

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.

study on the problem¹, which he urged the members of the Committee to reread, in particular paragraph 10.

3. In spite of the clear basis for action and the important progress being made in connexion with the laws of war, the Sixth Committee had made little progress in its consideration of international terrorism. Some members had stated the Committee should concern itself rather with the causes of terrorism. He hoped that those who stressed the study of the causes did in fact wish to eliminate the phenomenon and were not merely attempting to justify acts of terrorism. He felt that the question of causes should not bar the Committee from examining legal measures. The General Assembly, the Security Council and other United Nations bodies were already dealing in one form or other with the causes, such as the Middle East question, the denial of equal rights and self-determination, and economic and social problems. It would be a mockery of the particular responsibilities of the Committee to insist that it duplicate that work before dealing with the question of legal measures. Another reason for dealing with the question of legal measures to combat acts of terrorism was that all countries had passed laws against murder, kidnapping and assault, despite the fact that the causes of those forms of anti-social behaviour had not been fully understood, much less eliminated. Others had sought to blur the nature of the problem by broadening it to include all manner of State action which involved violence or injury to innocent persons. Such an approach had to be rejected, because it mixed two distinct problems in such a manner as to ensure that no meaningful action would be taken with regard to either. Furthermore, the law relating to State action was being dealt with in other contexts and was in a far more advanced state, as was shown by international instruments such as the Charter of the United Nations, the charters and decisions of the Nürnberg and Tokyo Tribunals, the 1949 Geneva Conventions, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and the Definition of Aggression. There was a growing and increasingly terrifying problem of terrorism which the Committee could not responsibly refuse to deal with by saying that it was not the only problem relating to violence. Others had asserted that there was a conflict of some sort between a decent respect for equal rights and self-determination, on the one hand, and a desire to take legal measures to deal with terrorism, on the other. He reminded those speakers that none of the many States which had won their independence through struggle had engaged in the type of international violence with which he was now concerned. There was, furthermore, an even more fundamental right than the right to equality and self-determination, namely the right to life. He reminded members of the Committee that not even nation States were allowed, in the exercise of their inherent right of self-defence, to resort to any and all means. Even a State whose very existence was threatened was not entitled to ignore the laws of war. For all the momentary broad support their cause might enjoy, individuals, no less than States, must be bound by limits on their conduct in support of that cause.

4. He recognized that no time remained at the current session to come to grips with the details of the problem,

but urged the Committee to consider the draft convention submitted by his delegation during the twenty-seventh session² which was still before the Committee and was formulated so as to deal only with the most serious criminal threats; each of four separate conditions as indicated in paragraph 1 of article 1 of the draft convention must be met before the terms of the draft convention would apply. He urged the Committee to take some time before the next session to reflect further on the problem of international terrorism, to consider the United States proposal, to reflect on alternative or complementary concrete steps, to sign and ratify the Tokyo, Montreal and Hague Conventions on interference with civil aviation, and to sign and ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents.

5. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation had wished the item on international terrorism to be concluded at the twenty-ninth session, but had deferred to the majority desire to defer consideration of the item until the current session. He hoped that the item would be comprehensively discussed at the current session and reminded the Committee that a study of terrorism and measures for combating it required a full study of the reasons which drove certain individuals to commit coercive acts against others for the achievement of national goals pertaining to the liberation of their people from colonialism, foreign domination and occupation and racial discrimination.

6. However, State terrorism was more dangerous than terrorism by individuals. The means available to States to commit terrorism were far greater than those available to individuals and national liberation movements and State terrorism consequently involved a greater loss of life and destruction of property and the culprit was more likely to escape punishment. Despite all of the international instruments cited by the representative of the United States of America, State international terrorism still existed and measures were needed to apply sanctions against States committing terrorism and against their agents, including secret agents and pilots. There could be no excuse for such individuals even if they claimed that they were performing their task under the orders of their superiors. The Nürnberg trial had laid down the law on that aspect of the question, stating that such agents were international criminals subject to international punishment. The starkest example of State terrorism was that committed by Israel, whose secret agents committed acts of murder and destruction in many cities of the world and whose bombers murdered innocent women and children in the Palestinian refugee camps. Israel's agents and pilots were international terrorists and should be punished.

7. Mr. SIAGE (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the last person who could speak about terrorism was the representative of the racist Israeli régime whose hands were still covered with the blood of the victims of the latest barbarous attack by Israeli aircraft against civilian targets and refugee camps in Lebanon. Those refugees had previously been expelled from their homes by that same régime whose long history of continued terrorist acts showed that

¹ A/C.6/418/Rev.1.

² A/C.6/L.850.

it was based on terrorism and the massacre of the innocent. Even Israel's envoy was a terrorist known to combatants on the West Bank who continued to suffer Israeli torture.

8. No international jurisdiction could call a legitimate struggle waged by people for their liberation terrorism. Their struggle was legitimate and based on the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations. They were attempting to combat a criminal aggressor. He called on the Committee to condemn real terrorism, i.e. State terrorism. When a Member State attacked another Member State, that was terrorism. The desperate struggle waged by victims with no other recourse to express their desire for self-determination could not be called terrorism.

9. Mr. FIFOOT (United Kingdom) said that he approached the item with a great sense of despondency, not so much because of its subject-matter but because of the evidence it afforded of the international community's lack of effort and will. The Committee had failed to make progress on the item which, he feared, included too many different fields of study. The item was too broad and represented a deplorable dissipation of effort. There was no need to list terrorist acts which only evoked explanations and even excuses. The international community had failed to concentrate, as it should, on the victim and had allowed itself to be distracted by other aspects of the problem, such as politics, matters of policy or blame. He noted that the concept of just or unjust war was no longer relevant in humanitarian law and he regretted the return of such a concept, namely just or unjust terrorist acts, to the discussion on the current item. There was more than enough evidence of the need for the international community to take whatever action it could to deal with the problem; his Government would join with others in seeking measures to achieve that end.

10. Mr. HELLNERS (Sweden) said that international terrorism was still a serious problem. Some years previously world attention had been focused mainly on actions directed against civil aviation, and the Hague and Montreal Conventions were important instruments in the struggle for the suppression of those crimes. More recently, the taking of hostages to induce Governments to make concessions had become prevalent. It should be completely unacceptable to all States that irresponsible or criminal groups should attack private individuals in that way and interfere with the exercise of public authority. He hoped, furthermore, that a sufficient number of States would soon ratify the 1973 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, so that that Convention could enter into force.

11. It was important that efforts to combat terrorism continue and that special attention be devoted to the causes of terrorist activities, the motives of which were often dim or even incomprehensible. In some cases certain understandable motives might be found, although they did not suffice to excuse the methods used by terrorists. Furthermore, terrorist activity often affected completely innocent persons and States not involved in the original conflict. Any country might become the victim of terrorist acts, as the recent experience of his own country had shown. It was in

the common interest of all to explore all possibilities and means of combating international terrorism.

12. Mr. BUSSE (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his Government was deeply concerned about the acts of terrorism which continued to be perpetrated throughout the world. Some of the most hideous incidents had either occurred in his country or affected his countrymen. His country, which had repeatedly advocated world-wide co-ordinated measures for effective prevention of terrorism and was prepared to accede to agreements providing for meaningful action, had initiated the legislative procedure for the ratification of the various conventions against terrorism involving civil aviation as well as the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, and urged all Governments seriously to consider acceding to the existing agreements so as to ensure their world-wide recognition and implementation. However, those agreements applied only to specific sectors and a comprehensive agreement on the prevention and combating of terrorist acts should be sought. It might be useful to establish a world-wide ban on the admission and harbouring of terrorists and persons released from prisons as a result of terrorist activities. All States should undertake to refuse protection or refuge to terrorists, thereby making them subject to prosecution.

13. It would be useful to study and eliminate the underlying causes of crimes but it was essential that the debate in the Committee focus on the question of direct measures of prevention. There should be a clear condemnation of all insidious acts of violence against the innocent, the defenceless and the unprotected. It was a hopeful sign that there was a growing reluctance to grant refuge to terrorists in recent cases involving the taking of hostages.

14. He hoped that the atmosphere at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly would be more propitious to a fruitful consideration of the item.

15. Mr. GARCIA ORTIZ (Ecuador) recalled that the item had been on the agenda for the past four sessions and had never been dealt with properly. Although there were now several international instruments aimed at preventing and punishing acts of international terrorism, those acts continued to multiply. The United Nations must be concerned with the situation and put an end to, or at least reduce the frequency of, such acts, which were an affront to the legal and moral conscience of mankind.

16. The matter was complex and delicate, as could be seen from the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism (A/9028). There had been the initial question of how to define terrorism. In his view, such definitions were difficult and did not embody the essence of the problem; the discussion should rather focus on effective measures to prevent and punish acts of terrorism. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee was good, and that Committee's mandate should be renewed so that by the thirty-first session an instrument could be drafted that would clarify the various elements of the problem. In that regard, he felt that the suggestion of the representative of Turkey made at the previous meeting was acceptable. Since the matter was quite technical, that Committee might also consider setting

up a small group of experts to elaborate a draft convention or draft resolution on the matter. The matter could not be left at the mercy of events or the policies of States.

17. Mr. JEANNEL (France) said that many innocent lives had been lost as a result of acts of terrorism which were political in origin and served political goals. For that reason it was important to study not only the tragic effects but also the underlying causes of terrorism. The careful student of the events in question could see that the phenomenon was linked with the feeling which minorities rightly or wrongly had of being excluded from society, seeing themselves as being denied the right to exist and having no possibility of asserting their identity. That same feeling led them to express themselves violently by placing explosives in public places, taking hostages, hijacking aircraft or making attempts on the lives of diplomats.

18. In that connexion, he wished to assure the representative of Turkey that France deplored and vigorously condemned the recent assassination of the Turkish Ambassador to France and was taking all measures to discover and punish the guilty parties.

19. The United Nations was obliged by its humanitarian vocation and democratic ideals to attempt to solve the complex problem of the pitiless onslaught of blind violence and its causes. The solution to the problem would have to be acceptable to all States, for otherwise the result would be formulas devoid of any real practical scope. Such solutions should, of course, be compatible with efforts to strengthen the international protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms and take into account the provisions of recent international agreements, such as those affecting civil aviation. States should furthermore be invited to re-examine their national legislation and their bilateral and multilateral agreements with respect to terrorism. He cited in that regard recent French legislation concerning the prevention and punishment of hijacking of aircraft, which reflected his Government's desire to combat barbarous acts which all peoples condemned, however noble the cause for which they might have been committed.

20. Mr. KUSSBACH (Austria) said that his Government had always condemned acts of violence committed against innocent persons and its position with regard to terrorism was well known. He wished to assure the representative of Turkey once again that his Government deeply deplored and condemned the crime committed at the Turkish Embassy in Vienna on 22 October 1975. The Austrian authorities would exert every effort in conducting their investigations, with a view to bringing to justice the criminals responsible.

21. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization), speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, drew attention to paragraphs 1 and 4 of General Assembly resolution 3034 (XXVII) expressing deep concern over increasing acts of violence and condemning the continuation of repressive and terrorist acts by colonialists, racist and alien régimes. He also noted that paragraph 38 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism stated that particular stress had been laid by several representatives on the importance of State terrorism, which they had considered as the most dangerous form of international

terrorism. State terrorism was being practised in Palestine by the forces of occupation, as was shown clearly in document A/10272. Those who escaped such acts of terrorism in their own countries were pursued to the camps which they currently occupied in neighbouring countries. A glaring example of State terrorism had been the savage air attacks carried out by Israel against refugee camps in southern Lebanon two days previously. Ironically, the Zionist so-called State had been so proclaimed as a result of the terrorism carried out by the Hitlerites against innocent Jews, among others, and the terrorism of the racist Zionists capitalizing on the tragedy and misery of the victims of racist Nazis. Terrorism had always been a characteristic of zionism, as had been demonstrated by, among other things, the bombing of the King David Hotel and of marketplaces in cities and towns throughout Palestine.

22. Paragraph 66 of the report stated that efforts to remedy violence-provoking situations were too often thwarted by Member States of the United Nations. In that connexion, the acts of terrorism committed by the Zionists must be linked to the supplies of lethal weapons provided by the United States of America. It was American-made planes using American-made bombs that had carried out the recent attacks against refugee camps.

23. His organization believed that all States should respect the principles of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, resolutions concerning the occupation of foreign territories, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

24. Mr. AL-ADHAMI (Iraq) associated himself with the observations made by the representatives of other Arab States and the Palestine Liberation Organization.

25. Referring to an article contained in the 3 December issue of *Le Monde*, concerning the situation in the Middle East two years after the war of October 1973, he appealed to those who had been subjected to the aggression of the Hitlerite forces to remember the theory that frontiers were movable and followed population movements, even to the detriment of other peoples. Other articles in the same issue also described the attacks on the refugee camps and the plan to establish four more villages in the Golan heights. The situation of the Palestinian people struggling for their freedom deserved serious consideration by the Committee.

26. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said that all members of the Committee were opposed to terrorism and believed that all possible means should be used to put an end to it. To achieve that end, it was necessary to seek the causes of terrorism. Those causes were related to the current world disorder in which the provisions of the Charter were not applied, injustice was rife and international security was based on the outmoded concept of the use of force. Disregard for or active violation of Security Council resolutions was greeted with indifference by the international community and the United Nations. His delegation had always opposed all forms of terrorism.

27. Mr. ABUL-KHEIR (Egypt), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation had been surprised that the representative of Israel had dared to speak at the previous meeting on the question of State terrorism when meetings of the Security Council had been prompted by acts of terrorism carried out by Israel itself. The reasons underlying the violence in the Middle East were linked with the occupation of the Arab territories and the refusal of Israel to grant the Arab peoples their right to self-determination. The Palestinian people were struggling with every means at their disposal to achieve the exercise of their legitimate rights, just as the peoples of Europe had done against the forces of fascism and nazism during the Second World War and just as the peoples of Africa and Asia had done.

28. Mr. SABEL (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, in his statement, he had not referred to the Government of Egypt or of any Arab State, but simply to those supporting terrorism. However, the representative of Egypt seemed to have felt it appropriate to reply to those remarks.

29. The Arab States' support for terrorism constituted one of the most ghastly episodes in modern history. In providing such support, they had on their hands the blood of innocent children, airline passengers, businessmen, athletes, diplomats, and all those Arabs of the west bank and Gaza who had refused to follow the instructions of the Palestine Liberation Organization. Those Arab States were personified by Colonel Qadaffi, who had awarded a \$5 million prize to those who had murdered the athletes in Munich. Arab States openly bragged about the exploits of the *fedayeen* terrorists who used refugee camps in Lebanon as bases for their attacks against Israeli civilians. The Government of Lebanon appeared unwilling or unable to take any action against the terrorists. The Arab States publicly gloated over each case of murder, showing signs of anguish only when Israel struck back, not at civilians and women and children, but at the terrorists themselves. The accuracy of those attacks had been attested to by the terrorists themselves in their own weekly magazine *Ila El Amam*. "State terrorism", if such a thing existed, consisted of aiding, abetting, openly supporting and gloating over acts of terror. It did not mean striking back at terrorists.

30. Mr. ABDALLAH (Tunisia), said that the list of Israeli crimes was too long to be dealt with in the time at the Committee's disposal. Consequently, he would not reply to the Israeli accusations, which had already been answered by world public opinion.

31. Since the item could not be given the detailed consideration it deserved in the time left to the Committee at the current session, his delegation, which had often condemned terrorism, proposed that debate on the item should be adjourned in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, and taken up again at the thirty-first session.

32. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the proposal to adjourn the debate could be taken up after all delegations wishing to do so had had an opportunity to exercise their right of reply.

33. Mr. OMAR (Libyan Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he had not been surprised to hear the representative of the racist and Zionist régime speak on the subject of terrorism. The ideas of war and force were inextricably linked with Zionism and formed an integral part of the thinking of its leaders.

34. Referring to the Israeli representative's observations concerning Colonel Qadaffi, he said that his country was proud to provide assistance to the Palestinian people in their legitimate struggle to return to their lands and homes, and to assist peoples struggling for their rights throughout the world. His Government would continue to support its Palestinian brothers until the Palestinian flag was once again raised over Palestine.

35. Mr. VANDERPUE (Ghana), speaking on a point of order, said that the Tunisian motion should be given due consideration under rule 116 of the rules of procedure. The Committee ignored those rules to its own disadvantage. It was sickening for the Committee to have to listen to a long list of accusations and counter-accusations when it should be concerned with finding solutions to the problems involved. The cause of terrorism was the state of undeclared war existing in a large number of areas of the world. He therefore supported the Tunisian motion.

36. Mr. JEANNEL (France) said that he shared the concern expressed by the representative of Ghana. The dialogue taking place in the Committee was a dialogue of the deaf. Consequently, debate on the item should be adjourned until the thirty-first session, when the question could be considered more objectively. His delegation supported the Tunisian motion.

37. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates), supported by Mr. AL-ADHAMI (Iraq), opposed the Tunisian motion. Since there had been no opposition to the procedure suggested by the Chairman, that suggestion constituted a decision by the Committee which, under rule 123 of the rules of procedure, could only be overruled by a two-thirds majority. Furthermore, he deplored the fact that the representative of Ghana had seen fit to lecture other delegations while interrupting the exercise of the right of reply on a point of order.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that no formal decision had been taken by the Committee and, consequently, rule 123 of the rules of procedure did not apply. The motion of the representative of Tunisia had been to adjourn the debate on the item until the thirty-first session. Even if that motion was adopted, those delegations wishing to do so would still be able to exercise their right of reply afterwards.

The motion to adjourn the debate on the item until the thirty-first session of the General Assembly was adopted.

39. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates), speaking in exercise of the right of reply with regard to the Israeli representative's assertion that Israel merely defended itself against attacks, said he wondered whether the Israeli secret agents who had attacked the Libyan Embassy in Rome and killed a well-known Arab poet and musician had been acting in self-defence and whether self-defence had been the motive for the killing of a Moroccan labourer in Stockholm.

and a Syrian public-relations man. Agents of the Israeli Government had sent a letter bomb which had seriously maimed the head of a research centre in Beirut, and Israeli soldiers attacking Beirut had killed a well-known Arab poet. Could those murders and the deaths of scores of women and children in Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon and elsewhere be regarded as acts of self-defence?

40. His delegation was in full agreement with the statement made by the United Kingdom representative to the effect that the concern of the international community should be primarily for the victims of terrorism. However, in his delegation's view, State terrorism carried out by agents of the army and secret police was much more reprehensible than acts of individual terrorism by freedom fighters.

41. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the Palestinians had embarked on a course of armed struggle to liberate their country and were forced to operate from refugee camps because they had been expelled from their homes and denied the right to return to their country by the occupying forces. Just as the partisans in various countries fighting against Nazi occupation during the Second World War had been obliged to go underground and live among their own people, similarly the Palestinian freedom fighters were obliged to live among their people in the refugee camps.

42. As to the bombing which had taken place two days previously, he had just received a cable confirming that 52 persons, primarily women and children, had died as a result of that savage racist Zionist attack. Not a single young man capable of serving as a freedom fighter had been included in the list of those murdered.

43. Mr. SABEL (Israel) said that his delegation had not objected to the consensus decision to adjourn the debate on the item under consideration until the thirty-first session as the discussions had turned into an avid debate but was disappointed that the Committee had not produced any constructive plan to take legal action to combat terrorism. Replying to the remarks made by certain Arab delegations, he wished to inform the Committee of one case which truly illustrated terrorism. At the end of October the Israel Defence Forces had captured a terrorist who had penetrated Israeli territory. He had subsequently been interviewed on television and had been asked why his equipment had included an axe. He had replied that the axe was to chop off the heads of inhabitants of Israeli settlements, the purpose being to take the severed heads to the Syrian Arab Republic to prove that the terrorist group of which he was a member had successfully entered the village, killed their victims and pulled back safely. That would have had the effect of terrorizing the civilian population and inducing them to leave Israel and go to any other country that would accept them. That, he respectfully submitted, was terrorism.

44. The CHAIRMAN observed that there were a number of speakers still wishing to take the floor on the item but, in view of the Committee's decision to adjourn the debate, they would have to do so at the thirty-first session.

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 (concluded) (A/C.6/L.1031/Rev.1)

45. Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to draft resolution A/C.6/L.1031/Rev.1, which included certain substantive changes in relation to the original draft resolution. In the preambular part of the revised draft resolution, the only substantive change was in the fifth paragraph, which advocated a study of the question of the status of the diplomatic courier in the light of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations³ of 1961. In the operative part of the revised draft, substantive changes had been made in paragraphs 4 and 5. In particular, paragraph 5 no longer invited the International Law Commission to begin a study of the question of the status of the diplomatic courier but rather requested the Secretary-General to submit a report on the comments and observations of Member States on that subject in accordance with the invitation extended to Member States in paragraph 4 of the revised draft resolution. The changes introduced in paragraphs 4 and 5 represented an attempt by the sponsors to accommodate the views expressed by certain delegations to the effect that it would be premature at the current stage to entrust the International Law Commission with the task of studying the question of the status of the diplomatic courier. Before taking such a step, it had been thought advisable to request the views of Member States on the matter. He hoped that the changes had made the draft more generally acceptable and that it would be adopted by consensus.

46. The CHAIRMAN thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for their efforts to accommodate the observations made by other delegations and the spirit of goodwill they had demonstrated.

47. Mr. FIFOOT (United Kingdom) thanked the USSR representative and the other sponsors of the revised draft resolution for the understanding they had shown in introducing the changes which removed the difficulties his delegation had expressed in regard to it at the preceding meeting.

48. Mr. ABUL-KHEIR (Egypt) observed that there were several translation errors in the Arabic text of the revised draft resolution, particularly in operative paragraph 5.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that the Translation Division would make the necessary corrections.

50. Mr. JEANNEL (France) joined the United Kingdom representative in expressing appreciation to the sponsors of the draft resolution for the changes they had made in the draft, which was now entirely acceptable to his delegation. Like the Arabic text, the French translation of the revised draft contained several translation errors to which his delegation drew attention.

51. The CHAIRMAN said that the translations of the revised draft resolution, which had been produced under

³ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 500, No. 7310, p. 95.

considerable time pressure, would be brought into conformity with each other.

52. Mr. KRISPIS (Greece) recalled that his delegation had objected to certain points in the original version of the draft resolution but was completely satisfied with the revised version and hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

53. After a brief drafting discussion in which Mr. JEANNEL (France), Mr. FIFOOT (United Kingdom), Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. VANDERPUYE (Ghana), Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) and Mr. FRANCIS (Jamaica) took part, it was agreed that the English text of the revised draft resolution was substantially accurate.

54. Mr. GODOY (Paraguay), referring to the Spanish text of the revised draft resolution said that it would be more correct to use the word "*Reafirma*" in operative paragraph 1 instead of "*Confirma*".

55. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.6/L.1031/Rev.1 without a vote, on the understanding that the English and Russian texts were correct and the other language versions would be brought into line with them.

It was so decided.

56. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) expressed appreciation for the spirit of co-operation displayed by the sponsors of the revised draft resolution in making the changes requested by several delegations. The present version enabled his delegation to retain its view that the text of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, and in particular article 27 thereof, should not be changed. His delegation endorsed the appeal to States which had not yet done so to become parties to the Convention.

57. Mr. SIBLESZ (Netherlands) said that his delegation had been able to join in the adoption of the revised draft resolution by consensus, although it had certain reservations with regard to the advisability of studying the question of the diplomatic courier. His delegation was not convinced that the alleged instances of violations of the provisions of the Vienna Convention should be considered as a separate agenda item. In connexion with operative paragraph 3 of the revised draft resolution, his delegation was happy to announce that the Netherlands Government would shortly present a bill to Parliament which would enable his country to ratify the Vienna Convention.

AGENDA ITEM 118

Resolutions adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Representation of States in Their Relations with International Organizations:

- (a) Resolution relating to the observer status of national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and/or by the League of Arab States;
- (b) Resolution relating to the application of the convention in future activities of international organizations (A/10141)

58. The CHAIRMAN said that, having held consultations on the matter with many interested delegations, he believed there was a general consensus that for lack of time consideration of agenda item 118 should be deferred until the thirty-first session of the General Assembly. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the item.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

1582nd meeting

Friday, 5 December 1975, at 11.05 a.m.

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

A/C.6/SR.1582

AGENDA ITEMS 113 AND 29

Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Charter of the United Nations (concluded)* (A/10033, A/10102, A/10108, A/10113 and Corr.1 and Add.1-3, A/C.6/437, A/C.6/L.1028, A/C.6/L.1030)

Strengthening of the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, the development of co-operation among all nations and the promotion of the rules of international law in relations between States: reports of the Secretary-General (concluded)* (A/10218, A/10219, A/10255, A/10289, A/C.6/437, A/C.6/L.1028, A/C.6/L.1030)

* Resumed from the 1578th meeting.

1. Mrs. LOPEZ (Philippines), referring to document A/C.6/L.1030 setting out the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.6/L.1028, which the Committee had adopted by consensus said that her delegation understood that the members of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization were holding consultations on alternative dates on which that Committee could meet. The members of the Special Committee considered February 1976 too early and the great majority preferred that the meetings should be held at a later date, even if they were not held at Headquarters. Her delegation asked the Secretariat to inform the Committee of other possible dates for the meeting of the Special Committee, which she hoped could be approved by consensus. She also asked the Chairman to appeal to the chairmen of the regional groups