with the subject raised this morning by the delegation of the United States. That delegation tried to inquire into the causes and the justifications for the Israeli aggression. It is crystal clear that the roots of the Arab-Israeli conflict lie in the expulsion of the Palestinian people from its homeland, of its dispersion around the world, in the fact that it has been deprived of its right to self-determination, in Israel's refusal to implement dozens of resolutions of the United Nations and the Security Council in particular in its complaints, its plans and its intentions, and in its continued expansion. Those are the roots of the conflict, and the members of the Council are fully aware of them, including the delegation of the United States.

202. This draft resolution failed, and nothing will prevent Israel from continuing its aggression because it has not been condemned, and is not confronted with the responsibilities it must assume in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Because of that, Israel will continue to push the region of the Middle East towards war and to threaten international peace and security.

203. As we come to the end of this meeting, I cannot fail, on behalf of my delegation, to thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council that supported the complaint of my Government and made every effort to have Israeli aggression cease and to establish peace in the Middle East.

204. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): I call on the representative of Lebanon.

205. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): Mr. President, allow me to express to you and to the many friendly delegations around this Council table the sincere appreciation and thanks of my delegation for the support it has received in its complaint about the Israeli aggression against Lebanon on 8 September.

206. I must say with deep regret that my delegation is deeply disappointed by the unprecedented negative vote cast by the United States delegation on the draft resolution presented by Guinea, Somalia and Yugoslavia. That draft resolution was not in principle acceptable or palatable to us. It was weak; it did not meet our requirements; it did not take fully into consideration the massive Israeli attacks against the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon; it did not take into consideration the many warnings addressed by this Security Council to Israel to refrain from repeating its aggressions against Lebanon. We had hoped that this Council would seize this opportunity to move into action, the action needed to put a stop to the repeated aggressions of Israel against Lebanon and its peaceful people. But unfortunately even the minimal draft resolution that was submitted was defeated. It was defeated because a certain

psychosis has been created in the Council in order to link what has happened in Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic to what happened in Munich. Why is it that Lebanon always has to pay the price for what happens somewhere else in the world?

207. Members of the Council met here in June following the massive attacks by Israel on Hasbaya, Deir el-Ashar and other towns in Lebanon in which scores of people were killed. They adopted a resolution [316 (1972)], they condemned Israel and warned Israel against the repetition of its acts. That was in the wake of the Lod incident. An attempt was made then to link Lebanon with the Lod incident. This was not done by the Council, which rose to its responsibilities and adopted a resolution.

208. Now we are told that a massive attack by 24 Phantom and Skyhawk aircraft on towns and villages of Lebanon, showering death and destruction on peaceful civilians, should have a link with the Munich incident, that this act should be put on the same level with that incident. I do not know why a people wants to be so generous to Israel as to try to put all the blame of the world on Lebanon every time that Israel is affected. Mr. Walter Scheel, the Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, made a statement not very long ago in which he said that the Arab Governments were not responsible for what had happened in Munich. That is a responsible and decent man. He said this at a time when some politicians—some of them Americans—were pointing the finger of responsibility at Lebanon. This is distressing and unforgivable. Naturally we are people with hearts and souls and we feel for other peoples. We are not oblivious to tragedies when they occur nor so callous as not to feel compassion for human beings, whoever they are, when they fall victim to such tragedies.

209. Following the Munich incident my Government did not fail to publish a statement in which it said:

“The Lebanese Government expresses its deep regret for the incident which took place in Munich. The Lebanese people and Government are grieved at the loss of human lives as a result of that incident. The Lebanese Government cannot fail to see in these events new evidence of the state of despair which grips the Palestinian people due to their continued and forced exile and calls upon the international community to participate actively in all actions aimed at bringing about respect for the human person, justice and equity.”

210. My colleagues from Sudan and Somalia have expressed the hope—which I strongly reiterate—that the negative vote of the United States will not be used as encouragement, as *carte blanche*, as a green light for Israel to carry on its attacks against Lebanon. What we expected from the Council was to redress the wrongs meted out to us, not to maintain a sword of Damocles over the heads of our innocent population.

211. I had a long statement to make on this matter. I shall refrain from going any further at this stage, however, because in the light of the turn of events during this meeting I must seek fresh instructions from my Govern-

ment. But we are not going to let the matter rest as it now stands.

212. An aggression has been committed against my country and my people by a recalcitrant criminal, by murderous squadrons of Israeli armed forces, in utter contempt of Security Council resolutions, of Council warnings, of international law and of the Armistice Agreement. In the light of these events my delegation would reserve the right to request you, Mr. President, to reconvene the Council at the appropriate time, after I have received full instructions from my Government.

213. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): There being no more names inscribed on the list of speakers, we have now concluded the explanations of vote and the

statements on the two documents on which the Council has voted: namely, the amendments contained in document S/10786 and the draft resolution contained in document S/10784. There is one more document still before the Council: namely, the draft resolution submitted by the United States of America and contained in document S/10785. In this regard I have been informed by the representative of the United States that he will not insist on a vote on his draft resolution at this meeting.

214. If there is no objection, it is my intention to adjourn the meeting, on the understanding that the Council remains seized of this matter. As to when the next meeting will be held, that will be decided through consultations.

The meeting rose at 8.45 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة
يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودرر التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها
أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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