

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

UN LIBRARY

JUN 19 1985

1939th MEETING: 9 JULY 1976

UN/SECURITY COUNCIL

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1939) | 1 |
| Expression of thanks to the retiring President | 1 |
| Tribute to the memory of Mr. Chou-teh, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China | 1 |
| Adoption of the agenda | 1 |
| Complaint by the Prime Minister of Mauritius, current Chairman of the Orga- nization of African Unity, of the "act of aggression" by Israel against the Republic of Uganda: | |
| (a) Letter dated 6 July 1976 from the Assistant Executive Secretary of the Organization of African Unity to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12126); | |
| (b) Letter dated 6 July 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritania to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12128); | |
| (c) Letter dated 4 July 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/12123); | |
| (d) Letter dated 5 July 1976 from the Chargé d'Affaires <i>a.i.</i> of the Permanent Mission of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12124) | 2 |

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.

1939th MEETING

Held in New York, on Friday, 9 July 1976, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Piero VINCI (Italy).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Benin, China, France, Guyana, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1939)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Complaint by the Prime Minister of Mauritius, current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, of the "act of aggression" by Israel against the Republic of Uganda:
 - (a) Letter dated 6 July 1976 from the Assistant Executive Secretary of the Organization of African Unity to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12126);
 - (b) Letter dated 6 July 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritania to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12128);
 - (c) Letter dated 4 July 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/12123);
 - (d) Letter dated 5 July 1976 from the Chargé d'Affaires *a.i.* of the Permanent Mission of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12124)

The meeting was called to order at 5.55 p.m.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT: My first words, as President of the Council, are addressed to my predecessor in this chair, Mr. Frederick R. Wills, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guyana, and to his compatriot and our colleague here, Ambassador Rashleigh E. Jackson. On behalf of all the members of the Council, as well as on my own behalf, I wish to express our admiration and gratitude for the dedication and skill with which they presided over the 15 formal meetings and numerous consultations held during their tenure of office. The Security Council was faced with a number of delicate and complex issues, and thanks to the wisdom, patience, great impartiality and admirable

sense of fair play with which our presiding officers so efficiently guided the proceedings, none of those issues, I am pleased to note, has been handed over uncompleted to the President for July. Accordingly, I can speak for all my colleagues in voicing our appreciation for the work carried out by the delegation of Guyana last month.

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Chou-teh, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to convey to the delegation of China, on behalf of the Council, the most sincere condolences upon the demise of Mr. Chou-teh, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China, who was an outstanding political personality closely associated with the history of China and who devoted his whole life to his country.

Adoption of the agenda

3. The PRESIDENT: The provisional agenda for this afternoon's meeting of the Council is contained in document S/Agenda/1939. I understand that the representative of the Soviet Union would like to make a short statement in this connexion. I give him the floor.
4. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, before the agenda is adopted, I should like to make sure our understanding of the question is clear as formulated in the text before us. We believe, and our understanding is, that the words in inverted commas, "act of aggression", are taken from the telegram from the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, the Prime Minister of Mauritius which refers to "this unprecedented aggression against Uganda by Israel" [S/12126, *annex*]. I should like this to be borne in mind.
5. The PRESIDENT: The statement of the representative of the Soviet Union has been recorded.
6. If I hear no objection, I shall consider the agenda contained in the document I just mentioned adopted.

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by the Prime Minister of Mauritius, current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, of the "act of aggression" by Israel against the Republic of Uganda:

- (a) Letter dated 6 July 1976 from the Assistant Executive Secretary of the Organization of African Unity to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12126);
- (b) Letter dated 6 July 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritania to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12128);
- (c) Letter dated 4 July 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary General (S/12123);
- (d) Letter dated 5 July 1976 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12124).

7. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of the Council to certain documents in addition to the documents listed on the agenda which are relevant to the item before the Council. They are the following: letter dated 7 July from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Kenya [S/12131]; note verbale dated 8 July from the Permanent Mission of Algeria, transmitting a message addressed to the Secretary-General by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria [S/12132]; letter of 9 July from the representative of the United States, transmitting the text of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970¹ [S/12134]; letter dated 8 July from the representative of Somalia [S/12136]; letter dated 9 July from the representative of Mexico [S/12135].

8. I should now like to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters requesting invitations to participate in the discussion from the following Member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Israel, Kenya, Mauritania, Mauritius, Qatar, Uganda and the United Republic of Cameroon. In accordance with the provisions of Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, I propose that the Council, in accordance with the usual practice, should invite the representatives of those States to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

9. In view of the limited number of seats available at the Council table, I invite the representatives of Israel, Mauritius and Uganda to take seats at the Council table, and the other representatives to take the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is their turn to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Herzog (Israel), Sir Harold Walter (Mauritius) and Mr. Abdulla (Uganda) took places at the Council table and

Mr. von Wechmar (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Camara (Guinea), Mr. Waiyaki (Kenya), Mr. El Hassen (Mauritania), Mr. Jamal (Qatar) and Mr. Oyono (United Republic of Cameroon) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

10. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Secretary-General, who has asked to make a short statement.

11. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Mr. President, I should like to join you in paying a tribute to the memory of Mr. Chou-teh, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China. I sent a message of sympathy of his passing to the Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China as soon as I received the sad news. His devoted and outstanding leadership will long be remembered, not only in his own country but throughout the world. I should like to take this opportunity to convey once again to Ambassador Lai Ya-li and to the members of the Permanent Mission of China my most sincere condolences.

12. I thank the Council for allowing me to speak at the very outset of this important debate. As the members of the Council are no doubt aware, I issued a public statement on 8 July, immediately after my return from Africa, in which I gave a detailed account of the role I had played in efforts to secure the release of the hostages at Entebbe. I also included an account of the statements I had made on this incident during my trip back from Africa to New York.

13. Of course, the case now before the Council raises a number of complex issues because, in this instance, the response of one State to the results of an act of hijacking involved an action affecting another sovereign State. Indeed, in reply to a specific question, I said: "I haven't got all the details, but it seems to be clear that Israeli aircraft have landed in Entebbe and this constitutes a serious violation of the sovereignty of a Member State of the United Nations." Given the responsibilities which I have as Secretary-General of the Organization, I consider that it is my obligation to uphold the principle of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of every State.

14. However, I am fully aware that this is not the only element involved in considering cases of the kind which the Council is discussing today. This is particularly true when the world community is now required to deal with unprecedented problems arising from acts of international terrorism, which I have consistently condemned and which raise many issues of a humanitarian, moral, legal and political character for which, at the present time, no commonly agreed rules or solutions exist.

15. With regard to the respective positions which will, no doubt, be put before the Council, it is, of course, for the Council to make its own determination on the merits of the case.

16. Let me conclude by expressing the hope that, despite the strong views which will undoubtedly be expressed in the debate, the Council will find a way to point the world community in a constructive direction so that we may be spared a repetition of the human tragedies of the past and the type of conflict between States which the Council will now be considering.

17. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Chairman Chou-teh, a member of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of China and Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China, passed away on 6 July in Peking. Chairman Chou-teh was a great revolutionary fighter and proletarian revolutionary of the Chinese people and one of the outstanding leaders of our Party, our country and the army. His death is a great loss to the Chinese people.

18. At the present meeting, the President of the Council and the Secretary-General have extended to the Chinese delegation their condolences on the passing away of Chairman Chou-teh. In the name of the Chinese delegation, I should like to take this opportunity to express our heartfelt thanks to them, and we shall convey their cordial sentiments to the Chinese Government and people, and to the bereaved family.

19. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Uganda, Lieutenant-Colonel Juma Oris Abdalla, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda, on whom I now call.

20. Mr. ABDALLA (Uganda): The Ugandan delegation wishes to express its thanks to the members of the Organization of African Unity for requesting the convening of the Security Council to consider the aggression of Zionist Israel against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Uganda. My delegation would like also to thank you, Mr. President, as well as all the other members of the Council, for agreeing to convene this meeting.

21. At about 4 o'clock local time, 0100 hours GMT, on 28 June, His Excellency Al-Hajji Field-Marshal Dr. Idi Amin Dada, Life President of the Republic of Uganda, was informed by a telephone call from Entebbe Air Control that a hijacked French plane with 250 persons on board was circling over Entebbe, having only 15 minutes' fuel left, and was seeking permission to land. President Amin was placed in a dilemma: whether to refuse permission for the aircraft to land, thereby risking every likelihood of crashing and killing all those aboard, or to allow it to land safely at Entebbe and face the consequences of a hijack situation.

22. Taking those facts into account, and motivated by humanitarian considerations, the President directed that the aircraft be allowed to land safely at

Entebbe airport. A contingent of security forces was positioned to guard against any possible danger. To avoid interference with the normal air traffic and also to enable the Ugandan authorities to ascertain the character and nature of the hijackers, the plane was directed to taxi to the old airport, which is about one mile away.

23. It took several hours before the initial contact with those in charge of the aircraft was made. After the initial contact the Ugandan authorities learned that the hijackers of the aircraft were members of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) and that they had with them over 250 hostages on board of different nationalities and different age groups. The hijackers stated that they did not want anybody to go near the aircraft and that, whatever security arrangements the Ugandan authorities intended to make, the security officers concerned should not go within a radius of 50 metres of the aircraft. After further communication with the hijackers, the President of Uganda was able to convince them to allow the hostages to be supplied with refreshments. At that point the hijackers informed the Ugandan authorities that they were waiting for further instructions from their leaders and to that end they wanted the fact of their being at Entebbe to be publicized. It was also at this point that they issued a long statement of the general policy of the PFLP, demanding that it be given as wide publicity as possible. Being anxious to co-operate for the sake of the hostages, the Ugandan Government agreed that the statement would be repeatedly broadcast by the Uganda Broadcasting Corporation and publicized in the local press so as to keep the hijackers appeased.

24. Initially the Ugandan authorities' intention was to offer the hijackers fuel and food supplies and request them to proceed elsewhere. They were extremely reluctant, and refused to proceed anywhere until they had made contacts with their leaders and made their motives for the hijacking known. This situation continued for most of that day, during which very tricky and delicate negotiations were being conducted by President Amin personally, resulting in the hijackers agreeing that the hostages would be allowed out of the aircraft and securely transferred to the old airport building. That process was a very delicate one, carried out at a time when the hijackers had become highly irritable and very suspicious of any possible disarming action by Ugandan authorities. It involved the aircraft being moved as near as possible to the old airport transit launch. For this process, the hijackers demanded that they first inspect the transit launch and the entire building to ensure their own security and that of their hostages. Some of them accordingly went ahead of the aircraft, placed explosives in strategic positions and demanded the withdrawal of the Ugandan security forces to a position 200 metres away from the aircraft terminal buildings.

25. At this point it is relevant to mention that, in addition to having high explosives which included

hand grenades, the hijackers also had automatic weapons. As Uganda has clearly stated in various communiqués on the hijacking, the Ugandan armed forces were not allowed by the hijackers to go near the airport building. That was part of the bargain. However, once the hostages and hijackers were in the airport building, after further bargaining, many facilities were made available to the hostages, such as medical and food supplies and other welfare maintenance, which were administered by the few civilians while negotiations continued with the hijackers.

26. Most of 29 June was spent in finding out the modalities of concrete negotiations while waiting to learn the wishes of the hijackers. By the end of the day, the hijackers proposed that the Somali Ambassador to Uganda, in his capacity as the dean of the League of Arab States, should be their spokesman. Also during the course of the day, the hijackers circulated a questionnaire to the hostages seeking information about their nationalities, professions and ages. The demands of the hijackers had not yet been made known by the end of that day. Also during that day, the hijackers accepted the Ugandan authorities' request that, in addition to food supplies, a medical team consisting of one doctor and several nursing staff be made available to hostages in need of medical attention.

27. On 30 June, following the report by the medical team and President Amin's persistent appeals, the hijackers agreed to release 47 hostages including the old, the sick and some children. It was on the same day that for the first time the hijackers issued their demand. This was for the release of certain persons imprisoned in Israel, West Germany, France, Switzerland and Kenya, totalling in all 53. The demand was given to the Somali Ambassador as well as to the Ugandan authorities. The Ugandan authorities in turn passed it on to the French Ambassador. On that occasion also, the hijackers set a new deadline of 2 p.m. local time, 1100 hours GMT, on 1 July, by which time all the persons whose release they had requested should be transported to Entebbe for an exchange of hostages.

28. On 1 July, which was the first deadline the hijackers had set for the release of the 53 persons who were allegedly held by the aforementioned five Governments, President Amin was not only able to persuade the hijackers to extend the deadline to 4 July, but also continued to plead for the release of the remaining hostages. The response received from the hijackers was the release of 100 hostages belonging to nations other than Israel or having dual nationalities, and the extension of the deadline to 1100 hours GMT on 4 July for the hijackers to secure their demands. Up to this point, as can be seen, President Amin had personally played a very vital part in talking the hijackers into agreeing to the release of their hostages. He had spent virtually the whole time without any sleep. In appreciation of his efforts, for example, he

received a number of messages from world leaders, such as the President of France, who, in two messages within two days, expressed his deep appreciation for the strenuous efforts President Amin was exerting to have the hostages released, and urged him to continue so that all the hostages could be released.

29. On 2 July, President Amin had to go to Mauritius, where he was to open the thirteenth session of the Organization of African Unity's Assembly of Heads of State and Government, and also to hand over the chairmanship of the Organization to the new chairman. While in Mauritius, President Amin took the opportunity fully to brief his colleagues on his efforts to have the hostages released. In his statement to his colleagues, President Amin included an appeal to all the Governments concerned to do everything possible to save the lives of the remaining hostages. He also took the occasion to brief the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, fully on the matter, urging him also to use his good offices to impress upon the Governments concerned the gravity and urgency of the matter.

30. Because of the delicate situation back home, President Amin had to cut short his stay in Mauritius to return home early on the evening of 3 July. Immediately on his return, the President quickly re-established contact with all those concerned, including the hostages, whom he personally addressed in the presence of the Somali Ambassador, now for the third time, reassuring them of his untiring efforts to secure their release. Specifically, President Amin took the occasion to thank the hostages for the message of appreciation which they had issued earlier in the day for the efforts he was making on their behalf.

31. Hardly had President Amin settled down when Israel's invading force landed at Entebbe. As you were informed, Mr. President, in a message sent to you by my President on 4 July [S/12124, annex], at 2120 hours GMT, three Zionist Israeli transport planes landed by surprise and without any authority from the Ugandan Government at Entebbe International Airport. Soon after landing, they proceeded straight to the old airport building where the hostages and the crew of the French airbus, which was hijacked in flight between Tel Aviv and Paris, were being held by Palestinian commandos. Out of the aircraft, two military jeeps drove and the invaders, using hand grenades, machine-guns, bazookas and other explosives, indiscriminately attacked the airport building and the Ugandan soldiers who were guarding the building at a distance of 200 metres and who were armed only with light arms in accordance with the conditions laid down by the hijackers. As a result of this attack on the building, the invaders killed seven hijackers and some hostages and a number of Ugandan soldiers, injuring many others as well. The Israeli invaders also blasted the old airport terminal building, damaged the runway and destroyed a number of Ugandan aircraft and extensive installations.

32. I should like to draw the attention of the Council to some aspects of the Israeli invasion that clearly indicate that Israel did not mount the invasion without the knowledge, collaboration and assistance of a few other countries. Africa should not allow any part of its soil to be used by the Zionist Israelis and their imperialist masters or collaborators to attack another sister country.

33. According to the information available to us, which information has been confirmed by the international press, Zionist Israel's plan to invade Entebbe was decided upon in Tel Aviv on 1 July. That is the very day President Amin had convinced the hijackers to extend the deadline for their demands and has also succeeded in getting the hijackers to release more of the hostages. The Ugandan delegation has further knowledge that the Israeli plan to invade Entebbe must have been conceived as far back as when the hijacked plane touched down in Uganda. It is of interest to note, for example, that on the very night of the invasion, exactly one hour and forty minutes after the Israeli force landed at Entebbe, the Voice of America was broadcasting the success of the mission. This was in its broadcast of 2 a.m. local time, 2300 hours GMT. All the British Sunday papers that normally are published by midnight of Saturday had, in great detail, the story of the so-called successful operation at Entebbe. *The Sunday Express*, for example, in its edition of 2.30 a.m. of that same day, gleefully reported that

"An Israeli commando force today rescued all hostages held by pro-Palestinian guerrillas at Entebbe Airport, Uganda, an Israeli spokesman said in Tel Aviv early today. The Air France crew was also freed, the spokesman said. Explosions rocked Entebbe Airport after three Israeli aircraft swooped down."

34. I should like to make it clear that Uganda has never condoned and never will condone international piracy. It is not therefore true to say, as has been alleged by the ruling circles in Israel, that Uganda collaborated with the hijackers. The Ugandan Government got involved in this affair accidentally and purely for humanitarian reasons. Perhaps the crew of the French airbus will be in a better position to tell us how the hijacking ended in Uganda. According to what we know from press reports, the French airbus belonging to Air France, flight 139, started from Tel Aviv *en route* for Paris via Athens. It was after it took off from Athens that the hijackers took over and forced the aircraft to land in Benghazi, from where it took off after refuelling. Its request to land at Khartoum was refused and, possibly, that is why it ended up at Entebbe with only a fifteen-minute supply of fuel. It can be deduced from this story that the hijackers wanted to go to Khartoum.

35. Uganda gave all the help and hospitality it was capable of giving to all the hostages. The response to

this humanitarian gesture by Zionist Israel—the vehicle of imperialism—was to invade Uganda, once again living up to its record of barbarism and banditry. By this act of naked aggression against Uganda, the Zionists killed Ugandans who were trying to protect the hostages and inflicted great damage on Ugandan property.

36. Is this a worthy Member of the Organization? Uganda has made its view on Israel's membership in the United Nations repeatedly clear in many international forums, the last of which was the address to the thirtieth session of the General Assembly by President Amin.²

37. We call upon the Council unreservedly to condemn in the strongest possible terms Israel's barbaric, unprovoked and unwarranted aggression against the sovereign Republic of Uganda. Uganda demands full compensation from Israel for the damage to life and property caused during its invasion. Our authorities are in the process of working out the particulars of the claim arising out of the damage.

38. I can only hope that no other African State can in any way be tainted with suspicion in this sordid affair, for this would mean that no one on the whole continent could trust or support the ideal of African unity. This unity has been forged through the sweat, brains and blood of all our African brothers. Let not today be, even in doubt, a day of suspicion.

39. I wish, on behalf of President Amin, the Government and all the people of Uganda, to end my delegation's submission by expressing our thanks to all those countries and organizations, especially the Organization of African Unity, that have since the unwarranted aggression against the innocent people of Uganda sent messages of sympathy, solidarity and support, which we very much appreciate.

40. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Mauritania. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

41. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I am speaking in this debate on behalf of the Group of African States in the United Nations. I should like to begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council and by saying how pleased we are in our Group to see a man of your competence and experience presiding over the work of the Council in such difficult and tragic circumstances. I should also like to thank you and the other members of the Council for having been kind enough to convene this meeting of the Council on the request of the Organization of African Unity and on the request of the African Group.

42. Before going into the substance of the matter, I wish to address our condolences to the delegation of the People's Republic of China on the death of

Chairman Chou-teh, who was well known throughout the world and who certainly played an important historic role in the liberty of peoples and in their emancipation. We hope that the Chinese delegation here will find this an expression of our deepest condolences.

43. The date of 4 July 1976 is of course an important date in the history of the United States; it was quite rightly a joyful occasion for the great American people. But for the people and Government of Uganda, and indeed for Africa as a whole, 4 July 1976 was a date of mourning and alarm—mourning and alarm not because of the loss of any given person, not because of a natural disaster, but because of the flagrant violation committed by Israel against the Republic of Uganda, whose Government had spared no effort to save innocent persons from almost certain doom. On 4 July 1976 several units of the Israeli Army, deceiving international public opinion and abusing the good faith of the countries of transit, as well as the good faith of the Government of Uganda itself, landed at Entebbe airport to sow death and destruction. Several Ugandan civilians and soldiers were killed without any reason or justification whatever. Considerable material damage was done to the Government and people of Uganda. This act of aggression and its human and material consequences are familiar to the Council; they have been made known to you, Mr. President, and to the members of the Council by the President of the Republic of Uganda [S/12124] and in the clear statement just made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda. I therefore do not need to repeat the details.

44. The pretext invoked by the Tel Aviv authorities for undertaking this adventure was to free Israeli citizens being held hostage by so-called Palestinians or pro-Palestinians. But everyone knows what efforts were being made not only by various Governments and by the Secretary-General but also by the Government of Uganda itself, to find a solution to a problem for which Uganda was in no way responsible. Everyone knows also that this action of the so-called Palestinians or pro-Palestinians had been disapproved of by everyone, and particularly by the Arab countries. Everyone is aware, furthermore, of the attitude adopted in this respect by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), to which these persons were supposed to belong.

45. But the Israeli Government, defying the international community, deceiving international public opinion, preferred to take the law into its own hands. There is nothing so surprising about the fact that that Government had decided to do everything it could to free innocent persons. But that it should have gone so far in its action as to attack a small country that had done and was doing everything it could to prevent a tragedy—the kind of tragedy that is, alas, occurring only too frequently these days—demonstrates an attitude which I believe no country of good faith can

tolerate. The consequences of the outrage committed by the Tel Aviv authorities against the Republic of Uganda are sufficiently serious to warrant Israel's condemnation by this Council.

46. But these consequences, however serious they may be, are not the only reason for the alarm expressed by the African Heads of State at the last summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity. It is the seriousness of the act itself, and particularly the dangerous precedent it constitutes, that prompted the most highly placed African leaders to condemn Israel and call for the convening of this meeting of the Security Council so that a similar position could be adopted by the Council.

47. No country, and certainly no African country, can henceforth be secure against such acts, on which the Israeli Government seems to wish to confer the status of State practice. By committing the act with which we are dealing, Israel violated the sovereignty and independence of a State Member of the United Nations and member of the Organization of African Unity. That is aggression within the meaning of article 1 of the Definition of Aggression in the annex to General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), which provides:

“Aggression is the use of armed force by a State against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of another State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations.”

Now, it is clear that Israel used force against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Uganda. It is clear also that this act of aggression is incompatible with Article 2 of the Charter, and particularly paragraph 4 of that Article.

48. I think that the facts are clear. International law has been flouted and it is the duty of the Council to ensure that all the Members of the Organization enjoy the rights guaranteed to them by the Charter.

49. The adventure launched by the Tel Aviv authorities is represented to us today as being an exceptional political and military act, and consequently something worthy of praise. However, if we take the trouble to look beyond the technical aspect of this adventure, it is easy to see that it is the work of people who are almost reckless and that it really belongs to the world of childhood. Not only could this adventure have ended in catastrophe for all those whom the Israelis wanted to rescue from captivity, but we are convinced that in future it will make even more difficult any peaceful solution to similar tragedies. It is clear, indeed, that those who, regrettably, go in for the hijacking of aircraft and the taking of hostages will draw a conclusion which can in no way be to the advantage of innocent people. Henceforth, this is nothing to prevent the hijackers of aircraft from carrying out their threats,

knowing the risk and the danger of death which will be involved, in any case, in negotiations undertaken with them. The result of the Israeli adventure cannot, therefore, be to the benefit of innocent people who may, unfortunately, one day find themselves taken hostage by individuals who are often irresponsible, having everything to gain and nothing to lose.

50. It is worth considering, too, what would be the attitude of a given country if, for humanitarian reasons, it were to agree to accept a hijacked aircraft in order to save innocent people from death, and for that reason fell victim to the same kind of Israeli aggression. Let us suppose for a moment—and this could easily have happened, as it may well happen in the future—that the Air France airbus that was hijacked had gone, not to Uganda, but to the United States, France, Belgium or the United Kingdom, for example. Would those countries have simply folded their arms when confronted not only by the violation of their sovereignty but also by the death of their fellow citizens, civilian and military? We believe that the answer to that question can only be in the negative and that the press of those countries would have been unanimous in blaming the Israelis for the aggression. But since we are dealing here with a third-world country, an African country, there is a rush to claim victory, to lavish praise and even to extend congratulations, flying in the face of logic and common sense. It seems, indeed, that there is applause for the introduction of the law of the jungle into international relations. There seems to be some delight at the prospect of seeing anarchy and mayhem erected as a system in the relations between States.

51. Aerial hijacking and certain forms of violence do exist. It is an undeniable fact. Even if in certain cases they reflect the despair of those who have been driven from their homes, of those who have had their dignity trodden down, and those who have been deprived of the most elementary human rights, no one can possibly approve the form, much less the consequences, of such violence. This is a form of violence which is unforeseeable because it is the work of persons or individuals who are difficult to control. The international community has every right to be concerned about this form of violence, and is seeking to eliminate its causes so as to remove the reasons for it.

52. But the violence indulged in, unfortunately, by certain uncontrollable individuals becomes an outrage when it is built into a system by a Government which not only publicly assumes responsibility for it but even bases national pride on it. The act committed by the Tel Aviv authorities against the Republic of Uganda is a new form of violence infinitely more dangerous because it is the work of an organized authority which, moreover, is a Member of this Organization. Israel wants to introduce the law of the jungle into international relations—and it may well succeed if you, the members of the Council, do not demon-

strate to Israel, clearly and unequivocally, your disapproval.

53. In conclusion, it seems to me that it is the duty of the Council to ensure that international law is respected, and to guarantee the rights recognized by the Charter to all Members of the Organization, particularly the weak ones, whose only defence reposes in their legitimate rights and their voice in the Organization. The Republic of Uganda has been the victim of aggression; its sovereignty and independence have been violated. Uganda, like the whole of Africa, expects from you, the members of the Council, an unequivocal condemnation of this violation of Uganda's sovereignty; it expects you to demand for it just and equitable compensation for the material damage inflicted. If, unfortunately, the Council does not measure up to this responsibility, the very *raison d'être* of the Organization will be threatened.

54. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

55. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): Mr. President, at the outset may I extend to you my delegation's best wishes on your assumption of the presidency of the Council, and express my highest regard for your wide-ranging experience and personal qualities, which will stand you in good stead in the deliberations of the Council. It is particularly appropriate that a son of Rome should be presiding on this occasion—Rome, in which the principle *civis romanus sum* was enunciated—the principle cited on the occasion when a State's duty to defend its nationals abroad was proclaimed.

56. From a purely formal point of view, this meeting arises from a complaint brought against the Government of Israel. However, let me make it quite clear that sitting here as the representative of the Government of Israel, as I have the honour to do, I am in no way sitting in the dock as the accused party. On the contrary, I stand here as an accuser on behalf of the free and decent people in this world.

57. I stand here as an accuser of the forces of evil that have unleashed a wave of piracy and terrorism which threatens the very foundations of human society.

58. I stand here as an accuser of all those evil forces which in their inherent cowardice and abject craven attitude see blameless wayfarers and innocent women and children—yes, even babes in arms—as a legitimate target for their evil intentions.

59. I stand here as an accuser of the countries that, because of evil design or lack of moral backbone, have collaborated with these bloodthirsty terrorists.

60. I stand here as an accuser of all those in authority throughout the world who for reasons of cynical expediency have collaborated with terrorism.

61. I stand here as an accuser of this world Organization, the United Nations, which has been unable, because of the machinations of the Arab representatives and their supporters, to co-ordinate effective measures in order to combat the evil of world terrorism.

62. I stand here as an accuser of those delegations which for reasons of political expediency have remained silent on this issue—an issue which is bound to affect every country in this Organization. In so doing they have themselves become accomplices.

63. Seated in the dock today with the accusing finger of enlightened world opinion directed against them are the terrorist organizations which are plaguing this world, and whose representatives have in the past been seated here by the world body with rights equal to those of Member States. In the dock are all those countries which have collaborated with the terrorists and which have aided and abetted them. There stand here accused those countries which have blocked every international move to deal with this plague of terror which besets the world.

64. In the dock before us stand all those countries—they are all too numerous—that cry to the high heavens when they are affected by terrorists, that fulminate in the Council when their citizens or diplomats are threatened, and that remain silent when the same thing happens to citizens of other countries. Some of them do not even have the doubtful grace to remain silent; they have the wicked effrontery to join in condemnation of a country which tries to prevent these acts.

65. In the dock before us stand the representatives of all those countries which stood and applauded the entry into the hall of the General Assembly of a gun-toting terrorist who, according to the President of Sudan, personally gave the order to execute the American and Belgian diplomats bound hand and foot in the basement of the Saudi Arabian Embassy in Khartoum on 1 March 1973.

66. Yes, before us stands accused this rotten, corrupt, brutal, cynical, bloodthirsty monster of international terrorism and all those who support it in one way or the other, whether by commission or omission. Facing them today are the ordinary decent human beings throughout the world who seek nothing more than to live a life free from terror and from intimidation, free from the threats of hijackers, the indiscriminate bombs of terrorists and the blackmail of criminals and murderers.

67. Israel's action at Entebbe in order to release its hostages has given rise to a world-wide wave of support and approval, such as has rarely been seen from every continent, including Africa; from every walk of life; from countries hostile, as well as friendly, to Israel. The ordinary man and woman in the street

have risen behind us and proclaimed "enough" to this spectre of terror, have cried out "enough" to this world body of pontificating diplomats in which on so many occasions moral cowardice and cynical expediency have combined to drag it down to the depths to which it has plunged.

68. In more ways than one, this Organization is in the dock today. Mankind will judge it by its behaviour on this occasion, because never has the issue been clearer, never has the issue been so clear-cut. There will be no excuse in history for this body, or for the constituent Members of this body, if it fails to condemn terrorism. The issue before this body is not what Israel did at Entebbe Airport: the issue before this body is its own future in the eyes of history.

69. The representative of Uganda has very conveniently avoided the main issue before us. Let me recount the events as they occurred.

70. On Sunday, 27 June, an Air France airbus, flight 139, *en route* from Tel Aviv to Paris, was hijacked by a group of PLO terrorists with 256 innocent passengers aboard in addition to a crew of 12. The terrorists took advantage of the lax security measures obtaining at Athens airport and brought on board pistols and approximately 20 grenades.

71. Thus began a methodically planned and carefully executed act of air piracy by the PFLP, one of the several terrorist groups joined together to form the PLO. Thus began another in a long list of PLO crimes against innocent civilians.

72. Having commandeered the aircraft, the hijackers forced the French pilot to land in what is by now internationally accepted as the first haven for such criminals, namely, Libya. This was, it will be recalled, the first stop in the flight of the ministers of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries kidnapped in Austria last year. The Council will recall that the hijackers, holding at pistol point the ministers of the member countries of that organization, of which Libya is a member, were greeted effusively by Prime Minister Jalloud of Libya, who embraced the criminals—who at that time were holding his Arab ministerial colleagues as hostages and who had only the day before killed a member of the Libyan delegation in Vienna. On the occasion which we are now discussing, last week the Prime Minister did not greet the terrorists. He was doubtless preoccupied with preparations for a Libyan sponsored *coup d'état* in Sudan, judging by the complaint submitted to the Council by my Sudanese colleague [S/12122]. All this in addition to his preoccupations with bringing in so-called Libyan peace-keeping forces to Beirut in order to fan the flames of hatred, to enlarge the scope of murder, and to increase the peril for the Christian population in Lebanon.

73. Having mentioned Libya, I think it is appropriate to draw attention to the central role which this country

plays in the promotion and encouragement of international terror in the world today.

74. This is the country which has for years acted as paymaster of international terror movements, Arab and non-Arab, throughout the world.

75. This is the country which has been condemned by Sudan and Tunisia only recently for its acts of terror and for the sinister and dangerous part it has played in planning to assassinate the leaders of these States and to overthrow their Governments.

76. This is the country whose ambassador was expelled but a few days ago by the Government of Egypt for its subversive activities.

77. It is, I submit, a disgrace to this world Organization that the representative of this world sponsor of terrorism is seated as a member of the Security Council, the purpose of which is to encourage the maintenance of international peace and security.

78. To return to our story, the Air France plane was refuelled in Benghazi. The destination of the hijackers was, in accordance with a previously prepared plan, Entebbe Airport, outside Kampala in Uganda. The airbus landed at Entebbe Airport on Monday, 28 June, and the hijackers were met by a reinforcement of terrorists, who awaited them at the terminal armed to the teeth with sub-machine guns and explosives. President Idi Amin of Uganda arrived at the airport shortly before the hijacked plane landed and embraced the hijackers in a gesture of welcome and with a promise of support and assistance. Ugandan soldiers were then positioned with their guns trained, not on the hijackers, but on the innocent civilians—men, women and children.

79. On Tuesday, 29 June, the hijackers spelt out their demands. These included the release of 53 terrorists gaoled in Israel, West Germany, France, Switzerland and Kenya by a deadline of 3 p.m., local time, on Thursday, 1 July. They threatened to put the innocent passengers to death if their terms were not met.

80. When the hijackers released 47 women and children and some other passengers on Wednesday, 30 June, it gradually became apparent that President Amin was in fact co-operating with the terrorists under a cloak of deception and false pretence. This was the situation on the evening of 1 July, the first deadline set by the terrorists. It became obvious that the Israeli passengers—men, women and children—were in serious and grave danger of their lives.

81. When the hijackers released a further 100 hostages, their story, when they arrived in Paris, revealed an ominous development. They described to the waiting reporters how Ugandan soldiers, under the direct orders of President Amin, supervised the

separation of Jewish passengers from non-Jewish passengers. This was a development of a nature so sinister and so pregnant with memories of the past that no member of the Jewish people, whether in Israel or abroad, could fail to recall its horrible significance. There flashed immediately upon the inward eye of every member of our people the memory of the terrifying selections carried out during the most horrifying holocaust that mankind has ever seen and which beset our people. We recalled the selections carried out by the Nazis in the concentration camps as members of the Jewish people were singled out for the gas chambers and extermination.

82. Following the never-to-be forgotten experience of the holocaust in Europe during the Second World War, an oath was taken—whether consciously or unconsciously—by every member of the Jewish people, wherever he or she might have been, that never again would this happen; that never again would circumstances be allowed to develop in which such a catastrophe could happen; that Auschwitz, Dachau and Buchenwald belonged to the past and would never again return. On this occasion, I solemnly reaffirm before this body the oath which has been taken by our Jewish people, wherever they may be. It will never happen again.

83. And so, when this ominously reminiscent selection began, when the separation of the Jews was undertaken, it became apparent to the Government of Israel that there was no alternative but to conduct a rescue operation to save the lives of its citizens. The Government of Israel's apprehension was heightened by a knowledge of President Amin's attitude towards the Jewish people. In September 1972, President Amin sent a cable, which was published on 13 September, to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, with copies to the Prime Minister of Israel and to the leader of the PLO, Yasser Arafat. In this cable, President Amin applauded the murder of the Israeli sportsmen at the Olympic Games in Munich who, bound hand and foot, were gunned down by the PLO. Moreover, in the same message, he had the obscene ghouliness to praise Hitler for his role in destroying over 6 million Jews.

84. The members of the Council will recall that but nine months ago, in the General Assembly², President Amin called for the extinction of Israel as a State. The combination of the move to separate Israeli and Jewish passengers from other passengers, the official endorsement of Hitler's policies by the President of Uganda, his call for the extinction of Israel and the horrible fate of hundreds of thousands of his own countrymen who did not find favour in his eyes—in this connexion I refer members to the terrifying recital of the brutalities of what it refers to as the "dictatorial fascist ruler of Uganda" published on 7 July by the Government of Kenya—all these taken together brought home to the Government of Israel the realization that, unless action were taken, the hostages,

men, women and children, were doomed and could expect no mercy in Entebbe. What more sinister indication of the wicked and maniacal intentions of the hijackers and murderers and of their Ugandan allies could there have been that that among the hostages held until the last moment before the deadline were 11 children and 34 women doomed to be shot in cold blood by those bloodthirsty murderers?

85. There, under the watchful guns of Terror International and President Amin, a kindergarten was organized by the hostages in the shadow of impending death. The tragic scene this evokes in one's mind is devastating. It is so much in character with the style of these bandits. They were there prepared to shoot down a kindergarten of innocent children, just as their colleagues in Somalia but a few months ago—as we were informed by the representative of France here [1899th meeting]—threatened to cut the throats of 30 French children aged six to twelve who were being held hostage.

86. At this point, let me quote from the statement of Prime Minister Rabin to the Knesset on 4 July:

“... the expiry of the first ultimatum was drawing ever closer; the release of non-Israeli passengers blatantly exposed the sinister conspiracy against Israeli citizens. Political efforts bore no fruit. The sand in the hour-glass was about to run out, leaving no possibility for an independent rescue effort.

“Under these conditions, the Government of Israel unanimously decided to declare its readiness to release terrorists detained in Israeli prisons. Following the Cabinet's decision, we informed the French Government, through which the negotiations with the terrorists were being conducted. In default of any other alternative we were even prepared to adopt this course to rescue our people. It was not a tactic to gain time and, had it been the only choice left, we would have stood by our decision as a last resort.” [S/12123, annex.]

87. The hijackers raised their demands. They announced that Israel would be held responsible for all the terrorists whose release they demanded, including those terrorists not held in Israel, and they refused to allow the exchange to be made in France or on neutral territory outside Uganda. Their sinister tone and new demands boded evil for the hostages. The Government of Israel was left with no alternative. On the night of 3 to 4 July, the Israel Defence Forces mounted a most remarkable operation which will go down in history, rescued the hostages and escorted them to safety.

88. I wish to reiterate on this occasion that Israel accepted full and sole responsibility for the action, that no other Government was at any stage party to the planning or the execution of the operation. The

operation was planned and executed by Israel. We are proud of it.

89. During that rescue operation, three of the hostages were killed by the terrorists before the terrorists were gunned down by Israeli troops. A senior Israeli officer was killed, shot in the back, and several soldiers and hostages were wounded.

90. The weight of evidence before us reveals prior knowledge and active connivance on the part of the Government of Uganda in this whole episode. Even if the evidence were not available—and I say it is available in abundance—it is sufficient to read the letter addressed by President Amin to you, Mr. President, on 4 July [S/12124, annex] in order to see that he implicates himself in his own statement. It is quite evident from his letter that the Ugandan troops mounted guard not over the terrorists and the hijackers but over the hostages. In the fourth paragraph of his letter he states, “I directed that the plane be guarded properly”. He then goes on, in the fifth paragraph, to make the most incredible statement: “the Uganda Armed Forces were not allowed by the hijackers to go near the airport building”. This is known to be false. The Ugandan troops were in and around the building.

91. He then reveals his complicity in relating the story of the release of the 147 hostages on 30 June and 1 July by openly admitting his part in separating the Israeli passengers from the other passengers. We learn also from his letter of the sinister part played by the Somali Ambassador to Uganda, the representative of a country which has become a prime troublemaker in the area and a threat to its neighbours—Kenya, Ethiopia and the area of Djibouti,—and which only a few months ago was involved in holding hostage 30 French children, on which occasion the Government of France, motivated by the same sentiments which motivated the Government of Israel this time, took armed action in exercise of its rights under international law to save the children from Somalia. It is no coincidence that one of the terrorists at Entebbe Airport was the head of the PLO office in Somalia.

92. The entire story is one of collusion from beginning to end on the part of the Ugandan Government. Let me spell out only a small proportion of the facts as recounted by members of the Air France crew and the hostages who were released.

93. On advance complicity;

(a) The captain of the Air France plane has stated that the German hijacker, Wilfred Bose, knew in advance that Entebbe was the plane's destination.

(b) When the plane landed at Entebbe, the German woman hijacker declared, “Everything is OK; the army is at the airport”.

(c) Böse announced to the passengers when they landed that they had arrived at a safe place.

(d) Immediately on arrival, Ugandan soldiers surrounded the plane. They were accompanied by five armed Arab terrorists who embraced and kissed the hijackers on the plane. After that, the terrorist reinforcements took part in the guard duties and in the negotiations.

(e) Before landing, while they were still in the air, the hijackers advised the passengers that buses would come to collect them.

(f) After the passengers had been concentrated in the terminal's large hall, President Amin was seen embracing and shaking hands with the hijackers.

(g) As the plane landed and was taxiing along the runway, a black Mercedes car drove up, two terrorists emerged and one of them took over control of the operation thereafter. He boarded the plane, embraced Böse and talked to him.

(h) Michel Cojot, a French company executive who acted as a go-between for the passengers and the hijackers, reported that when the airport director brought supplies for the hostages, he, the director, said he was prepared with supplies as he had been told to wait for approximately 260 passengers and crew.

94. Now, on the detention of the hijacked passengers:

(a) In the first 24 hours, guard duty was done by Ugandan soldiers, and the hijackers were not in sight. When the hijackers returned refreshed, the Ugandan soldiers supplied them with sub-machine-guns to guard the hijacked passengers. I ought to mention here that the Foreign Minister of Uganda had said that the hijackers were armed with sub-machine-guns. What he omitted to mention was that on the plane all they had was pistols and grenades. The sub-machine-guns were supplied to them when they landed at Entebbe.

(b) In the following days the Ugandans were on guard outside the building, while a large force of them was concentrated on the first floor of the building.

(c) Ugandan soldiers escorted the hostages to, and guarded them in, the toilets.

(d) The terrorists came and went as if they were at home with two cars driven by Ugandans, one of them in uniform, at their disposal.

(e) The hijackers received logistic aid and were supplied with arms—sub-machine-guns, pistols and explosives—at the airport. They also received a mobile communications set.

(f) The terrorist who took control of the operation in Entebbe took hostages aside, under Ugandan guard, for interrogation.

(g) Every time President Amin appeared in the area of the terminal and before the passengers, he was closeted with the terrorists in a most friendly atmosphere.

(h) At the outset of the negotiations President Amin dismissed the French Ambassador and prevented him from establishing contact with the terrorists. This contact was conducted by him in person.

(i) President Amin warned the hijacked passengers not to dare to try to escape.

(j) Apparently for reasons of bravado and to frighten the hijacked passengers, two jet aircraft overflew from time to time the terminal in which they were being held. Near the building an armored vehicle armed with a heavy machine-gun was parked, and close to it stood two helicopters.

(k) A mixed guard of hijackers and Ugandan Army men guarded the hostages; contact between them was constant and free. The Ugandan soldiers were on guard both inside the hall, on the second floor of the terminal, and on the plane.

(l) The hijackers were unconcerned and very relaxed during the period on the ground. They left the airport building from time to time and acted with an obvious feeling of assurance that the Ugandan Army would not attempt to overpower them. Mr. Tony Russell, an official of the Greater London Council and one of the Britons freed from the hijacked Air France airbus, in an interview with the *The Times* of London on 5 July, said that President Amin had been in a position to release all hostages if he had wished. "Once we were moved from the aircraft", he said, "the terrorists were not in a commanding position. ...I had the feeling that if Amin wanted to free us after we were transferred to the airport building, it could have been done. The terrorists had had no sleep for 30 hours and had no powerful weapons at their disposal", said Mr. Russell.

(m) The commander of the hijackers in Entebbe spent all his time in the company of President Amin, who, incidentally, recounted this fact by telephone to Colonel Bar-Lev, who spoke to him from Israel.

(n) While the passengers were being held, Radio Uganda broadcast an announcement of the hijackers praising Amin for his stand against zionism and imperialism.

(o) And finally, the hijackers were buried with full military honours together with soldiers of the Ugandan Army.

95. Uganda maintains close ties with the PLO, which has a large presence there. The PLO office, operating in Kampala under Khaled Al-Shaykh, organizes propaganda activities throughout East Africa. The PFLP,

under George Habash, has an intelligence office in Kampala responsible for the activities of the organization in the whole of Africa. This office is subordinate to Wadia Haddad, the head of the branch for overseas terror-strikes of the PFLP. Hundreds of Palestinians are employed in administrative posts in the administration and public services in Uganda as substitutes for the Asians who were expelled from that State.

96. Uganda and the PLO maintain close co-operation also at the military level. In Uganda there is a centre for the military training of Palestinians. Palestinian pilots train in the Uganda Air Force on MIG 21 planes. Members of the PLO are to be found among the bodyguards of President Amin.

97. The extent of Ugandan collaboration can be gauged from the news broadcasts in English on Kampala Radio after the aircraft landed at Entebbe. Records of these broadcasts are available from monitoring reports supplied by the British Broadcasting Corporation. If the representatives will take the trouble to read them, the reports will reveal a complete identity of purpose with the hijackers and their demands on the part of the Ugandan authorities. There is no attempt in the broadcasts to hide an atmosphere of euphoric ecstasy over the hijacking, and of identification with the hijackers on the part of the Government of Uganda. Thus the enthusiastic broadcast on 29 June opens with: "We now bring you the special announcement you have been waiting for. The following are the demands of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine...". The announcer then read out the six-point statement issued by the PFLP.

98. One does not really require all this evidence in order to prove that Israel was entirely justified by every norm of natural and international law in taking the action which it took. In viewing the facts of the case, one must reach one of two conclusions: either the Government of Uganda was directly implicated in holding as hostages innocent passengers, men, women and children, or the Government of Uganda does not exercise sovereignty over its territory and was incapable of dealing with half a dozen terrorists.

99. And what better evidence do we have to support this contention of ours than the fact that to date the Government of Uganda has not released a 75-year-old lady, Mrs. Dora Bloch, who was on her way to the marriage of her son in this country when the plane was hijacked? Moreover the refusal of the Government of Uganda to release the Air France plane immediately after the hijackers were eliminated tends only to confirm the fact of complicity. What other reason should there be for the Government of Uganda to refuse to return the plane to the French Government, in violation of the Hague Convention of 1970,¹ of which Uganda is a signatory?

100. If the Government of Uganda is not implicated in this crime, why was Mrs. Bloch not released imme-

diately after the hijackers were eliminated? Why was she held in custody under guard in hospital in Kampala? Why was she not released to the British Consul when he called her on Sunday, 4 July, after the rescue operation? Why have we suddenly been notified ominously that the Ugandan authorities, four of whose employees reportedly dragged her screaming from the hospital, are unaware of her whereabouts? Either the Government of Uganda exercises national sovereignty, in which case it knows where she is, or it does not.

101. I ask my colleagues, Africans and others here, who have joined in condemning Israel for exercising its inherent right of self-defence, do you or do you not condone the horrifying behaviour which is reflected in this act of "chivalry" on the part of President Amin against Mrs. Dora Bloch, aged 75? For once, have the courage of your convictions and speak out, or be damned by your own silence. Here you have a plain, simple case which has no answer and cannot have any answer for decent people wherever they may be. Here you have the unbelievable, macabre spectacle of a State waging a war against a 75-year-old lady, and supported, presumably, by those who would associate themselves with this despicable and cowardly behaviour. If the Government of Uganda is not implicated, let it now and forthwith produce Mrs. Bloch!

102. Does the Council propose to remain silent on the fate of Mrs. Bloch?

103. The disappearance of this old lady and the by now all-too-familiar picture of the terrifying happenings in Amin's Uganda provide ample justification in themselves for the premonition which prompted the action taken by the Government of Israel.

104. This type of action, which in principle is not unprecedented, is dealt with at considerable length in international law, and there is no doubt whatsoever but that the weight of international law and precedent lies fully in Israel's favour. However, the Israeli action at Entebbe came to remind us that the law we find in statute books is not the only law of mankind. There is also a moral law, and by all that is moral on this earth, Israel had the right to do what it did. Indeed, it had also the duty to do so.

105. Uganda violated a basic tenet of international law in failing to protect foreign nationals on its territory. Furthermore, it behaved in a manner which constituted a gross violation of the 1970 Hague Convention.¹ This Convention had been ratified by both Israel and Uganda. Article 6 of that Convention reads as follows:

"Upon being satisfied that the circumstances so warrant, any Contracting State in the territory of which the offender or the alleged offender is present shall take him into custody or take other measures to ensure his presence. The custody and other mea-

asures shall be as provided in the law of that State but may only be continued for such time as is necessary to enable any criminal or extradition proceedings to be instituted."

Article 9 states:

"1. When any of the acts mentioned in article 1 (a) has occurred or is about to occur, Contracting States shall take all appropriate measures to restore control of the aircraft to its lawful commander or to preserve his control of the aircraft."

"2. In the cases contemplated by the preceding paragraph, any Contracting State in which the aircraft or its passengers or crew are present shall facilitate the continuation of the journey of the passengers and crew as soon as practicable, and shall without delay return the aircraft and its cargo to the persons lawfully entitled to possession."

106. The right of a State to take military action to protect its nationals in mortal danger is recognized by all legal authorities in international law. In *Self-Defence in International Law*,³ Professor D. W. Bowett states, on pages 87 and 88, that

"The right of the State to intervene by the use or threat of force for the protection of its nationals suffering injuries within the territory of another State is generally admitted, both in the writings of jurists and in the practice of States."

"In the arbitration between Great Britain and Spain in 1925, one of the series known as the *Spanish Moroccan Claims*, Judge Huber, as rapporteur of the commission, stated:

"However, it cannot be denied that at a certain point the interest of a State in exercising protection over its nationals and their property can take precedence over territorial sovereignty, despite the absence of any conventional provisions. This right of intervention has been claimed by all States. Only its limits are disputed."

"...

"... We now envisage action by the protecting State which involves a *prima facie* violation of the independence and territorial inviolability of the territorial State. In so far as this action takes effect in derogation of the sovereignty of the territorial State it must necessarily be exceptional in character and limited to those cases in which no other means of protection are available. It presupposes the inadequacy of any other means of protection against some injury, actual or imminent, to the persons or property of nationals and, moreover, an injury which results either from the acts of the territorial State and its authorities or from the acts of individuals or groups of individuals which the territorial State is unable, or unwilling, to prevent."

107. In *The Law of Nations*, Sixth Edition,⁴ pages 427 and 428, J. L. Brierly states as follows:

"Whether the landing of detachments of troops to save the lives of nationals under imminent threat of death or serious injury owing to the breakdown of law and order may be justifiable is a delicate question. Cases of this form of intervention have been not infrequent in the past and, when not attended by suspicion of being a pretext for political pressure, have generally been regarded as justified by the sheer necessity of instant action to save the lives of innocent nationals, whom the local government is unable or unwilling to protect. ... Every effort must be made to get the United Nations to act. But, if the United Nations is not in a position to move in time and the need for instant action is manifest, it would be difficult to deny the legitimacy of action in defence of nationals which every responsible Government would feel bound to take if it had the means to do so; this is, of course, on the basis that the action was strictly limited to securing the safe removal of the threatened nationals."

108. In support of this contention, D. P. O'Connell states in *International Law*, Second Edition,⁵ pages 303 and 304:

"Traditional international law has not prohibited States from protecting their nationals whose lives or property are imperilled by political conditions in another State, provided the degree of physical presence employed in their protection is proportional to the situation. When the Sixth International Conference of American States at Havana attempted to formulate a legal notion of intervention in 1928, the United States pointed out that intervention would need to be clearly defined, for the United States would not stand by and permit the breakdown of government to endanger the lives and property of American citizens in revolution-ridden countries. Interposition of a temporary character' would not, in such circumstances, it was argued, be illegal..."

"... Article 2 (4) [of the United Nations Charter] should be interpreted as prohibiting acts of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of nations, and not to prohibit a use of force which is limited in intention and effect to the protection of a State's own integrity and its nationals' vital interests, when the machinery envisaged by the United Nations Charter is ineffective in the situation."

109. The act of hijacking can well be regarded as one of piracy. Pirates have been *hostes humani generis*—enemies of the human race—since the early days of international law in the Middle Ages. During the war against the slave trade and piracy, certain norms were established in international law which permitted intervention in the case of ships engaged in the slave trade between Africa and America and against the centres of piracy in North Africa. The principle of national sovereignty was overruled by the higher principles of man's liberty.

110. In this connexion it is perhaps appropriate to recall here that the United States Marine Corps was established for the purpose of waging war against the pirates. And one cannot fail to note that the Marine anthem refers to "the shores of Tripoli". Apparently, that coast is not new as a haven for terrorists—then for pirates and ships and today for hijackers and airplanes.

111. Israel's action in Entebbe was very similar to the humanitarian rescue operation which took place in those days. The slave trade then could have claimed that searching the slave ships was in violation of international maritime law. But civilized man defined a higher law, namely, that of human freedom, above which no national sovereignty can claim to be.

112. Had a Jewish State existed in the 1930s, we might well have decided, with the rise of Nazism, to endeavour to undertake an operation to rescue the inmates of the concentration camps. The logic of those who criticize us today would maintain that by so doing we would have been in flagrant violation of the national sovereignty of the Third Reich. What would have been more important: Hitler's sovereignty or rescuing innocent people from a holocaust?

113. May I recall General Assembly resolution 2645 (XXV) of 1970, the consensus adopted by the Council in document S/10705 on 20 June 1972 on the subject of hijacking, and the 1970 resolution of the Assembly of the Council of Europe condemning acts of hijacking, sabotage, taking of hostages and blackmailing of Governments by Palestinian organizations utilizing the territory of certain Arab States as a refuge, training ground and base for action. I draw those resolutions and may other relevant resolutions by the United Nations and other international bodies to the Council's attention to remind in that the problem is not new, but that no practical and effective steps have been taken to combat it.

114. The problem of combating terror has exercised countries throughout the world. Thus the Soviet Union on 3 January 1973 published a new law on criminal liability for the hijacking of aircraft. That law was discussed at length by V. Ivanov in *Izvestiya* on 16 January 1973. Indeed, the mounting Soviet official concern is evident in Soviet scientific and legal literature and also in a series of official actions. On 4 December 1970 *Pravda* reported favourably on the International Civil Aviation Organization's Conference at The Hague to draw up a new convention concerning the prevention of hijacking of aircraft. In November 1970 *Pravda* published an article by O. Khlestov praising General Assembly resolution 2645 (XXV). There was a further article by O. Khlestov in *Izvestiya* on 16 January 1971 praising the Hague Convention of 1970. Attention is drawn also to an article by P. Yevseyev and Y. Kolosov entitled "Air Bandits Outlawed", published in *International Affairs* in Moscow in August 1971, in which both resolution

2645 (XXV) and the Hague Convention of 1970 are discussed and—I would remind the Soviet representative—supported.

115. The right of self-defence is enshrined in international law and in the Charter of the United Nations and can be applied on the basis of the classic formulation, as was done in the well-known *Caroline Case*, permitting such action where the "necessity of self-defence is instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation".⁶ That was exactly the situation which faced the Government of Israel.

116. In equivalent circumstances, other States have acted in a manner similar to Israel. But a few months ago the Council discussed actions taken by France in freeing a busload of 30 children held hostage on the Somalia border. I refer the Council to the remarks of the representative of France on 18 February 1976 [1889th meeting]. The representative of France was addressing the Council on an incident which arose out of the holding of 30 French children 6 to 12 years of age in a school bus as hostages by a group of terrorists in Somalia. The representatives of these terrorists in Somalia made demands on the French Government and announced that if their demands were not met the terrorists would cut the throats of the children. The French forces thereupon took action against the terrorists on the Somali border, killing them; in the process one of the children was killed by the terrorists and five others were wounded. As the French soldiers rushed to save the children, fire was directed at them from the Somali frontier post, seriously wounding a French lieutenant. The French forces naturally enough returned fire into Somali territory, causing casualties and damage to the Somalis. In this case too one hostage was missing, and the child was found later to be held in Somalia by terrorists. He was happily later returned alive.

117. The debate is familiar to members of the Council. Suffice it, however, to say that France unequivocally rejected any accusation of aggression in this regard. France on that occasion legitimately exercised its rights under international law in a situation which is similar in many respects to the situation which we had in Entebbe.

118. In the *Mayaguez* incident last year, in which the United States acted to rescue merchant seamen and their ship, President Ford was quoted as saying: "The decision to use force was based 100 per cent and entirely on a single consideration, to get the crew and the ship back".

119. I could continue and present dozens of cases which reveal that international precedent and international law fully justify the Israeli action and show that every country that respects itself would have taken the same action in similar circumstances had it considered such action feasible.

120. This principle was emphasized by the British Government in the case of British merchant seamen prisoners of war being transported on a German ship, the *Altmark*, back to Germany through the territorial waters of Norway in February 1940. The British flotilla led by the destroyer *Cossack* entered the territorial waters of Norway, then a neutral country, which had allowed passage to this German ship. And in 1940 those British prisoners were prisoners of war taken prisoner in accordance with the law of war. Mr. Winston Churchill personally authorized British ships to fire at the Norwegian naval ships in the area should they open fire and thereby endanger the British force. He sent the following order to Captain Vian on the *Cossack* with regard to the Norwegian torpedo boat: "If she fires upon you... you should defend yourself using no more force than is necessary and ceasing fire when she desists". Sir Winston Churchill in his history of the Second World War enunciates the principle which guided him: "What mattered at home and in the Cabinet was whether British prisoners were found on board or not... This was a dominant factor".

121. What mattered to the Government of Israel in this instance was the lives of the hostages, in danger of their very lives. No consideration other than this humanitarian consideration motivated the Government of Israel. Israel's rescue operation was not directed against Uganda. Israeli forces were not attacking Uganda—and they were certainly not attacking Africa. They were rescuing their nationals from a band of terrorists and kidnappers who were being aided and abetted by the Ugandan authorities. The means used were the minimum necessary to fulfil that purpose, as is laid down in international law.

122. Some parallels could be drawn with the right of an individual to use appropriate means to defend himself if he kills someone who is trying to kill him. He is not liable to be found guilty of murder. Judgment takes into account the context and the purpose of the act. The same applies to the use of force in international affairs.

123. Over the years, Israel in pursuance of its policy of aiding developing countries helped Uganda, as indeed it has co-operated and continues to co-operate with many fellow developing countries throughout the world, including countries in Africa. But there is a limit to the aid which we were prepared to make available to Uganda. In 1972 President Amin came to Israel, produced maps describing his proposed plan to invade Tanzania and asked for Israeli air support in the planned action, including the bombing of Dar es Salaam. Israel's reply to this preposterous and wicked proposition was such as to bring about a dramatic change in the attitude to Israel of Field Marshal Amin. His frustration with Israel's attitude to his plans for dealing with Tanzania, coupled with the lavish blandishments proffered to him by the ruler of Libya, combined to produce an extreme, violent,

anti-Semitic, anti-Israeli attitude on the part of the ruler of Uganda.

124. The move by the Organization of African Unity to bring this complaint to the Council must appear to be completely incongruous were one's senses not completely dulled by the utter incongruity of some of the proceedings of this Organization. The deliberations on this occasion will doubtless be no exception.

125. Let me recall to my African colleagues the text of a resolution of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity in 1970:

"The Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, meeting in its fourteenth ordinary session in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 27 February to 6 March 1970,

"*Having heard* the declaration made by the Foreign Minister of Ethiopia regarding the repeated sabotage and hijacking of civil aircraft thereby endangering the safety of passengers,

"*Conscious* of the disastrous consequences resulting from such criminal acts to international air travel,

"1. *Condemns* all attempts and acts of hijacking and sabotaging of civil aircraft;

"2. *Calls upon* all States to undertake strict measures to protect civilian air travel from being endangered;

"3. *Appeals* to all States to apprehend and punish such criminals in order to ensure the safety of international air travel."

126. How do they reconcile their attitude with the text of a resolution on this very issue which they all accepted? Here we are again being selective. Do the member States of the Organization of African Unity not realize that by condoning acts of piracy and hijacking they are laying themselves open to such acts on their own airlines and in their own countries? Are we to understand that there is to be a selective cataloguing of hijacking, of international murder, of piracy, of brutality and of brigandage according to race, colour or continent to which the murderer or transgressor belongs? We the Jewish people are only too familiar with this type of selective behaviour and with the awful catastrophe and doom which it brings to those who engage in it.

127. In this context, may I recall that only last month, in a discussion [1919th meeting] at the Council table, in reply to remarks made by the representative of the Soviet Union on the issue of terror, I recalled that a distinguished Soviet Foreign Minister, Maxim Litvinov, had once said "Peace is indivisible". I submitted then that terrorism too is indivisible. You cannot be selec-

tive about it. The nations of the world will either join hands to destroy this scourge which affects mankind, or they will be destroyed by it. It is not enough to raise your voice in horror when it affects only you. If terrorism is bad, it is bad for everybody, in every case, on every occasion, by whomever committed, an whoever the victim may be. It must be eliminated.

128. Summing up the daring and imaginative operation which we are discussing, my Prime Minister stated in the Knesset on 4 July that:

"This rescue operation is an achievement of great importance in the struggle against terrorism. It is Israel's contribution to humanity's struggle against international terror, but it should not be viewed as the final chapter. It will give us encouragement as we continue our efforts, but the struggle is not over: new efforts, new methods and unremitting sophistication will be required. Terrorism will find us neither immobilized or hidebound by routine."
[S/12123, annex.]

129. In many ways, this is a moment of truth for this Organization. If it will seize this opportunity courageously and without flinching to join hands in a war against international terror for the benefit of ordinary men and women throughout this world, then it will be serving the purpose for which it was established. It can yet retrieve, perhaps, in small measure, the prestige and good will which it has dissipated by becoming hostage to despots and extremists.

130. The murder of 11 Israeli athletes in Munich in 1972 moved the Secretary-General to demand of the General Assembly that it devise measures for the eradication of the scourge of terrorism from the world. The Arab States and their friends managed to bury the subject by means of their automatic majority. Today the question of international terrorism is before the Security Council, not the General Assembly. If the Council fails to seize this opportunity which has been granted it to eliminate the scourge of terrorists, kidnappers, hijackers and blackmailers from our midst, then it will plunge to the lowest depths in the eyes of mankind and will disappear in history as yet another great and tragic lost opportunity.

131. It has fallen to the lot of my small country, embattled as we are, facing the problems which we do, to demonstrate to the world that there is an alternative to surrender to terrorism and blackmail. It has fallen to our lot to prove to the world that the scourge of international terror can be dealt with. It is now for the nations of the world, regardless of the political differences which may divide them, to unite against this common enemy which recognizes no authority, knows no borders, respects no sovereignty, ignores all basic human decencies, and places no limits on human bestiality.

132. We come with a simple message to the Council.

133. We are proud of what we have done, because we have demonstrated to the world that in a small country, in Israel's circumstances, with which the members of the Council are by now all too familiar, the dignity of man, human life and human freedom constitute the highest values. We are proud not only because we have saved the lives of over 100 innocent people—men, women and children—but because of the significance of our act for the cause of human freedom.

134. We call on the Council to declare war on international terror, to outlaw it and eradicate it wherever it may be. We call on the Council, and above all we call on the Member States and countries of the world, to unite in a common effort to place these criminals outside the pale of human society, and with them any country which co-operates in any way in their nefarious activities.

135. In calling the Council to action I cannot ignore its limitations, which are daily demonstrated by the fact that it has sat silent through 15 months of the greatest tragedy besetting the world today in Lebanon, while a nation is torn apart, tens of thousands are killed, tens of thousands more are wounded, and the cup of human suffering overflows daily.

136. Let me remind you that, when the hijacking took place, the Council was debating the report of the so-called Palestine Committee. The Council held four meetings on the Palestinian question while an act of terror carried out by Palestinian terrorists was taking place. Yet the Council did not even see fit to raise the question and plead for the release of the innocent civilians.

137. If the Council fails to take action, we call on all freedom-loving countries in the world to come together outside the framework of the Organization, establish accepted norms of behaviour in relation to terrorists, and declare in no uncertain terms that each and every one of them will have nothing whatsoever to do with any country which violates these norms and which encourages terrorism. Once hijackers have no country in which to land their airplanes because receiving such an airplane would mean exclusion from the world community, or part of the world community, whether in the field of air transportation, trade, commerce or international relations, there will be no more hijacking.

138. We are proud to have given the lead in this struggle against international terrorism. This debate is an opportunity for the world to take action on this issue, which can effect the lives of every man and woman and child in the world. Those countries which fail to take a clear and unequivocal stand on the issue for reasons of expediency or cowardice will stand damned by all the decent people in this world and despised in history.

139. There is a time in the affairs of man when even Governments must make difficult decisions guided not by considerations of expediency but by considerations or morality. Israel was guided by these considerations in risking much to save its citizens. May we hope that others will be guided by these principles too?

140. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Mauritius on a point of order.

141. Sir Harold WALTER (Mauritius): I wish to offer a personal explanation as current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity. There is only one point that I want to clear up, and the point is very simple. I will quote what the previous distinguished and brilliant orator has just said. He quoted the resolution whereby the Organization of African Unity unanimously condemned international terrorism. As a matter of fact I myself, took part in that debate and I can recall the words I used. I said, "Such heinous offences can only be dealt with by callous punishments". Let no one come and say that the Organization of African Unity condoned. It did not, it condemned. The question which the Organization of African Unity wished to raise in the Council, through the voice of its Chairman, is the violation of territorial integrity.

142. I reserve my right to comment later on the subject.

143. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

144. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): I did not, in any of my words, condemn the Organization of African Unity. I merely asked the Organization of African Unity how it reconciled that resolution with its request to condemn Israel on this occasion.

145. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Kenya. I therefore invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

146. Mr. WAIYAKI (Kenya): Mr. President, permit me first of all to express my gratitude to you and to all the other members of the Council for inviting me to participate in this important debate concerning acts of aggression perpetrated by one Member State against another sovereign Member State. I should also like to thank you for the swift action you have taken in convening this Council meeting. May I also express my sincere pleasure and satisfaction in seeing you, the representative of Italy, preside over this important debate. Your long diplomatic experience and your wisdom will no doubt enable the Council to come up with a fruitful solution of the problem at hand.

147. On behalf of my delegation, I wish to convey our deepest condolences to the delegation of the People's Republic of China on the untimely death on

6 July of one of the most distinguished leaders of China, Mr. Chou-teh, member of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of China and Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China. During his long career, Mr. Chou-teh had been in the forefront of the leadership and had played a most constructive role in his country. I should like to request the Chinese delegation through you, Sir, to convey our most sincere condolences to the Government and people of China on this sad occasion.

148. The Council has gathered here to discuss the act of aggression committed against Uganda by Israel. Unfortunately, in lodging its complaint, in document S/12124, Uganda has deemed fit to drag Kenya into this affair. These, too, are very grave matters and must be considered seriously by all members of the Council and, indeed, the whole membership of the United Nations. The Council should seek a solution that will prevent such tragic events from occurring again, not only in Uganda, but anywhere else in the world. Kenya is most strongly opposed to the use of force in the diversion of civil aircraft as a solution of political problems. We consider it completely inadmissible as it jeopardizes the lives of innocent passengers who are not in any way connected with the political conflict in question. We therefore watched with keen interest and concern the tragic events of the hijacked Air France plane that landed in Uganda on 28 June. We watched and prayed for the safety of the hostages. We were quite encouraged when 147 of them were released without loss of life. This, indeed, was a commendable achievement by those who were involved in the negotiations with the hijackers. The release of the 147 hostages created a lot of hope in most of us that the rest of the hostages would be released unharmed. It is a matter of great regret to note that our hope was not realized. Force was used to release the remaining hostages with the consequence that unnecessary loss of life occurred. We have already sent our condolences to the bereaved, and I take this opportunity to request those Governments whose nationals lost their lives in this tragic and regrettable event to convey our sympathy and condolences to the families of the bereaved.

149. It is a matter of great regret also that the enemies of Kenya whose aim is to sow seeds of mistrust and to divide Africa did not hesitate to use this tragic case of hostages to try to smear the good name of my country. Everybody must have read in the world press that the hijackers were giving as a condition the release of certain prisoners said to be held in a number of countries, including my own. It was alleged that Kenya is holding five Palestinian prisoners whose release from Kenyan gaols would secure the release of the hostages. It was not the first time that these fictitious prisoners appeared in the international press. It will be recalled that in March of this year a certain neighbouring country laid claim to a good part of the territory of my country, contrary to the principles

enshrined in the Charters of the Organization of African Unity and of the United Nations. When this country, Uganda, was confronted with the solid opposition of the rank and file of the people of Kenya, it attempted to divert attention from its aggressive intentions against Kenya by uttering the invented story of these fictitious Palestinian prisoners.

150. Kenya knew why that country was doing so, and we did not find it necessary to engage in a futile exercise by replying to such groundless accusations from a régime which had long lost any international credibility. To tell the truth, we have had a long series of incident after incident, vilification after vilification, incitement and even murder, extending from 1971 to date, and our patience is at the point of exhaustion.

151. So it was understandable that the Government and the people of Kenya were rightly indignant and surprised when the case of the same fictitious Palestinian prisoners was introduced in this latest episode. Kenya promptly, and in the clearest terms, denied that it was holding any Palestinian prisoners in its territory. On behalf of my Government, I again categorically deny these slanderous lies aimed at discrediting the good name of my country. Our position on the struggle by the Palestinians is well known, and I do not have to repeat it here. Suffice it to say that we will continue to support their legitimate rights regardless of attempts by our enemies to create friction between us and the Palestinians.

152. The aggression committed in Uganda by Israeli commandos came to us as a complete surprise, contrary to some baseless accusations levelled at my country that we had prior knowledge of it and collaborated with the Israelis. As my Vice-President said during the debate on this matter at the recent summit of the Organization of African Unity in Mauritius,

“Kenya is not and will not be used as a base for aggression against neighbouring or indeed any other country in the world, least of all Uganda, which Kenya has consistently assisted with supplies since the *coup d'état*.”

153. The first time that Kenya ever had contact with the Israeli planes was when the planes requested permission to land at Nairobi International Airport in an emergency. They carried sick and injured people. Kenya was bound to allow the planes to land, on purely humanitarian grounds and in accordance with international law. As an alert nation, we had to take precautionary security measures at the airport. Any other nation would have done the same. It is thus preposterous for anyone to associate the presence of our security forces at the airport with an alleged collaboration between Kenya and the Israelis. Kenya's humanitarian approach to the problems facing the hostages at Entebbe was manifested long before the tragic events of last Sunday. The Government of

Kenya allowed Air France to station its aircraft and a special medical team at the airport for any emergency operations. Indeed, twice Air France planes left Ambakasi airport to go to Uganda to pick up the 147 released hostages. Our action in allowing the Israeli aircraft to land at Nairobi was therefore neither an unusual act nor one to be construed as collaboration with Israel.

154. I should like to place it on record here that Kenya views with great concern the aggression committed by the Israelis against Uganda at Entebbe. We would equally like to place on record our objection to Israel's violation of our airspace. As we pointed out in Mauritius, Israel must have violated the airspace of many African and Arab countries when it was undertaking its exercise to rescue the hostages forcefully at Entebbe. To single out my country simply because we allowed the Israeli aircraft to land at Nairobi on a humanitarian basis is therefore an injustice to my country. Our commitment to the liberation of all the oppressed peoples is total. Few nations in Africa can surpass the supreme sacrifice Kenya suffered in both human and material terms in its struggle for independence and nationhood. We continue to support as well as we can the liberation of the colonized in Africa as a member of the Organization of African Unity. Kenya cannot therefore collaborate with any forces that might prove hostile to Africa.

155. Let us discuss here the means and ways of getting rid of the situations and conditions that will lead to many Entebbes. It is all too easy to stand up and point an accusing finger at others. I am sure the Security Council, which is the supreme body of the United Nations, will rise to the occasion and not let itself be confused by baseless accusations against one State or another, for to do so would be to depart from the supreme duty of this Council—that of maintaining international peace. Kenya, if it wished, could point out numerous cases and instances of aggression committed against it by those who have been so eager to accuse it of collaborating with aggressors. If the Council wishes to have the list, we have it ready. But, for the time being, Mr. President, may I request that you and the Council take note of the latest accusation, which is characteristic of the manufacture of the falsehoods we have put up with. I refer to a Ugandan broadcast of 7 July last, which I shall now quote:

“Uganda: Enemy aircraft approaching Uganda, says military spokesman. The military spokesman wishes to inform the whole country that 30 enemy aircraft have been detected by the Uganda Radar. The aircraft, believed to be Israeli and American, were approaching Uganda from Kenya. The military spokesman advises the public not to panic, but keep a close eye on any suspect western spies and bring to the attention of the Government the activities of such people. All medical services in Uganda should be on a stand-by, and the public are called upon to be prepared to donate blood for emergency cases.

"Uganda, says the military spokesman, is capable of defending herself without assistance although several friendly countries are prepared to come by air or otherwise in our defence.

"He appealed to the security forces and to every man and woman to be on the alert. Should any Ugandan notice any enemy aircraft landing anywhere near his area, use any weapon within your reach to speedily finish off the occupant because the enemy has no sympathy.

"The military spokesman further advises the country to constantly listen to the Uganda Broadcasting Corporation for any development."

Those Israeli and American aircraft were supposed to be coming from Kenya. But no aircraft came from Kenya. The question is: was this story, deliberately manufactured to confuse Ugandans and to inflame their feelings against Kenya, intended to be a cover for the arrival of military aircraft in Uganda from wherever?

156. Is it not the wish of my delegation to continue taking any more of the Council's valuable time. I should, however, like to conclude by reiterating the following points.

157. First, Kenya does not have and never has had Palestinian prisoners.

158. Second, Kenya did not have prior knowledge of nor did it collaborate with Israel in its aggression against Uganda. On the contrary, Kenya was a victim of aggression of its air space by Israel. As I stated earlier, our permission for the Israeli planes to land at Nairobi, and this after Entebbe, not before, was granted purely on a humanitarian basis in accordance with international law.

159. Third, Kenya will always continue to co-operate with its neighbours, including Uganda, in a spirit of good-neighbourliness and respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all nations, as enshrined in the Charters of the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations. In this respect, we scrupulously observe and adhere to the principles of the sovereign equality of all Member States; non-interference in the internal affairs of States; the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each State and its inalienable right to independent existence. We expect others to respect the same principles too. But should anyone not do so, Kenya will always be ready to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity by all means available to it.

160. Fourth, Kenya, as a faithful Member of the United Nations, will implement the provisions of any resolution that the Council may adopt as a measure to curb and, indeed, eliminate the repetition of the events in Entebbe.

161. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Qatar, who wishes to speak in his capacity as current Chairman of the Group of Arab States. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

162. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar): Mr. President, in my capacity as the Chairman of the Group of Arab States for this month, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you upon your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of July. Your outstanding experience and tact will be a great asset in ensuring the success of the deliberations of the Council.

163. I should also like to pay a tribute to the President of the Council for the month of June, Ambassador Jackson, of Guyana. His skill and statesmanship had almost secured the adoption of a resolution which would have brought the Middle East conflict closer to peace and justice.

164. I should also like to extend my appreciation and gratitude to you, Mr. President, and through you to the members of the Council, for giving me the opportunity to address the Council on this important issue.

165. It is indeed a great honour for me to welcome the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Uganda, Mr. Juma Oris Abdalla, most cordially as the head of the Ugandan delegation to the Council. I wish also, on behalf of the Arab Group, to extend our sincere condolences and sympathy to the Government and the people of the Republic of Uganda upon the loss of innocent Ugandan lives.

166. I also wish to convey our sincere condolences and sympathy to the representative of the People's Republic of China on the loss of Mr. Chou-teh. I request that the representative of China to convey to his Government and to the great people of China our deep condolences.

167. I should also like to take this opportunity to welcome among us the Foreign Minister of Mauritius and the Foreign Minister of Kenya, and to give them our best wishes.

168. One more time, we meet here to discuss another flagrant act of aggression committed on a peace-loving country by the same old racist State implanted in the Middle East. On 4 July, the Zionist forces of aggression unleashed their death squads on Uganda, a Member State of the United Nations, which resulted in the loss of many innocent lives and extensive property damage inflicted upon this developing African nation.

169. Even though we are not here to discuss the matter of the French airline hijacking, I wish to remind all the Member States of the unanimous condemnation of these acts, particularly the endangering of the lives of innocent civilians, by the Foreign Ministers of the

20 Arab States and by the Palestine Liberation Organization, which tried to intercede with the hijackers at the French Government's request. The airplane landed at Entebbe airport with 275 endangered civilians, and the brave President of the Republic of Uganda, His Excellency Idi Amin Dada, took it upon himself to see that food and medical care were provided to those involved in this unfortunate tragedy and to start the negotiations for the release of the hostages.

170. On 30 June, the President of Uganda obtained the release of 47 hostages. On 1 July, he obtained the release of another 100 persons and the extension of the deadline for the negotiations, and submitted the by now well-known demands of the hijackers to the various countries involved, which showed their readiness to negotiate with the hijackers to avoid bloodshed. But as the truth unfolded, the Zionist State was buying time by declaring its desire to negotiate and avoid bloodshed while preparing for aggression. At the time when there should have been negotiations for sparing the lives of the innocent people involved, the Israeli storm-troops invaded sovereign Ugandan territory and committed a mean act of terrorism which resulted in unnecessary bloodshed.

171. What concerns us all today is the fact that a Member State of this Organization has dared to violate the territorial integrity of another Member State by flagrantly landing its troops on that State's territory and menacing scores of people among its population and security forces. There was no declaration of war, as we recall, on Uganda. There was not even an official hint of displeasure. On the contrary, while the Israeli murderers were preparing for their aggression, the Israeli Government was bluffing the rest of the world and declaring its readiness to negotiate, all with the intention of assuring success in its surprise attack on this unsuspecting, peaceful country in the heart of Africa. What is just as disturbing is that this illegal act of State terrorism, endangering world peace and security, was hailed and commended by some members of the world community despite its flagrant violation of international law and the United Nations Charter.

172. The implication is that the stronger countries can at any time land troops in smaller countries without a declaration of war, and commit unpunished acts of aggression. Anyone who followed the Israeli media before, during, and after the Israeli terrorist attack on Uganda, especially with respect to the coverage given to the four Israelis killed in comparison to that given to the many Ugandan lives lost, can already see a similarity among the Rhodesian, the South African and the Israeli attitudes regarding the value of black people as compared to white.

173. We therefore call upon the Council to condemn Israel in the strongest possible terms for its aggression against the Republic of Uganda, to show its disap-

proval of those Governments whose statements might be misunderstood as an encouragement of this act of piracy, and to consider sanctions against this long-time violator of the United Nations Charter and of international law, including the suspension of its membership until it pledges to respect all provisions of the Charter and the resolutions of the various United Nations bodies.

174. Having said that, I should like to add that our patience is coming to an end. We can no longer pretend to discuss world order and justice when the most flagrant acts of aggression are sanctioned by prominent Members of the United Nations and protected by the veto power of one of the permanent members of the Council which is ignoring the racist Zionist danger confronting the developing nations and endangering world peace and security.

175. The United Nations has now arrived at a cross-road, it can either reassert its authority, backing its decisions with action, or it can take the other road which leads down to dishonour and oblivion, for what use is the United Nations when an arrogant State like Israel can defy it with impunity? The world waits expectantly for a meaningful decision which will put an end to such actions. Now is the time for the Council to make it clear to Israel that the world has had enough of the Zionist State's defiance, which must now end its dissembling and meet without further argument the requirements of its United Nations membership or cease to have standing as a Member State.

176. It is our conviction that the Council should face to its responsibilities by adopting a resolution unanimously condemning Israel's aggression against the Republic of Uganda.

177. Mr. LECOMPT (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, my first words are to congratulate you on behalf of my delegation on assuming your responsible post. On 28 June last you said that, after a particularly heavy month, you hoped that in July the Council might be able to work in a more leisurely way. Unfortunately, this wish has not been fulfilled. I regret this for you but less for us, because we, in a particularly difficult situation, shall be able to benefit from your great experience and unique talents. The French delegation cannot but be gratified at seeing an eminent representative of a Latin nation, a sister country, in charge of this work, an essential partner of ours in the work of European construction in which our two countries are involved side by side.

178. I should also like to address my thanks to the representative of Guyana, who was sorely tested last month and brilliantly demonstrated the courtesy and political tact which we knew were his outstanding qualities. The month of June will go down in the Council's annals not only statistically but also because it was marked by the presence of a great President, Ambassador Jackson, and, latterly, the Minister for

Foreign Affairs of Guyana, who did us the honour of directing our work.

179. It is my unhappy duty to present to our Chinese colleagues the condolences of my delegation at the death of Chairman Chou-teh. He was one of the historic figures in the People's Republic of China, involved as he was in the founding and consolidation of that country, to which he made an eminent contribution. My delegation would like to echo the tributes which have been paid to his memory here.

180. I have asked to speak at this opening meeting because of the evidence which my delegation is in a position to provide regarding the matter now being dealt with by the Council. We believe that this evidence can shed light on our work since France was gravely implicated from the very beginning in the Entebbe affair, which meant that it had to play an active part in it.

181. As we are aware, this affair started with the hijacking on 27 June, over Corfu, of an Air France airbus which was flying from Tel Aviv to Paris with 250 passengers on board.

182. The French authorities, when informed of this hijacking, alerted some of their embassies, including that in Kampala, asking them to take steps for the plane to be given permission to land, since it was soon going to run out of fuel. That is why our Ambassador in Kampala approached the Ugandan authorities about this, and permission to land was given immediately.

183. The airbus landed at Entebbe on 28 June at 3.40 p.m. The French Ambassador went to the airport, but he was unable to establish direct contact either with the hijackers or with the crew and the passengers. Marshal Idi Amin also went to the airport.

184. The French Ambassador immediately hastened to approach the Ugandan authorities and Marshal Idi Amin, who received him at 7 p.m., for the purpose of obtaining the release of the passengers and the crew. He also conveyed to the Ugandan Head of State a personal message from President Giscard d'Estaing for the purpose of securing the release of all the persons—passengers and crew—who were the victims of this act, the reprehensible nature of which deserved censure and called for firmness.

185. Through the efforts of Marshal Idi Amin, a few minutes later the passengers were allowed to leave the plane and food was brought to them. A doctor was also able to attend them. From that time, the passengers seemed to be guarded, at least in part, by persons who were not among the first group of hijackers; external security was provided, at a distance of 50 metres, by Ugandan soldiers.

186. On 29 June, at 1.15 p.m., Marshall Idi Amin submitted to the French Ambassador the text of the

conditions laid down by the hijackers for the return of the hostages. The Ambassador of Somalia was present at that meeting. He emphasized that as the senior Arab ambassador, he had been chosen to represent the hijackers. Thereupon, all the conditions of the hijackers were communicated to the Governments concerned.

187. On 30 June, the representative of the PLO in Kampala informed our Ambassador that women and children might be released by the hijackers in the course of the day. Forty-seven passengers were in fact freed at 1 p.m.

188. On the same day, at 5 p.m., we learned from a local radio station that the hijackers had told the President of Uganda that they would blow up the plane and all the remaining hostages if their demands were not met by the countries concerned the next day, 1 July, by 3 p.m. In the course of the evening the Ambassador of France was received by Marshal Idi Amin, whom he asked to secure an extension of the deadline.

189. On 1 July, shortly after the time-limit had run out, the Ugandan Radio announced that the hijackers, as a result of the intercession of Marshal Idi Amin, had agreed, first, to release about 100 hostages, with the exception of Israeli nationals and those with dual nationality, and secondly, to extend the deadline to 4 July, 11 a.m. The crew had asked not to be released until all the passengers had been released.

190. On 1 July, late in the morning, the Ambassador of Israel in Paris informed the Minister for Foreign Affairs that the Israeli Government was prepared, in exchange for the release of the hostages, to free a "certain number" of prisoners whose names appeared on the hijackers' list. He requested that that information be communicated to the President of Uganda by the Ambassador of France in Kampala. The Israeli Government expressed the hope that the terms and conditions for the exchange would be negotiated through the intermediary of France.

191. On the same day, at 3 o'clock, 100 passengers of the airbus were in fact released and handed over, by the Ambassador of Somalia, to the Ambassador of France. The Ambassador of France was received in the afternoon by the President of Uganda, in the presence of the Ambassador of Somalia. He transmitted to them the communication received from the Israeli Government. He suggested, furthermore, resorting to the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

192. Towards the end of the day, the Ambassador of Somalia informed our Ambassador in Kampala of the hijackers' reply. They stated that they were prepared to study the terms for the release of the prisoners held by the countries concerned. They made it clear that they rejected the idea of involving the Secretary-General.

193. In the meantime, the Foreign Ministry had indicated to the Israeli authorities that it agreed to instruct our Ambassador to undertake the negotiation for the release of the hostages, on the basis of the replies received from the Governments concerned.

194. On 2 July, the Ambassador of Israel made known the position of the Israeli Government: it wanted the terms of the exchange to be determined beforehand.

195. The Israeli plan, which envisaged the exchange of the prisoners on neutral ground, was transmitted by our Ambassador in Kampala to the Ambassador of Somalia during the morning of 3 July, for subsequent transmission to the hijackers. Somewhat later, the Ambassador of Somalia transmitted to our Ambassador the counterproposals of the hijackers; one of those counterproposals was that the exchange had to take place at Entebbe.

196. On the same day, our Ambassador requested an extension of the deadline of the ultimatum from the Ambassador of Somalia. Since Marshal Idi Amin was not in Uganda, our Ambassador made the same request to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda. A few hours later, the Ambassador of Somalia communicated the information that the deadline of the ultimatum—4 July at 11 o'clock—could not be extended.

197. Upon his return from Mauritius, however, the Ugandan Head of State suggested to our Ambassador that all the countries concerned should inform him, within the allotted time, of the numbers of the flights to Kampala that the prisoners would be on. That information was transmitted to the Israeli Embassy in Paris by our Minister for Foreign Affairs.

198. On 4 July, at 12.30 a.m., our Ambassador in Kampala informed the Minister for Foreign Affairs in Paris, by telephone, that fighting had taken place at Entebbe airport. Half an hour later, the Ambassador of Israel transmitted, by telephone, to Mr. Sauvagnargues a message from Mr. Yigal Allon. The message stated that an Israeli operation to free the hostages had just been completed. During the night, the President of the Republic received a message from the Prime Minister of Israel confirming those facts.

199. That was the information I was asked to bring to the Council's attention at this time when it is beginning its work on this question.

200. I should like to say how much we regret that the Secretary-General was unable, because of the hijackers' opposition, to intervene in this matter as we would have wished him to do. It appeared to us that his great moral authority would have been a valuable asset in a situation affecting a number of States Members of the Organization. Moreover, in view of the general confidence he enjoys, his intervention appeared to us to be likely to provide all the parties with

the necessary guarantees in a particularly complex and delicate affair where many human lives were at stake. Unfortunately, we were unable to obtain agreement on his playing an active role. Nevertheless, we should like to thank him warmly for his efforts, particularly during his stay in Mauritius.

201. From the account of the facts I have given, it is quite clear that we are faced by a complex set of circumstances in which events and responsibilities are inextricably interwoven.

202. That this tragic affair has been marked by violent and illegal acts cannot be denied. The initial action—that is, the hijacking of a civilian aircraft and the taking of innocent hostages—is in particular an intolerable violation of international morality and of *jus gentium* which could not be justified by any cause and against which the international community has to adopt effective measures with the resolve to implement them.

203. The French delegation will have occasion, here and elsewhere, to revert to this distressing aspect of the present day. A growing risk faces any traveller, any innocent bystander. Furthermore, it is perfectly clear that acts of terrorism jeopardize the stability of international relations and undermine the trust that should exist among States. These actions are a breach of the fundamental rules that make it possible for men to live together. For that reason they must claim the attention of the United Nations.

204. Finally, the French delegation would like, at this stage of the discussion, to express not only its gratification at the fact that the hostages have been freed, but also its grief at the death of the innocent victims.

205. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of France for his very kind words about me. I particularly appreciated what he said about the co-operation between our two countries, and above all about the efforts our two countries are jointly making for the construction of Europe.

206. The next speaker is the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

207. Mr. OYONO (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): First, Mr. President, I should like to carry out the pleasant duty of offering you our warmest and friendliest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of July. We are particularly pleased because your country, Italy, and Cameroon are co-operating fruitfully on both the bilateral and the multilateral level, and because we know you personally and greatly admire your talents as a man and as a diplomat with wide experience of the problems of our Organization—talents that are indispensable for the success of this series of meetings.

208. I should like also to express condolences, on behalf of my delegation, to the representative of China on the passing of the great pioneer of the Chinese people, Mr. Chou-teh.

209. My delegation is grateful to the Council for allowing us to participate in this serious debate on the brutal, underhand act of aggression coldly committed by the State of Israel against the Republic of Uganda, a sister country, a member of the Organization of African Unity, and a Member of the United Nations.

210. We wish to express our indignation and horror at this outrageous act of terrorism which has caused the loss of many lives; more than a hundred persons were killed, and there were many casualties among the Ugandan troops. There was also much material damage, including the destruction of a number of military and civilian aircraft of the Ugandan Armed Forces, and the destruction of buildings and other installations at Entebbe Airport.

211. The Ugandan people, who have been humiliated and whose feelings and pride have been hurt by this dastardly action, an action which has aroused the indignation and reprobation of Africa and of all peace-loving forces throughout the world, are now experiencing a great tragedy.

212. The fact remains that certain people with one-sided views have hastened to accuse the Ugandan Head of State of collusion with the commandos, despite the fact that the captain of the hijacked aircraft, an eye-witness if ever there was one, was much more reserved in his views, as was clear from the interview he gave to the press in Paris on 7 July, extracts of which were printed in *The New York Times* of 8 July.

213. In this hour of tragedy for the Ugandan people, Cameroon, through its highest authority our Head of State, His Excellency El Hadj Ahmadou Ahidjo, vigorously condemned Israel's act of aggression and has assured the Republic of Uganda of its sympathy, solidarity and support.

214. There are no words strong enough to condemn Israel's aggression against Uganda. This act of aggression took place at a time when the international community, once again confronted by an act of aerial piracy which it deplores and condemns, and at the same time deeply concerned for the lives of the hostages, which it wanted, as always, to safeguard, was entitled to expect an outcome without any bloodshed—particularly since the Ugandan Head of State was personally very active in this affair and his efforts had already resulted in the release, on 30 June, of 47 passengers—women, children and old persons.

215. The Israeli act of aggression took place while President Idi Amin, encouraged by that first success and by the hope which Israel had aroused by agreeing

to negotiations with the members of the commando group, was continuing his efforts to bring about the release of the remaining hostages. Israel did not want to run the risk of a peaceful settlement that would have prevented bloodshed. Those are the facts. They explain why we find the attempts to legitimize Israel's action after the event and to create chaos and confusion neither convincing nor well-founded.

216. For Cameroon, the situation is clear: Israel took the initiative of attacking the territory of Uganda—a sovereign State more than 3,000 kilometres away from Israel—with commandos from its regular army, airlifted by three military planes. In so doing, Israel deliberately initiated hostilities against Uganda, and for that reason is the aggressor in this affair, as defined by international law.

217. The Security Council, which is responsible for international peace and security, must vigorously condemn this barbaric act which constitutes a flagrant violation of the rules of international law and of the spirit and the letter of the Charter, Article 2 (4) of which provides that:

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.”

218. In the spirit of the Charter, that prohibition means that Member States have an obligation to settle their international disputes by peaceful means in order to maintain international peace and security. I need hardly remind you that our Organization is not dedicated to anarchy or to the notion that might makes right, but is an organized community whose mutually accepted principles and rules must be scrupulously respected, and their violation adequately punished. It is the corner-stone of our Organization that there can be no justification for the use of force against the sovereignty, independence or territorial integrity of a State, unless we wish to imperil international co-operation in its present form and indeed the very existence of States that do not yet possess modern, sophisticated systems of detection and deterrence.

219. It is precisely in order solemnly to defend and reaffirm these sacred principles that the Council has to consider the request of the Ugandan Government and to condemn Israel's act of aggression in no uncertain terms.

220. Israel pretended to agree to negotiations on the freeing of the remaining hostages merely to gain time, to mislead, and to lull international public opinion in order to carry out unimpeded its diabolical designs against Uganda.

221. It is a matter of regret that people seem to be getting used to seeing Israel, whose alleged peaceful

intentions are hardly matched by its deeds, persist in its systematic and unbridled use of deceit and the brute force of war, which have become part and parcel of its political behaviour. It is high time the Council put an end to this state of affairs and unreservedly and unanimously condemned Israel's flagrant aggression against the Republic of Uganda. Israel must also be required to pay compensation for the loss of life and for the material damage caused as a result of its barbaric acts.

222. In conclusion, let me say that the eyes of Africa and of world public opinion are upon our deliberations, and the sternness of their gaze must be matched by the serious tone of our deliberations. But what do Africa and world public opinion expect? They expect the Council to act firmly to deter future potential aggressors intoxicated with a sense of power from violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States of our Organization and from trampling underfoot the sacred principles of peace and international security which are enshrined in the Charter.

223. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Foreign Minister of Kenya and the representatives of Mauritania, Qatar, France, Cameroon and others have expressed condolences this afternoon on the death of Chou-teh, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China. On behalf of the Chinese delegation, I wish to express deep thanks for their cordial sentiments.

224. In the early morning of 4 July, Israeli armed personnel on board three military planes wantonly landed on the Entebbe airport in Uganda for a sneak attack, killing more than a hundred officers and men of the Ugandan army, destroying a number of Ugandan military and civilian aircraft, and causing serious damage to the Entebbe airport. This is a premeditated and naked act of aggression committed against a sovereign State by Israeli Zionism. It constitutes a gross violation of the United Nations Charter and further reveals Israeli Zionism's behaviour and its determination to make itself an enemy of the Arab and African peoples. The Chinese Government and people express their indignation of the unbridled act of aggression committed by the Israeli Zionists and strongly condemn it.

225. As is known to all, we have always disapproved of such adventurist acts of terrorism as assassination, kidnapping and the hijacking of aircraft. However, they can in no way be used as a pretext for Israel to commit armed aggression against a sovereign State. Over a long period, the Israeli Zionists have subjected the Palestinian and other Arab peoples to frenzied aggression and brutal massacre. Having committed innumerable crimes, they are clinging to their evil course. This time they have carried out another brazen act of armed aggression against a sovereign African State. Whatever excuses the Israeli Zionists may find

to justify and whitewash their criminal acts of aggression, they are absolutely untenable and can be of no avail.

226. The Chinese delegation believes that the Council should adopt a resolution in support of the just demand of the African countries and the Summit Conference of the Organization of African Unity, condemning Israeli Zionism for its aggression and its atrocities against Uganda and calling upon the Israeli authorities to compensate Uganda for all its losses and to guarantee that there will be no recurrence of such incidents.

227. The PRESIDENT: I have no other speakers on my list who wish to speak in today's debate. Before calling on speakers who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply I shall call on the representative of Mauritius, who has asked to make a clarification.

228. Sir Harold WALTER (Mauritius) (*interpretation from French*): I simply wish to ask a question of the representative of France which is of capital importance when we view the facts of which we have been given two distinct versions in the Council. The representative of France said at one point that:

"The French authorities, when informed of this hijacking, alerted some of their embassies, including that in Kampala, asking them to take steps for the plane to be given permission to land, since it was soon going to run out of fuel." [*Para. 182 above.*]

Could the representative of France tell us at that time that message was transmitted to Kampala?

229. Mr. LECOMPT (France) (*interpretation from French*): I must humbly confess to the Foreign Minister of Mauritius that I am not in a position here and now to tell him exactly at what time communication was established between our Ambassador and the Ugandan authorities regarding the landing of the plane. All I can do is repeat what I said, namely, that we asked for the plane be allowed to land when it seemed that it would be able to fly for only another 15 minutes.

230. Having said that, I should like to say, Mr. President, that I shall be at the disposal of the Foreign Minister of Mauritius on Monday to give him the information he has asked for when we have been able to check our files.

231. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

232. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): We have listened to the usual allegations and fabrications of the representative of the Zionist entity. I should like to reserve the right of my delegation to reply to all those allegations when it is my turn to speak. But now, since the hour is late, I should like to place some comments on the record.

233. Mr. President, first let me congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I express the satisfaction of the Libyan delegation at seeing you preside over our work during this very important debate. Your country and mine are neighbours. We are Mediterraneans. We have a long history of association. There has been bitter and sweet in our relations. Your country has annexed my country twice—once as the Roman empire and once as modern Italy. My country participated in the occupation of parts of your country, as part of the Arab empire, for centuries. But I am happy to say that our two countries now have relations of friendship and good-neighbourliness, and we are happy to see that hate among peoples is not eternal.

234. Mr. President, on the first day we participated in the work of the Council you welcomed me and said it was a sign of changing times that the representatives of Italy and Libya were together in the Council. I now support your statement, and express our satisfaction that your country and mine entered the United Nations on the same day in 1955, and now the former master and the former colonized are together as friends and representatives of free peoples.

235. I should also like to express the gratitude and satisfaction of my delegation to my friend and brother Ambassador Jackson of Guyana for his able conduct of our work during last month.

236. In the name of my delegation I also associate myself with the condolences that have been addressed to the Chinese people and Government on the death of Marshall Chou-teh.

237. As I have said, I reserve my right to reply in more detail to the Zionist representative at a later stage, but I should like to make some comments now.

238. Really, one must express one's admiration for the effrontery of the Zionist representative. He is, as usual, faithful to his traditions. His motto is lie, lie and lie. As his master Goebbels once said, perhaps some day, in the end, we will believe you. This motto is also, shout, shout and shout—in order to cover up the weakners of his arguments. But all this is of no effect, because whatever arguments he presents, he could not belittle the intelligence of the members here or hide the true face of Israel, which may be summed up in two words: State terrorism.

239. The Israeli representative tries in vain to shed crocodile tears about the loss of human life. Is it not the barbaric actions of his Government that have led to the loss of human lives, be they Ugandan or other human lives? From the very beginning the Israeli Government was bent on attacking Uganda because it has not forgiven the heroic people and Government of Uganda for unmasking the ugly and true face of Israel in Africa and its collaboration with the racist régimes in South Africa and Rhodesia.

240. The history of the establishment of the Zionist State is a history of terrorism. Its terrorism is well known to everyone. I will not go into details now. I will do so in the future. I will not go into detail and cite a long list, but I shall give a few examples that will suffice.

241. Who killed in cold blood the United Nations mediator, Count Bernadotte? Who assassinated Lord Moyne? Who made the killers of Count Bernadotte public heroes sitting in the Israeli Cabinet? Who stated the barbaric raid on Beirut airport in 1969? Who shot down a Libyan civilian aircraft, killing scores of people, including women and children? Ironically, that plane also was piloted by a French crew. The list is endless.

242. From the very beginning, the Israeli Government has wanted to use the hijacking incident as an excuse to attack Uganda. I shall now quote what Mr. Rabin proudly told the Israeli Knesset on 4 July: "The Israeli defence forces and the intelligence community lost not a single hour required for thinking, planning and preparation." This after his Foreign Minister had said in the Knesset on 1 July: "I will say more. According to information available to us, all the hostages are safe".

243. The Israeli representative tries in vain to cast doubt on the behaviour of the Palestine Liberation Organization, which is recognized by the United Nations and by the majority of the world community as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, at a time when the whole world knows that the Palestine Liberation Organization denounced and condemned the hijacking from the outset and dispatched one of its highest representatives in a special Egyptian plane so that he could take part in the negotiations with the French Ambassador in Kampala. The hijackers turned down mediation by that Organization at a time when the whole world recognizes that the Palestine Liberation Organization, the legitimate representative of the fighting Palestinian people, is serious and honest and moral. Even the protectors of Israel, even the United States, has thanked it for its role in helping with the evacuation of American citizens.

244. The Israeli representative tries to avoid addressing the main issue, which is that his Government planned and executed an act of aggression against a sovereign, independent country, a Member of the United Nations. Should the Council tolerate such aggression, it would give the green light, it would give permission to every country in the world to take the law into its own hands and invade other countries under any pretext it chooses. We believe the Council should apply the provisions of the Charter, which everybody is interested in applying. The Council should condemn in the sharpest terms this contemptuous, wanton Israeli aggression. If the Council fails to do so because of obstruction on the part of this

country or that, those who obstruct will have to bear the consequences of their action in the future.

245. The Zionist representative mentioned Auschwitz, he mentioned Dachau, he mentioned Buchenwald. He said that "Auschwitz, Dachau and Buchenwald belonged to the past and would never again return" [para. 82 above]. I say that Dachau, Auschwitz and Buchenwald are not things of the past; they are still alive, physically and spiritually, only this time the roles are reversed; those who were the victims—or pretend to have been the victims—are now the torturers. The racist and criminal exercises and policies are now being executed against the Palestinian people by the Zionist racists and against the African peoples by the other racist régimes of southern Africa.

246. Certainly, Mr. Herzog, you did not learn the lesson of Dachau, of Auschwitz, of Buchenwald. But you learn through experience. We admit that you were, and you are, excellent disciples of the Nazis. You have done even better than your Nazi masters. You have improved their techniques, you have pushed to perfection their style and practice. By your fabrications, Mr. Herzog, and lies, you are merely trying to cover up the wanton crime committed against Uganda. What you did was really an act of treachery. You announced your intention to negotiate all over the world. Even the representative of France said that you communicated to France your willingness to negotiate. And people believed you. But you went to the negotiations with no good faith; you went to the negotiations with a dagger under your cloak. You profited from the good faith of our Ugandan brothers. And after that, Mr. Herzog, you dare to speak of morals. Everyone now knows what your morals are and, above all, what the Zionist criminals and racists mean by "negotiations" when they come here to the Security Council and the United Nations and ask for negotiations with the Palestinians and with the Arabs.

247. I said that I would not be long. But Mr. Herzog in his speech was indeed very generous to my country. I admire, I am impressed by how much he hates my country and my leader. He said that Libya is playing a "central role" in this; he referred to "the central role which this country"—he means Libya—"plays in the promotion and encouragement of international terror in the world today" [para. 73 above]. He said that "this is the country which has for years acted as paymaster of international terror movements, Arab and non-Arab, throughout the world" [para. 74 above]. We are not paymasters to anybody. We are trying to do our best to help our brothers, to help liberation movements. We help them, we train them, people who are fighting against colonialism, against imperialism, against racism, against *apartheid*, and we shall continue to do that. If we do not do that, we shall lose our *raison d'être*.

248. Also, Mr Herzog mentioned, as he has done before, problems among Arabs. As I said before, we

know that we have problems, we know that we have fighting. We are developing countries; we are fighting for our progress, for our unity, and for our liberation. In the history of all nations, big and small, there has been fighting for liberation and for unity. As I said before, we Arabs have not yet ended our civil war. The United States had its civil war. Your own country, Mr. President, had its civil war. The native country of Mr. Herzog, Ireland, is right now experiencing a kind of mixed colonial and civil war. Every country in the world has its wars, and we Arabs must also have our problems. We know that we have problems with some neighbours, with some brothers, but, as we say in Arabic, these are only summer clouds and they will soon disappear. And, Mr. Herzog, you will find us united before Israeli aggression.

249. Mr. Herzog also said that Libya should not be seated as a member of the Security Council. For his information, we were elected by 126 votes of sovereign States. We were the candidate of the African Group of 48 States, and if we are a member of the Council, after all this time, it is also, for the first time, a kind of recognition of our history, of our fight for liberation. We are a country that fought for its liberation for 40 years, a country that lost 40 per cent of its population, a poor country—the oil came only in 1964—that fought for its independence. We suffered and, as I said, we lost more than 40 per cent of our population. So, if we are here in the Council, it is recognition by the international community. We are proud of the 126 votes which brought us here. Perhaps the other votes, those not in favour of Libya, were cast by Israel and its friends, protectors and lackeys.

250. I shall not go on tonight, but I reserve my right to speak again to answer the allegations and cynical fabrications and lies of the representative of the Zionist entity.

251. The PRESIDENT: I highly appreciated what Ambassador Kikhia just said about the relations between our two countries. I subscribe fully to his remarks that reciprocal occupation belongs to the past; the past will not come back; it is a bad habit on which we turn our backs; and we are looking forward to better and better relations based on the friendship which has been restored between our two peoples.

252. Mr. ABDALLA (Uganda): I shall not now reply fully to what the representative of Zionist Israel said, but there is one important point on which I wish to reply immediately. I hope to have an opportunity to reply in detail later regarding the unfounded allegations against Uganda and some other friendly countries of Africa.

253. The Security Council has been informed of the Israeli invasion of Uganda on 4 July. We are all aware of the efforts made by His Excellency Al-Hadj Field-Marshal Dr. Idi Amin Dada, V.C., D.S.C., M.C., President of the Republic of Uganda, and the entire

people of Uganda to save the lives of all the hostages, numbering 250.

254. Up to the time of Israel's invasion in the early hours of Sunday, 4 July, President Amin had succeeded in having more than half the hostages released. At the risk of his own life, he even cut short his stay in Mauritius in order to continue negotiations, thereby saving the lives of the remaining hostages. In his humanitarian efforts he was concerned not only with the release of all the hostages but also with their welfare. In so doing, the basic needs of life—for instance, food and medical services—were provided to all the hostages without discrimination. It was in this spirit that Mrs. Dora Bloch, who had a piece of food stuck in her throat, was immediately rushed to Uganda's best hospital for medical treatment. When she got better, in the evening of Saturday 3 July, she was returned by the medical authorities to the old Entebbe airport to join the other hostages. In accordance with the understanding given by the Uganda Government to the hijackers, this was done in order not to jeopardize the lives of the hostages who were at that time still at Entebbe airport.

255. The Israelis committed a naked act of aggression by invading Entebbe airport where the hostages, including Mrs. Dora Bloch, were being held by the hijackers. The Israelis, as the Council has already been informed, used all kinds of weapons, shooting indiscriminately. In the process, many lives, including those of Ugandan soldiers, hijackers, hostages and members of the Israeli invading forces, were lost. The members of the invading force took away all the hostages—dead, injured or otherwise. They also took away all their members of the invading force—again, dead or injured. Therefore, it is for Israel to answer regarding the whereabouts of Mrs. Dora Bloch.

256. The press reports and diplomatic sources according to which one diplomat saw Mrs. Dora Bloch in hospital on Sunday are false. There is no concrete information about it. Everyone knows about the aggression that was launched against the people of Uganda, which resulted in much loss of life, and my President tried his best to do everything peacefully, but the Israeli aggression would not allow this. So it is Israel that is responsible for answering as to the whereabouts of Mrs. Dora Bloch.

257. I have done my very best to avoid mentioning Kenya, as it is a sister State and a neighbouring State of Uganda. Unfortunately, the representative of Kenya mentioned Uganda in his statement. I had in mind the Organization of African Unity, and the fact that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mauritius is here, and did not intend to say much about Kenya.

258. So I should like the Council to know exactly what are the facts regarding Kenya on this invasion. On 1 July a special Israel military mission was dispatched to Nairobi to communicate the decision on

the invasion to the Kenya authorities and, presumably, obtain their clearance and assistance in the operation. We have irrefutable evidence that that request was readily granted. Besides our own sources of information, I should like to quote from a story on the incident filed from Nairobi by a Mr. James MacManus and published in the London newspaper *The Guardian* of Monday, 5 July. That story reads, in part as follows:

"Although the Kenyan Government has offered no statement on the attack, and is unlikely to do so, officials here have been at pains to minimize the Government's role in the operation. As seen from Nairobi, the sequence of events runs as follows:

"At 9 o'clock local time on Saturday night (7 p.m. British time), a number of eyewitnesses at Kenya's busy international airport reported seeing the arrival of three troop transport planes, allegedly Israeli C-131 military aircraft.

"Shortly afterwards, an airport lounge was turned into a makeshift field hospital complete with operating table, anaesthetic equipment, and oxygen canisters. Kenya Regular Army troops and members of the para-military General Service Unit had earlier moved in to secure the airport area.

"Around midnight the three aircraft carrying Israeli troops, members of a counter-terrorist unit, took off for the one-hour flight to Entebbe."

259. From that story it is clear that Israeli invading aircraft not only were allowed to overfly Kenya but were given Kenyan landing and service facilities on their way to raid Uganda and on their way back to Israel.

260. Another version of the raid is given by another English newspaper, the *Financial Times* of Monday 5 July. That version states in part:

"According to reports from Nairobi large numbers of Israeli security men arrived in the city during last week and were much in evidence, along with Kenyan security forces, at Ambakasi airport as the Israeli aircraft refuelled and medical attention was given."

261. Although in this submission we have shown that a sister member State of the Organization of African Unity connived in the invasion of our country, we wish to state here that Uganda still regards the people of Kenya as their brothers and sisters, and we express the hope that the authorities in Kenya were somehow misled into collaborating in this heinous act. Accordingly, Uganda does not intend to undertake any retaliatory measures against Kenya for this collaboration.

262. I should like to mention here my President's statement at the time of the opening of the Organization of African Unity Summit Conference in Mauritius. He also gave booklets to all members of the Organization of African Unity proving that he had no ambitions for even an inch of Kenyan soil and that he and the people of Uganda as a whole respect the Charter of the Organization of African Unity. Fortunately, the current Chairman of that Organization is here. He will say more about the statement by my colleague from Kenya concerning alleged Ugandan claims on Kenyan soil.

263. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): The remarks by the representative of Uganda about Mrs. Dora Bloch give rise to very considerable concern, because what he has said about her is a blatant untruth; it does not accord with the facts that have been published and that are known not only to Israel but also to other countries.

264. Let me quote from *The New York Times* of today:

"... in the British House of Commons yesterday a Government minister said Mrs. Bloch had been visited in the hospital by a member of the High Commission on the day after the Israeli raid.

—that is, on 4 July—

"The diplomat reported that she was being guarded by two men in plain-clothes and that he was denied access to her when he returned an hour later.

"Mulago Hospital sources said their records showed that Mrs. Bloch was admitted last Friday,

but listed no details of her treatment or discharge from the hospital."

265. Having regard to the veracity of the statement made on this point by the representative of Uganda, I think that we can draw conclusions about the veracity of all the remaining statements he has seen fit to make before the Council.

266. Mr. BATTISCOMBE (United Kingdom): My delegation had not intended to speak today. I do so now only because of the remarks made by the representative of Uganda on the case of Mrs. Bloch. Obviously, this case has aroused very grave concern in my country.

267. The High Commissioner in Uganda—who has recently returned to Uganda—has had an interview with President Amin, and we have been promised a further statement on the case by President Amin. I therefore do not wish to say anything further on the matter at the present time.

268. I would only state that in view of the remarks made on the case of Mrs. Bloch by the representative of Uganda, we reserve our right to return to the matter and reply when we make a statement at a later moment in this debate.

The meeting rose at 9.50 p.m.

Notes

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 860, p. 105.

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2370th meeting.

³ New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1958.

⁴ Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1963.

⁵ London, Stevens and Sons, 1970.

⁶ John Bassett Moore, *A Digest of International Law* (1906), II, 412, quoted by Hans Kelsen in *Principles of International Law* (New York, Rinehart and Company Inc., 1952), p. 59.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم - استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何获取联合国出版物

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.
