

47. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the revised amendments to draft resolution A/C.6/L.1019/Rev.1 as contained in document A/C.6/L.1023/Rev.1.

The amendments were adopted by 58 votes to 26, with 15 abstentions.

48. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.6/L.1019/Rev.1, as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 70 votes to 1, with 28 abstentions.

49. Mr. RASHID (Afghanistan) requested that his delegation should be recorded as having voted in the negative.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

1580th meeting

Thursday, 4 December 1975, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Frank X. J. C. NJENGA (Kenya).

A/C.6/SR.1580

AGENDA 109

Succession of States in respect of treaties: report of the Secretary-General (concluded) (A/10198 and Add.1-5, A/9610/Rev.1, A/C.6/L.1019/Rev.1, A/C.6/L.1022/Rev.1, A/C.6/L.1023/Rev.1, A/C.6/L.1026)

1. Mr. VAN BRUSSELEN (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted against the amendments in document A/C.6/L.1022/Rev.1 because it felt that the draft articles on the succession of States in respect of treaties (see A/9610/Rev.1, chap. II, sect. D) represented a compromise that would be hard to improve on, and that therefore there was no need for the International Law Commission to consider them further, and also because they left the question of the convening of a conference of plenipotentiaries, which Belgium favoured, completely open.

2. As for the amendments in document A/C.6/L.1023/Rev.1, his delegation had abstained from voting on them, while agreeing with some of the ideas they embodied, because no provision was made for referring to the Commission for further study the proposals mentioned in paragraph 75 of its report (A/9610/Rev.1), although the Commission itself had stated that it had had insufficient time to study them. Moreover, according to operative paragraph 3 proposed in the amendment, it would be decided that the conference of plenipotentiaries should embody the results of its work in an international convention and Belgium considered that it was too soon to take a decision at the present stage on the final form of the articles. Nor did it believe that a convention would be the best formula and, in any case, it felt that the conference itself should take the necessary decision. In view of the adoption of the amendments contained in document A/C.6/L.1023/Rev.1, his delegation had been obliged to abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.6/L.1019/Rev.1 as amended.

3. Mr. KUSSBACH (Austria) said that his delegation had voted against the amendments in document A/C.6/L.1023/

Rev.1 because it had been under the impression that a vote was being taken on the last paragraph of document A/C.6/L.1022/Rev.1. Actually, his delegation had intended to vote in favour of the amendments in document A/C.6/L.1023/Rev.1 because they fully reflected its point of view. Consequently, his delegation had then voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.6/L.1019/Rev.1, as amended.

4. Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho) said that, unfortunately, his delegation had been absent when the vote had been taken. Otherwise it would have voted in favour of the amendments contained in document A/C.6/L.1023/Rev.1 and draft resolution A/C.6/L.1019/Rev.1, as amended.

5. Mr. BOSCO (Italy) said that his delegation had voted against the amendments in document A/C.6/L.1023/Rev.1 because, although it did not disagree with the proposed operative paragraphs 1 and 2, it had found operative paragraphs 3 and 4 unacceptable, as it would be premature to decide on the convening of a conference of plenipotentiaries in 1977 before knowing the comments and observations of more member States. For the same reasons, his delegation had been unable to vote for draft resolution A/C.6/L.1019/Rev.1, as amended.

6. Mr. JEANNEL (France) said that his delegation had voted against the amendments contained in document A/C.6/L.1022/Rev.1 because it felt that, if they were adopted, it would mean indefinitely delaying a decision on the draft articles. His delegation had also voted against the amendments in document A/C.6/L.1023/Rev.1 because it believed that a convention was not the most appropriate and effective form for the draft articles and because the text still contained certain points which, as the International Law Commission itself had acknowledged, had not been given sufficient study.

7. With regard to draft resolution A/C.6/L.1019/Rev.1, as amended, his delegation, which had been a sponsor of the original draft resolution and had included in it the decision to convene a conference of plenipotentiaries, regretted that it had not been possible to agree on an acceptable wording. It therefore abstained in the vote.

8. Mr. RASHID (Afghanistan) considered that, although the set of draft articles prepared by the International Law Commission was at a fairly advanced stage, it still needed to be studied in greater depth in the light of the comments made in the Sixth Committee, not only with regard to paragraph 75 of the Commission's report, but also with regard to paragraph 84 of that report. Since some delegations had made pertinent comments on the supposedly finalized articles, his delegation thought that the study of the question could not be considered at an end.

9. As for the organ responsible for finalizing the draft articles, he had noted that some delegations were in favour of referring the question back to the International Law Commission, while others felt that the Sixth Committee should study the draft. There were also differences of opinion regarding the form or title to be given to the draft articles. Some States were in favour of a convention whereas others felt that the articles should be embodied in a General Assembly resolution or in a declaration. Many States had not expressed an opinion on the matter.

10. On the subject of the conference of plenipotentiaries, opinion had been divided up to the time of the vote. Consequently, far from there being a consensus, one could not even say that there had been a majority in favour of a particular approach to the question as a whole. Meanwhile, the view had been gaining ground that, before taking a final decision, the Sixth Committee should await the completion of the Commission's work on another aspect of the question—namely, succession of States in respect of matters other than treaties, so as to have a unified text.

11. Those differences were reflected in the amendments proposed. Draft resolution A/C.6/L.1019/Rev.1 confined the questions to be referred to the International Law Commission exclusively to paragraph 75 of its report, and said nothing about the procedures and methods to be applied for the completion of the work on the draft articles. For example, according to one of the amendments contained in document A/C.6/L.1023/Rev.1, the Secretary-General would be requested to circulate, before the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, the comments and observations submitted by member States, and by another it would be decided that the Assembly should deal with the question of the conference of plenipotentiaries, to be held in 1977. However, the amendments submitted by his own delegation provided that, in view of the opinions expressed in the course of the discussion, observations of States relating not only to paragraph 75 of the report but also to other questions should be referred to the International Law Commission for consideration and that, at its next session, the General Assembly should consider the various aspects of the question with a view to taking a decision on the future of the articles. The reason for those amendments was that, in his delegation's opinion, matters had not progressed sufficiently to warrant closing the discussion of the draft articles and other procedural points. He felt that, in view of the importance of the draft articles, every precaution should be taken to ensure positive results and he feared that, if the convening of a conference of plenipotentiaries were forced by means of a majority vote, the draft articles might run into difficulties at a later stage. Even if the conference of plenipotentiaries adopted the articles of a convention by a small majority, States might

find themselves obliged to refrain from signing or ratifying it or to enter reservations concerning the articles.

12. For all those reasons, his delegation had been unable to vote in favour of the amendments contained in document A/C.6/L.1023/Rev.1 and had voted against draft resolution A/C.6/L.1019/Rev.1, as amended. However, if draft resolution A/C.6/L.1019/Rev.1 had not been amended, it would have abstained, and it would have voted in favour if its own amendments had been adopted.

13. He wished to point out that, as he had stated at the time (1579th meeting), because of the hasty manner in which the voting had taken place, there had not been an opportunity to record his vote against draft resolution A/C.6/L.1019/Rev.1 as amended. In that connexion, he asked the Secretary of the Committee to ensure that the fact was reported in the relevant document and reflected in the summary record of the meeting. He was surprised that the Chairman should have rushed through the vote on that very important and sensitive matter.

14. He thanked the delegations which had voted in favour of his delegation's amendments.

15. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) said that his delegation had agreed that certain matters might not be referred to the International Law Commission because it felt that the Commission should not be overburdened with work. It still felt, however, that the draft convention would be incomplete unless it contained some provisions regarding the settlement of disputes. Although he was sure that the International Law Commission would bear that in mind in its future work, he felt that the matter should be properly settled at the conference of plenipotentiaries. His delegation also agreed with the implicit suggestion that ways and means should be found of ensuring that the Convention could be applied in the widest possible range of circumstances and believed that that point could also be clarified at the conference.

AGENDA ITEM 115

Implementation by States of the provisions of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961 and measures to increase the number of parties to the Convention (continued) (A/C.6/L.1031/Rev.1)

16. Mr. JEANNEL (France) said that the establishment of good bilateral relations was a fundamental element of international co-operation and that the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations¹ was therefore extremely useful since it codified the rules governing diplomatic relations. Although no one could deny its effectiveness, some delegations had pointed to the problems presented by the Convention. Judging from the comments that had been made, he believed that those problems fell into two categories, namely, problems relating to the diplomatic courier and problems relating to the treatment of diplomats themselves. As to the former category, he believed that criticism centred more on the manner in which the provisions of the Vienna Convention were applied than on

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 500, No. 7310, p. 95.

the provisions themselves, since article 27 of the Convention was sufficiently clear and comprehensive. The same could be said of the second category: although deplorable incidents involving searching and detention had been cited, they were the result of improper application of the Convention since the relevant article affirmed the inviolability of mission personnel, forbade their arrest or detention in any form and stipulated that it was the duty of host States to prevent any attack on the dignity and integrity of their person. He thought that a survey should be made to ascertain how the provisions of the Vienna Convention were being applied in practice, particularly with regard to the two areas mentioned. A resolution should therefore be adopted requesting the Secretary-General to seek the comments and suggestions of Governments on the matter, to prepare a report and submit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session for consideration and a decision. Similarly, an appeal should be made to Governments that had not yet done so to accede to the Convention.

AGENDA ITEM 116

Measures to prevent international terrorism which endangers or takes innocent human lives or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms, and study of the underlying causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair and which cause some people to sacrifice human lives, including their own, in an attempt to effect radical changes: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism (A/9028*)

17. Mr. FERNANDEZ BALLESTEROS (Uruguay) said that the General Assembly's various postponements of the discussion of the item, necessitated by lack of time, made it necessary to revert to the status of the question as it had been three years earlier. However, it soon became clear that the circumstances which had led to its inclusion had not changed and that during the interval acts of international terrorism had continued and had daily reinforced the reasons that had prompted the Secretary-General to seek the General Assembly's assistance in dealing with the tangible threat that the world was beginning to face and to request the inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session, as an additional item of an important and urgent character, of an item entitled "Measures to prevent terrorism and other forms of violence which endanger or take innocent human lives or jeopardize fundamental freedoms".² In response to that request, the General Assembly had adopted on 18 December 1972, resolution 3034 (XXVII) in which the title initially proposed was expanded and whereby the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism was established.

18. Uruguay had heeded the Secretary-General's appeal and that of the General Assembly and had wholeheartedly prepared to make the required commitment, hoping to find allies in all the peoples that had espoused the cause of the United Nations, in the enemies of violence, in the advocates

of humanitarian law, in short, in all peace-loving peoples. Uruguay's readiness had been expressed in all areas and in all circumstances. Uruguay had raised its voice not only when the lives cut short by terrorism were those of its own sons, as in the case of the brutal and cold-blooded murder of the military attaché in Paris, Colonel Ramón Trabal, but also when victims had been claimed by terrorism at the mission of the Federal Republic of Germany at Stockholm, at which time the Uruguayan Government had expressed its strong condemnation to the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany.

19. He recalled what the Secretary-General had said to the effect that those acts of violence had created a climate of fear throughout the world from which no one was immune, and he said that his country provided the best example of the truth of that assertion because Uruguay, which had been swept by the most violent wave of terror in its history—which now, fortunately, had been totally eliminated—was the very country which for so long had been known as "the Switzerland of the Americas". Uruguay, which from 1908 to 1972 had been able to boast that it had had no deaths due to direct or indirect political causes, had been taken by surprise and caught off guard by the terrorist attack. It was essential to know those details in order to understand that Uruguay's position was both objective and serious as well as sincere.

20. It was no secret that the item under consideration had become somewhat taboo for some of the States represented in the Committee. That was because it was feared that a condemnation by the General Assembly might jeopardize the legitimate struggle of certain peoples or movements against colonialism or for self-determination. Furthermore, those who took a position on terrorism could be identified with one or another faction in the conflict regarding the Middle East. In that connexion, he recalled the statement made at the previous session by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uruguay (2240th plenary meeting), who had said that, while continuing to support the immediate measures which the United Nations was taking to alleviate the sad plight of the Palestinian people, the Government of Uruguay advocated more far-reaching formulas that would take account of and meet the legitimate aspirations of that people, thus facing up to the real, political, social and, ultimately, human essence of the problem, all within the framework of global negotiations for peace.

21. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism (A/9028) did not give a clear idea of the difficulties encountered in reaching some kind of compromise for the organization of its work. The obstinacy of some delegations, and in particular the intransigent attitude of others, had made it impossible to achieve the consensus which had seemed within reach, and the session had been closed with a mere account of the meetings held by the Committee which, while it might serve as a basis for subsequent work, had not provided the necessary clarification of the issue which had been the purpose of the Committee's establishment; nor had it made it easier for the General Assembly to adopt recommendations on the matter.

22. That report obliged his delegation to reiterate the views it had expressed on the subject in the Committee and

* Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 28.

² See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Annexes, agenda item 92, document A/8791 and Add.1.

which were not reflected in the report. Uruguay had stated, and stated again most categorically, that it repudiated the acts of international terrorism which had been recurring to an increasing extent in recent years and which were not confined to particular geographical regions or political-ideological systems but were, on the contrary, indiscriminately perpetrated for no other reason than barbarism and complete ruthlessness on the part of the criminals that committed them.

23. It was obvious that no system of preventive measures, and no procedure for international co-operation for the punishment of those crimes, however strong or co-ordinated it might be, could ever eliminate that type of crime altogether unless the root causes were attacked. Governments must therefore assist each other not only in fighting that kind of crime, but also in the heroic and formidable task of putting an end to the inequities in old and obsolete socio-economic structures. That, however, did not mean that, given the existence of terrorist crimes of various kinds, States should not attempt to deal with such offences in their respective laws, or co-operate with one another to prevent and curb that kind of crime by ensuring, through appropriate agreements, that the perpetrators of such crimes did not escape punishment by the simple expedient of taking refuge in the territory of a country other than the one in which their crimes had been committed.

24. Terrorism could not be sanctioned by any institution of international law, since that would mean legitimizing the Machiavellian principle that the end justified the means. In that connexion, his delegation wished to state that it attributed a profound moral content to the genuine national liberation movements and therefore was unwilling to concede that those movements were characterized by the use of terrorist methods.

25. Uruguay believed that the organized international community should be especially diligent about taking prompt action on the matter, in view of world public opinion which was becoming increasingly concerned at acts of terrorism perpetrated everywhere and calling for the immediate implementation of effective measures to put an end to such acts. Perhaps the only viable course would be to strengthen national legislation, which often lacked adequate legal instruments to combat the virulence of that relatively new phenomenon, and to ensure, through bilateral agreements, that there was an effective international defensive network. Furthermore, the signing and ratification of multilateral conventions such as those of Montreal, The Hague and Tokyo, on air hijacking, and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents was an absolute necessity and his delegation appealed to all States Members of the United Nations to take such action.

26. Uruguay would support the adoption of specific measures that would permit the prevention and condemnation of that growing violence, the inhuman methods of which created a climate of insecurity and danger and caused the loss of innocent lives.

27. Mr. GÜNEY (Turkey) said that his Government, which was deeply concerned over the alarming increase in

acts of terrorism which not only endangered innocent lives, but also jeopardized the fundamental rights of States, supported the initiative of the Secretary-General in including in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly an additional item on measures to prevent terrorism and other forms of violence. It was distressing and disconcerting for the United Nations and the international community as a whole that to date the purpose of the Secretary-General's initiative had not been achieved and that the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism had not been able to conclude its work and formulate certain conclusions.

28. In recent years, there had been a series of violent acts that had resulted in an increase in the number of innocent victims. No country, community or region could be considered safe from that wave of violence. It should be emphasized that there were very few States represented in the Sixth Committee whose citizens had not suffered seriously as a result of a steady increase in acts of terrorism. In that connexion, Turkey's own experience might be recalled: two young Turkish diplomats had been assassinated only three years earlier in the United States; Turkish aircraft had been hijacked to foreign countries and foreign aircraft hijacked to Turkey; the Turkish Ambassadors in Vienna and Paris had been assassinated within the space of two days, on 22 and 24 October 1975 respectively. That short catalogue of the experiences of a single country, in the recent past, should serve to demonstrate how acts of violence tended to become part of the way of life and to show that no region in the world was immune from that phenomenon.

29. Terrorism was not a recent phenomenon but, with technical progress and the development of means of communication, it had been transformed since the end of the First World War into an international problem with increasingly serious consequences. Acts of terrorism took various forms, the most frequent and individual form at the present time being that in which diplomats were victims. That was a form of international terrorism which had replaced diplomatic privileges and immunities by constant risk and had created a feeling of insecurity for all diplomats, particularly ambassadors, which seriously threatened the very machinery of international co-operation. In that connexion, he outlined the events that had taken place between 22 and 24 October 1975, which highlighted the recrudescence of acts of violence against diplomats and other innocent persons and the feeling of insecurity which such violence aroused within the international community. Yet the measures adopted thus far by the international community had been insufficient. They included the conventions signed at Tokyo in 1963, at The Hague in 1970 and at Montreal in 1971, as well as the more recent international instrument adopted by the General Assembly, namely the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents (resolution 3166 (XXVIII), annex), which, owing to the lack of the requisite number of ratifications or accessions, had not yet entered into force.

30. With regard to the causes of international terrorism, there was nothing to add to the conclusions of the study prepared by the Secretariat,³ and he wished also to

³ A/C.6/418/Rev.1.

mention the statement made by the Secretary-General when the item had been included in the agenda, in which he had declared that acts of violence arising from international terrorism were contrary to international law and morality, that they also constituted violations of the fundamental purposes and principles of the Charter and that they were contrary to the declarations and resolutions in which those principles had been developed and confirmed.

31. The United Nations could not remain a passive witness of acts of violence; the time had come to put into practice the principles embodied in the Charter and to take appropriate measures while taking full account of practical objectives, which might be the following: it was necessary to act with objectivity, leaving aside considerations of a political nature, which should be examined in their respective fields and dealt with appropriately; no attack must be made on the fundamental right of peoples to self-determination or the liberation struggle against colonialism; although it would be useful to define the concept of international terrorism, that concept was imprecise and did not lend itself to exact definition, and it might therefore be sufficient to define the concept in provisions formulated to that end; it was necessary to undertake simultaneously the study of the causes of terrorism, which were varied and complex, but without delaying the measures to be taken in order to prevent and suppress international terrorism, which urgently required concerted action; international terrorism could not be combated effectively without international co-operation; the latter could be carried out only through a convention, which should embody provisions relating to co-operation in the prevention and suppression of acts of international terrorism, as well as provisions relating to the trial, punishment and extradition of their perpetrators.

32. The General Assembly must act with speed and firmness if it wished to avoid new acts of violence which would claim more innocent victims. Therefore, it should, on the one hand, condemn international terrorism; encourage States to become parties to existing conventions and to reinforce anti-terrorist measures already taken at the national level; stimulate the exchange of information concerning effective precautions and techniques already implemented or being elaborated within countries; and appeal to States to increase bilateral or regional co-operation with a view to better combating international terrorism; and, on the other hand, it should renew the mandate of the *Ad Hoc* Committee so that the latter could continue its work and make every effort to attain the practical objectives already mentioned. The international community must put an end to the increase in brutality, of which international terrorism was one of the most serious forms arising in society; if society's limit of tolerance was reached or surpassed, there might ensue an irreversible and fatal collapse of international relations.

33. Mr. SABEL (Israel) said that, as in previous years, it was regrettable that the Sixth Committee had once again failed to take any definitive step towards ensuring international legal action against the scourge of international terrorism. The choice was clear: whether there were certain acts by individuals which the international community felt to be so reprehensible, so despicable and so contrary to the basic ideals of humanity that different countries of widely

differing political systems should rise together to denounce them and take clear unequivocal action against them. Acts of terrorism could never be justified on political grounds.

34. The report submitted at the twenty-eighth session by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism must be one of the most arid and sterile ever submitted by a committee working under a directive of the General Assembly; the inability of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to make progress in facing that evil merely completed the vicious circle of failure which had been the lot of all United Nations action against international terrorism, from the so-called consensus in the Security Council in 1970 and 1972 through the various debates in the General Assembly on the hijacking of aircraft. His delegation had approached all those discussions in a constructive spirit, attempting to set forth some basic considerations and practical proposals in the least controversial form, as in the case of the observations which Israel had submitted in response to General Assembly resolution 3034 (XXVII) of 1972 in document A/AC.160/1/Add.1. But irrelevant political considerations which had intruded throughout, virtually wrecking the Secretary-General's initiative in 1972, had combined to transform the *Ad Hoc* Committee and its report, as well as the Sixth Committee's discussions on the item, into a parody and a bitter pill for all those innocent or potential victims of international terrorism who had hoped that the United Nations effort would give rise to concrete and serious steps to rid the world of that scourge.

35. There was an obvious and pressing need for an international instrument to ensure that persons committing such acts did not escape punishment. The principle of such an instrument would be that a State must either extradite the offender or submit his case for prosecution. That was the principle underlying the civil aviation conventions of The Hague and Montreal, both ratified by Israel. The distressing element of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report was the effort made by certain delegations to prevent any concrete steps being taken towards the drafting of such an instrument. The obstruction appeared to have been in two main directions. First, the issue of the causes of international terrorism had been raised, based on the unacceptable thesis that there might be some political cause which might justify or extenuate terror. His delegation felt it essential for the Committee to state categorically and clearly that terror was universally, absolutely and unconditionally an evil to be countered. The other diversionary tactic had been that of the issue of State responsibility or so-called State terrorism. For many years, Israel had argued that where a State was directly or indirectly involved in acts of terror, direct State responsibility was involved. That was laid down clearly in the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex). Those who brought the issue up in connexion with the current agenda item could only be attempting to blur the clear principle of State responsibility or detract from the responsibility of the individuals involved. Either of those objectives was to be regretted, for they involved a clear attempt to prevent the Committee from pursuing the task of proposing legal measures to ensure that those carrying out such acts were either prosecuted or extradited. International law, when in a far

more primitive state than at present, had managed to secure international action against the scourges of piracy and the slave trade, and it would be to the lasting discredit of the Sixth Committee if it failed to take similar action against the current scourge of international terrorism.

36. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) said that when the Secretary-General had proposed an exhaustive in-depth study of international terrorism, he had merely taken up a general outcry which the United Nations had been unable to ignore. Following a debate in the course of which principles had succumbed for explainable political reasons, the item had been retained on the agenda through the perseverance of some delegations, but no progress had been made. Although terrorist violence had not diminished, the international community appeared to be in a state of paralization with regard to the subject. For example, the World Conference of the International Women's Year had made no mention of terrorism in its resolutions.

37. Although three years had passed since the item had been introduced and new developments had occurred, it was still imperative for the international community to study terrorism, establish its causes, consider measures for dealing with it in the most appropriate way and the legal

framework within which society could eradicate it or protect itself from criminal acts which distorted and tarnished the most just claims. His delegation wished to reiterate its most sincere and absolute repudiation of the use of terrorist violence, whatever the motive.

38. It was well known that the item was difficult and likely to be controversial, but he wondered whether there was any item on the agenda which did not involve such a risk. Everyone should muster sufficient determination to avoid the difficult aspects of the item and focus, not on the most controversial points, but on those on which there was likely to be agreement. His delegation considered that the Sixth Committee was prepared to take advantage of the four meetings set aside for the item and take action to fulfil, at least partially, the hopes placed in it by the General Assembly, which was shared, although with visible discouragement, by the general public. His delegation was ready to support any initiative aimed at keeping the item on the agenda and promoting the adoption of the measures necessary to ensure a prompt and exhaustive study of the item, without evading the responsibility incumbent upon the Sixth Committee.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

1581st meeting

Thursday, 4 December 1975, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Frank X. J. C. NJENGA (Kenya).

A/C.6/SR.1581

AGENDA ITEM 116

Measures to prevent international terrorism which endangers or takes innocent human lives or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms, and study of the underlying causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair and which cause some people to sacrifice human lives, including their own, in an attempt to effect radical changes: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism (concluded) (A/9028*).

1. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) deplored the fact that acts of terrorism continued to plague the international community and cited various incidents of terrorism against citizens of the United States and other countries. Little action had been taken by the international community to deal with the problem and the United States had not pressed as hard as it might for action, because it recognized that members of the Sixth Committee were not yet prepared to accept their responsibility to face up to the problem of terrorism. He hoped that with the passage of time a sufficient number of other members would be

prepared to join in action not only to condemn such acts but also to combat them with legal measures. He realized that to press Governments to take action before they were ready could result in actions which were worse than inaction and could lead to the creation of unnecessary barriers to constructive action. However, there came a time when forbearance ceased to be understandable prudence and became itself a part of the pattern of irresponsible unwillingness to deal with difficult problems.

2. The item on terrorism had again been moved to the end of the agenda of the current session, reflecting tacit acceptance of the fact that the Committee was unwilling to take action at the current session. He urged the Committee, nevertheless, to refresh its recollection of the problem and to begin to rethink some of the prejudices which had hitherto prevented meaningful action. Such a discussion might prepare the Committee to take meaningful action in 1976 and thus begin to free the United Nations of the stigma of being an institution which was unwilling even to try to deal with a scourge which every year maimed the minds and bodies and took the lives of countless innocent people. He recalled some of the history of the item, since it was first included in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. The Secretariat had prepared for consideration at that session an excellent

* Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 28.