

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

1940th MEETING: 12 JULY 1976

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1940)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
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 <i>a.i.</i> of the Permanent Mission of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12124)	1

UN LIBRARY
JUN 21 1985
UN/SA COLLECTION

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.

1940th MEETING

Held in New York, on Monday, 12 July 1976, at 10.30 a.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/1940)

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 11.40 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

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)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its 1939th meeting, I propose to invite the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Israel, Kenya, Mauritania, Mauritius, Qatar, Uganda and the United Republic of Cameroon to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Herzog (Israel), Sir Harold Walter (Mauritius) and Mr. Abdalla (Uganda) took places at the Council table and Mr. von Wechmar (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Doukouré (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.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the members of the Security Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Somalia requesting an invitation to participate in the Council's discussion. In accordance with the provisions of Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representative of Somalia to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

3. In view of the small number of seats available at the Council table, I invite the representative of Somalia to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when in is his turn to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Hussen (Somalia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following documents: S/12135, containing the text of a letter from the representative of Mexico, addressed to the President of the Council, and S/12136, con-

taining the text of a letter from the representative of Somalia, addressed to the President of the Council.

5. I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic, who has asked to speak on a point of order.

6. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): Permit me to take the floor now to make a statement on behalf of my delegation on a point of order.

7. I should like to stress the fact that the item on our agenda which we are discussing now is simple and clear; it deals with the criminal act of aggression committed by the Zionist, racist and terrorist entity against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Uganda, a State Member of the United Nations. The title of the item is, without any shade of doubt or ambiguity and has been unanimously agreed to by the Council. It reads as follows: "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". For that reason, Mr. President, I express my earnest hope that you will call on speakers to limit themselves to the issue before the Council.

8. On this occasion I should like to express our thanks and gratitude to the Secretary-General for the sincere efforts he made in helping to alleviate the suffering of human beings during the tragedy of Entebbe, and I join the representative of France in regretting that the Secretary-General was unable to intervene in this matter as all of us had wished him to do. We are convinced, as the representative of France said, that his great moral authority would have been a valuable asset in a situation affecting States Members. The mere fact that he has participated in the debate proves that the matter we are discussing now is very important and merits the attention of the Council.

9. Indeed, what could be more serious than a flagrant act of aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a Member State? The Secretary-General, in his statement before this Council, undoubtedly motivated by humanitarian considerations, said that to uphold the principle of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of every State was not the only element involved in considering cases of the kind which the Council is discussing today. He continued as follows:

"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." [1939th meeting, para. 14.]

10. My delegation welcomes this sincere and noble appeal by the Secretary-General to the world com-

munity, especially through the United Nations, which is taking care of this problem in the General Assembly under the agenda item "Measures to prevent international terrorism which endangers or takes innocent human lives or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms, and study of the underlying causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair and which cause some people to sacrifice human lives, including their own, in an attempt to affect radical changes".

11. We understand that it is not the intention of the Secretary-General to invite the Council to depart from its clear and agreed upon agenda. Moreover, also in this respect, I refer to document S/12134 containing the letter from the representative of the United States addressed to you, Mr. President. My delegation would like to state that the contents of the above-mentioned communication are irrelevant to the item under discussion. We express our reservations in this regard and our hope that this move is not an attempt to distract us from the agreed agenda with the intention of broadening the debate and giving an erroneous interpretation to our agenda.

12. Again, Mr. President, I hope that you will keep the debate on the line agreed upon by the Council with a view to reaching a happy and effective conclusion. My delegation will oppose any attempt to hijack the debate under the guise of debating the hijacking.

13. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic for raising this point of order.

14. I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

15. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): Mr. President, as a point of order, may I ask for your guidance: when is a point of order a point of order?

16. The PRESIDENT: The only thing I can do is to read out rule 30 of the provisional rules of procedure which says:

"If a representative raises a point of order, the President shall immediately state his ruling. If it is challenged, the President shall submit his ruling to the Security Council for immediate decision and it shall stand unless overruled."

17. I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

18. Mr. SCRANTON (United States of America): I wish to assure the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic that the intention of the letter which we have passed around is clearly to make it perfectly certain to all what are the provisions of that particular Convention¹ and that particular agreement which have great relevance—indeed, very great relevance—to this

particular debate, as outlined in the agenda, both with regard to the title of the agenda item and to the letters thereunder, which was made extremely clear in the consultations.

19. I should like to make one other comment, and that is that I hope that the Government of the Libyan Arab Republic is as interested in creating a situation in the world where we do not have hijacking as it is in not having a hijacking of this agenda.

20. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): We are not going to take up the time of the Council. We are going to continue with our debate, but I should like to assure the representative of the United States that my country, Libya, like all the African and Arab countries, has always condemned and denounced hijacking. It has signed two conventions concerning hijacking. The Organization of African Unity adopted unanimously a resolution in which hijacking was condemned by all its members. The League of Arab States has condemned hijacking and our Palestinian brothers have condemned hijacking.

21. The question here is not one of defending hijacking. It is the question of not allowing any confusing measures to cover up a wanton aggression against an independent, sovereign State. If someone wishes to discuss the question of hijacking, we are open to a discussion of it, we are ready to discuss it. We have been discussing it since 1972 in the General Assembly. If it can be put as a separate item on the agenda of the Security Council, we are ready to discuss it, but not to discuss it at the same time as a justification for aggression against an African country.

22. The PRESIDENT: In reply to this point of order, may I say that I believe that all members of the Council are aware of the item inscribed on the agenda and of the background of the wording of this item. I think that Ambassador Kikhia has referred to some relevant parts of the statement made by the Secretary-General which also shed some illumination on the whole item, because there are other relevant parts of that statement.

23. Finally, I would say that it has been the practice in the Council and it is clear to everybody that any item has always been interpreted with some latitude, and it is, of course, the duty of each participant to stick to the item, but not with such a restricted interpretation. I think that this is quite clear to everybody.

24. We shall now proceed to our debate. The first speaker is the representative of Guinea, on whom I now call.

25. Mr. DOUKOURÉ (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the delegation of the State Party of Guinea is truly proud to convey to you its sincere congratulations as you take up the presidency of the Council.

26. Our delegation has received a mandate from the Organization of African Unity to participate in the debate on the item on our agenda, but our delegation will not go into the core of the subject before it has extended its condolences to the Chinese Mission upon the passing of President Chou-teh, whose memory is inseparably associated with the difficult struggle of the Chinese people.

27. Mr. President, the country which you represent with competence and efficacy has become renowned through time and among men because of its high level of intelligence and deep understanding of the history of mankind. My country has in recent years seen expressed in friendly terms the feelings of mutual understanding which unite Italy and the Republic of Guinea.

28. Mr. President, I should like to quote a passage from one of your brilliant statements made in the Sixth Committee at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. You were then recognizing the difficulty inherent in elaborating a general definition of the expression "international terrorism", and you stated at that time:

"Like all human actions, terrorism had causes which deserved to be examined with greatest attention, even compassion. The basic position of the Italian Government in that regard was that some forms of violence had their origins in causes economic, social and therefore political in nature. Consequently the maintenance of international peace and security could not consist merely in ending conflicts, but must also involve the search for their causes and the elimination of the imbalances which characterized the international community."²

This thought of yours, Mr. President, eloquently illustrates the enlightened way in which your Government will aid in judging the complaint submitted by the Organization of African Unity with regard to the act of aggression committed by Israel against the Republic of Uganda.

29. The Organization of African Unity cannot be put out by this situation, because it firmly condemns any act of terrorism. It rises up, together with all universal forces, to condemn this evil. But condemnation should not be restricted to certain kinds of terrorism; it should be applied to the entire matter, from top to bottom—that is, to the true cause and to all its effects. The complaint stresses the act of aggression because article 1 of the Definition of Aggression contained in the annex to General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) specifies clearly and precisely what is meant by the world aggression. The desire to turn our complaint into a discourse on the nature of terrorism is merely a clear demonstration of the desire to maintain confusion by refusing to deal with the cause and by dealing only with its effects.

30. The Republic of Guinea is a young developing State. Its objective is to solve economic difficulties and all that narrows man's horizon. It desires to make the greatest possible contribution so that a world of peace, justice and universal security may be attained. That is why it energetically condemns all acts of hijackings, banditry, pillage, carnage and destruction, including the illegal and unjust occupation of foreign territories. It vigorously condemns the brutality and killing to which millions of people of Africa, Asia and Latin America are subject. Wherever one people forcibly attempts to reduce another to a bestial state, that is terrorism at its worst because it is its very roots.

31. The large countries, whose histories record much mistreatment of other peoples and so much good treatment of their own, cannot be prouder than Africa, which has terrorized no one. Members will recall that after the Second World War the League of Nations was to decide where the Jewish State was to be located. Some had proposed the Fouta-Djalon in Central Guinea; others preferred Uganda and even Angola. To make myself even clearer, I must here refer to an article entitled "When Angola was almost a Jewish State", published by the *Jewish Press* on 9 July last and therefore having an Israeli source. It says:

"With Angola, the former colony of Portugal, at the centre of world headlines in recent months, it is a remarkable fact that 65 years ago that African jungle area almost became a Jewish State. The bizarre story begins with the split within the Zionist movement in the days of Herzl. In the wake of the British offer for a Jewish homeland in Uganda and Kenya, a deep division appeared within the Zionist movement. Herzl and others, including the British Zionist Israel Zangwill, wanted to accept the offer since to them the land of Israel was the first choice but the main thing was to find any place of refuge for the oppressed Jews of East Europe. ... When the Zionists finally rejected any other land except that of Israel, Zangwill broke with them and organized his own Jewish Territorialist Association."*

This reminder is of great importance, because thousands of kilometres separate Israel from Entebbe, but Zionist aviation had to make this trajectory to meet an old dream—that of being master of Uganda.

32. Several countries were concerned by the hijackers' ultimatum, and Israel was not the only one. In their ultimatum, the hijackers communicated their demands to the Governments of Israel, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Kenya and Switzerland. All those countries save Israel adopted the best possible attitude in such circumstances—that is, they kept their wits about them and acted with tact and intelligence so as to avoid the worst.

33. If Uganda had refused to permit the landing of the airbus in distress at Entebbe, it is certain that for lack of fuel the aircraft would have crashed, immediately killing all passengers. And then the international outcry against Uganda would have been even angrier. France itself had to ask its representatives to intervene as quickly as possible and speak to President Idi Amin so that the airbus would be able to land at Entebbe. Thus Uganda cannot be reproached for having acted as it should have in such tragic circumstances. If the fact of receiving that poisoned package indicated any kind of connivance with the hijackers, then France also participated by intervening with the Ugandan Government so that the airbus might land at Entebbe.

34. France is very experienced. It knows the values of civilization and it respects international law. That is why it acted as it did. It would certainly not accept having the Loyada case serve as an example for Zionist strategy. While the other countries involved, in a spirit of full solidarity and collaboration, harmonized their actions so that the problem might be solved, Israel, with characteristic disloyalty, abused the confidence of its partners. Prouder, more stubborn, motivated by its ideas of destruction, Israel, risking the killing of all involved, forgetting its nationals, invaded alone, machine-gunned alone, assassinated alone, and, raising its bloodstained hands, cried out,

"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." [S/12123, annex.]

Not content with the disorder concerning which it does not consider itself guilty, Israel affirms that this operation

"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." [*Ibid.*]

35. Uganda has fallen victim to its own humanism and its excessive confidence in the moral values and infinite perfectibility of man. Uganda was confident of the good will of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and other countries. It felt itself involved, and was to serve as a contact in the unravelling of this sensitive matter. It waited, and it acted in accordance with reason in the face of folly. Uganda's good will was, however, thwarted by the invasion of its airport. It was waiting for negotiations; it received executioners. It was therefore a most serious piece of trickery that Uganda and Africa as a whole were faced with on 4 July 1976, the date of the bicentenary of the United States, which Israel celebrated with the carnage at Entebbe.

36. Israel declares that Africa has applauded its barbarous actions. What an odious slander! Was a

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

single African pleased to see Ugandan blood shed in that rescue operation? Is there a single African woman or African child who would have acted thus, rather than bite its nails and say, "I had nothing to do with it, but I must still pay for it". We have sad memories of Dachau, of Buchenwald, of Auschwitz. We have sad memories of the crematoriums where millions of Jews were reduced to ashes. But were those ovens in Entebbe, in Uganda, in Africa?

37. The Nazis were Israel's worst enemies. What did Israel do to punish them? And what does Israel mean when it speaks of the cowardice of the Africans? Is it not real cowardice to let the guilty lion go free and to interrogate the docile antelope? Those who were judged at Nuremberg were not really the guilty ones, according to Israel. Rather, according to the Israelis, the guilty were the peoples of Africa who learned the best lessons from the war—that is, to eliminate slavery, colonialism and imperialism! And it is upon the people of Africa that they vent their rage at not having been able to destroy Dachau and Auschwitz. They find satisfaction in burning Entebbe. To celebrate such an act, as some have done, just shows the sort of person one is the kind of morality one advocates.

38. Israel's justification for its aggression is, as we have heard, that never again will Jews experience the nightmare of being sorted out and separated from others. But who counted and separated them at Buchenwald? Was it Africa? Who counted and separated them at Dachau? Was it Africa? Who counted and separated them at Dachau? Was it Uganda? Who counted and separated them at Auschwitz? Was it President Idi Amin? Of course not. Neither Marshal Idi Amin nor Uganda nor Africa knows how to segregate or to discriminate against anybody. But instead of rising up against the Nazis, they fall upon Africa, which they believe to be weak and ready to be dismembered. Only our dignity and sense of our own worth prevent us from replying to such insolence.

39. Precedents have been cited here that supposedly served to inspire this barbarous act. Books have been spoken of, pages referred to and authors mentioned which have been interpreted so narrow-mindedly that international law would appear to give the authorization to kill everybody and to declare one's country the only peaceful country on earth. International law is too civilized, too well worked-out and too humane hot to condemn the violation of the air-space of a sovereign State, unauthorized landing in a country, and, what is worse, the destruction of the human and material resources of a State Member of the United Nations.

40. There could be no better testimony in this matter than the statements made by the commander of the Air France airbus. May I be permitted to quote *The New York Times* article of 6 July entitled "Pilot says Africans Didn't Stand In for Guinea" by Mr. James

F. Clarity, whose statement has best clarified the matter for us:

"The statement of the commander, Michel Bacos, 52 years old, appeared to contradict some accounts of the events at Entebbe airport indicating that Uganda troops had replaced the hijackers guarding the hostages.

"... Commander Bacos said 'Ugandan soldiers were never substituted for the hijackers'."*

Despite the alleged misinterpretation of the note of thanks addressed to Marshal Idi Amin, Commander Bacos said that, and we quote: "the Ugandan authorities had made efforts to assure decent material conditions for the hostages".* The French authorities, we believe, have confidence in this senior officer, the only officer in command of his aircraft. No passenger is better qualified than he is to give an accurate account of what occurred, unless for the purpose of gagging the truth and imposing a lie.

41. We wish to draw the attention of the Council to the real danger that this precedent represents—a precedent which Israel wishes to see established because it is convinced it will remain unpunished. On page 71 of the book entitled *South Africa: Civilizations in Conflict*³, which was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for international reporting, Mr. Jim Hoagland writes:

"To Afrikaners, the parallels are as obvious as they are embarrassing to the Israelis. They and the Israelis are essentially white, Europeanized peoples who have carved their own nations out of a land inhabited by hostile, non-European majorities that would destroy the two nations if Afrikaners, and the Israelis, listened to the United Nations and depended on world opinion. Their religions are similar, each being a 'chosen people'. Israel... is the other Western outpost in the third world."*

At the bottom of the page, we read:

"C. L. Sulzburger, the astute foreign affairs columnist for *The New York Times*, reported in 1971 from Johannesburg that the Israeli 1967 tactics are given major attention in South Africa's military manoeuvre schools... Sulzburger, a serious... journalist, reported 'unconfirmable rumours' that a South African mission flew to Israel during the Six-day War to study tactics and that the Israelis passed on to the South Africans secret plans of the French Mirage fighter engine they had secured in Switzerland."*

42. May we not wonder whether a secret South African mission was not to learn, in this new school of 4 July 1976, the art of invading Luanda, Maputo, Conakry or—tomorrow perhaps—Algiers? We know

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

that South Africa had adopted a law authorizing it to intervene by force anywhere in Africa, that the interests and security of the *apartheid* régime are threatened. We know that, according to the *Jewish Chronicle* of 2 July 1976, 20,000 Israelis reside in South Africa, and that in Soweto, one of the schools that was the site of the recent massacres is the Morris Isaacson Primary School, the name of which honours the memory of a Jew who settled there in 1896. We know—and *The Star*, a South African newspaper, in its issue of 24 April 1976 confirms this—that inventories of joint Israeli-South African forces have been made. As proof of this, we quote the following:

“Israeli armed forces total 34,000 regulars and 122,000 conscripts, with mobilization up to 400,000 possible within 72 hours. Our total is 50,000, of whom 35,400 are conscripts. Another 138,000 citizen force men can be called up. Israel also has far more artillery than South Africa and a formidable array of anti-tank missiles. Israel has 38 brigades...”*

Why these calculations of joint forces, if not for the purpose of formulating plans of aggression against Africa and threatening the total destruction of our peoples?

43. If in our debates we are dealing with the question of victory over international terrorism, my delegation indeed advocates the complete destruction of terrorism, starting with the destruction of its causes, that is to say, wiping out colonialism, neo-colonialism, the unlawful occupation of the territory of other States, and imperialism in general. The Republic of Guinea will never agree that the struggle against terrorism can be synonymous with the destruction of airports of other sovereign States, and my delegation regards such an act as terrorism by one sovereign State against another sovereign State.

44. If the Council fails to examine the complaint before it bearing in mind the grave consequences that will result therefrom if through complacency State-sponsored piracy is legalized, if Israel is allowed to go unpunished, this will only prove to the peace-loving world that we have fallen into the trap of the wolf who has become the shepherd, and that the only security left for our peoples is to avoid everything that might serve to set us against each other.

45. From now on there must be a clear-cut distinction made between the allies of our enemies and our own allies—our own allies being those who share the common aspirations for the peace and progress of mankind, those whose assistance will not tomorrow be a source of murder. The delegation of the Republic of Guinea is sure that the world's peoples will not be duped by the reasons put forward by Israel in this adventure. We are convinced that this operation had aims other than the liberation of the hostages. The

attack against the Ugandan MIGs and the destruction of the airport were not measures of reprisal against the hijackers, but rather measures against the sovereignty of the State of Uganda, a Member of the United Nations.

46. It is for these reasons that, pursuant to the mission entrusted to my delegation, we call upon the Council: first, vigorously to condemn Israel's act of aggression against our sister Republic of Uganda; second, to require of Israel immediate reparations for the material damages inflicted by its aircraft on the fraternal people of Uganda; and third, to take all necessary measures to prevent international law from degenerating to the point where it itself might endanger world peace and security.

47. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Guinea for the very kind words he has addressed to me and, particularly, to my country. I also wish to thank him for having quoted the statement I made in the Sixth Committee during the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. It will be very useful to me, I must say; I do not have to go and look for it now.

48. I now call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mauritius.

49. Sir Harold WALTER (Mauritius): Mr. President, I wonder whether I should congratulate you on assuming such a high office or sympathize with you, for how uneasy lies the head that wears a crown. Be that as it may, you have my best wishes for a successful term of office.

50. I should like to join the chorus of others who have spoken before me to pay a humble tribute to that great leader, Chairman Chou-teh, whose untimely death is an international loss. His example as a servant of democracy with a philosophy of persuasion rather than force will, I hope, serve those nations which need further instruction in the art of peaceful negotiations, patient discussions and forbearing tolerance.

51. As Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, I have been charged, together with our sister States Guinea and Egypt, to support our sister State, Uganda, in a just case of flagrant violation of territorial integrity and sovereignty by the State of Israel on the night of 3 to 4 July.

52. The representative of Israel at the opening of his statement [*1939th meeting*] mentioned the principle *civis romanus sum*, the principle recognizing a State's duty to defend its nationals abroad. Yes, but the world does not belong to Rome nor are Romans allowed with impunity to trample upon other nationals through bloodbaths. Rome conjures up the pinnacle of imperialism. The principle recognizing a State's duty to defend its nationals abroad is right, but it does not lure that State into raping the sacrosanct integrity of another State.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

53. Listening to the representative of Israel in his skilful use of *la magie du verbe* and the masterly exposé of his concept of sophistry in the presentation of the events leading to that fateful night, a feeble man would almost be crowded to death. If we pause and do not "let winged fancy roam", can we disregard the following facts, as evidenced by no less a person than the representative of France, who is an interested party and on whom the responsibility for the plane, the crew and the passengers lay? I quote:

"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." [*Ibid.*, para. 182.]

54. That is a very important piece of independent and objective evidence, and the Council will see, in the course of my exposé, that it is the basic tenet which will destroy the case presented to the Council by the representative of Israel. This facet of independent and factual evidence is what the representative of Israel called in his statement:

"The destination of the hijackers was, in accordance with a previously prepared plan"—the operative words are "previously prepared plan"—"Entebbe Airport, outside Kampala in Uganda." [*Ibid.*, para. 78.]

55. There is no need for me, in the light of the two statements I have just cited, to belabour this point, which can be dismissed very casually, that Uganda was no accomplice in this pervasive act of international terrorism. And yet, this was equated by the representative of Israel as: "The weight of evidence before us reveals prior knowledge and active connivance on the part of the Government of Uganda..." [*Ibid.*, para. 90]. The question of prior knowledge, from what I have just cited from the French representative's statement, is easily disposed of.

56. So we are left now with the second part of the Israeli representative's statement, regarding connivance". Let us see whether these remarks were justified and whether they are supported by the slightest atom of evidence. Here again, I go to the unchallenged evidence of the representative of France. May I point out, *en passant*, that we have heard the version of the Ugandan side and the version of the Israeli side. If there is any doubt, then let us take the independent version—that which the representative of France gave to the Council in all objectivity and coolness and without any passion whatsoever:

"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.

"On 29 June, at 1.15 p.m., Marshal 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 he, as the senior Arab Ambassador, had been chosen to represent the hijackers. Thereupon, all the conditions of the hijackers were communicated to the Governments concerned.

"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.

"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."—The importance of that paragraph is obvious as one continues reading from the statement by the Ambassador of France. Remember the times and the dates: 5 o'clock on 30 June, and 3 o'clock on 1 July, the next day.—"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".—It was the Ambassador of France who requested Marshal Idi Amin to obtain the extension of the deadline.—"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.

"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.

"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.

"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.

"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.

"On 2 July, the Ambassador of Israel made known the position of the Israeli Government."
—Take note of those dates: 1 July at 3 o'clock, and 2 July at 11 o'clock.—"It wanted the terms of the exchange to be determined beforehand." [*Ibid.*, paras. 185-194.]

57. Can we disregard the fact that it was through the President of Uganda that the passengers were allowed to leave the plane and food was brought to them? Can we disregard the fact that there was a first release of 47 passengers, through the intervention of the President of Uganda? Can we disregard the fact that 100 more hostages were released, on the intervention of the President of Uganda? Can we disregard the fact that the deadline was postponed from 1 July to 4 July at 11 a.m., through the intervention of the President of Uganda?

58. Can we, furthermore, disregard the fact that the pilot of the plane, Captain Bacos, said, as reported by a responsible newspaper, *The New York Times*, of 6 July. "The watch over us was exclusively secured by the hijackers. Ugandan soldiers were never substituted for the hijackers". *The New York Times* report goes on:

"Last night one of the plane's flight officers read a statement on behalf of the crew, complimenting President Idi Amin of Uganda for 'his constant care' of the hostages during their detention.

"Commander Bacos said tonight that the statement had been misinterpreted and what the crew meant to express was merely that 'the Ugandan authorities had made efforts to assure decent material conditions for the hostages'."

59. Can we also disregard the fact that in such delicate negotiations, with any party at that, hostility

must be brushed aside and tokens of conciliation made? Instead of being taxed with active connivance, one should recognize, in all fairness, that the President of Uganda revealed such passion, patience and diligence as, like faith, could have moved mountains.

60. Unfortunately, and sadly too, for all the efforts and expense involved Uganda got as a reward the death of some of its people, when the bugles of Israel sounded the wrath of war and the rape of Uganda to the whole world for ever. The quality of the villainy is acknowledged and praised, but the villainy itself is unforgiveable and inexcusable.

61. I do not intend to mention any other country, but it is right that Africa should be vigilant and not allow division in its ranks. Perhaps it is fitting that I quote these words of John Donne: "Do not listen for whom the bell tolls. It may toll for thee. No man is an island unto himself".

62. Whatever punishment does to a nation, it does not induce a sense of guilt. We have seen the representative of the State of Israel bask in the glory of the skilful and detailed perpetration of an outrage. But let us not forget that the currency with which one pays for peace is made up of courage and readiness to serve honour at any cost. Ambition's debt is paid.

63. The Organization of African Unity proclaimed to the world at large at its meeting in Addis Ababa in 1970 that it condemns unequivocally international terrorism in whatever shape or form, but at the same time will do everything in its power to uphold the sacred principle enshrined in both the United Nations Charter and the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, that territorial integrity and political sovereignty cannot be violated.

64. The very purpose of the United Nations is to guarantee individual security through collective and mutual protection. As Ambassador Scranton of the United States said:

"Africa symbolized the challenges and hopes of removing the last vestiges of colonialism so that all nations and peoples could choose their own destinies and overcome the burdens of economic disadvantage."

65. We are told here by the representative of Israel: "Israel's rescue operation was not directed against Uganda. Israeli forces were not attacking Uganda". [*Ibid.*, para. 121]. Yet, in the same breath, he accused the Ugandan authorities of having aided and abetted that band of terrorists, and qualified it by "active connivance"—but they did not attack Uganda; the attack was not against Ugandan soldiers.

66. We must be living in a world of dreams. Over 20 Ugandan soldiers died, and as many were wounded. Those very people who were responsible for the safe

keeping and comfort of the hostages paid the supreme sacrifice at the hands of Israeli gunmen.

67. To all intents and purposes, the trend of events since the intervention of the President of Uganda on request can lead to one—and only one—conclusion: that gradually, but consistently, the President was succeeding in defusing the time bomb, and none of the facts of that painful night augured a fatal ending to this dramatic and sordid affair.

68. Before I conclude, it is but right that I quote some gleanings of the responsible press. This will show how we must not allow our views to lead us to mistake the trees for the forest.

69. *The Guardian* wrote:

“Over the years, the repeated question has been how a nation of such military bravado and daring can be so politically cautious at the peace game. One touch of the imagination that made this rescue possible might have transformed the Middle East time and again.”

70. *The Financial Times* wrote:

“The rescue will turn into a tragedy rather than a triumph if the result is further to encourage the Israelis to ignore the reality that the problem of the Middle East is ultimately the problem of the Palestinians, and that it will begin to be solved only when the moderate Palestinian leaders are offered the hope of a negotiated settlement.”

71. As a son of Africa, and as an African, I feel with concern this violation of territorial integrity and sovereignty. What guarantee is there for the small independent nations? Have we got to live under the umbrella of fear all the time as a result of the dangerous precedent which this has constituted? But I am an optimist, and I will conclude, Mr. President, by leaving for your meditation and that of the members of the Security Council the following lines:

“Fates, we will know your pleasure.
That we shall die, we know.
It is but the time
And drawing days out that man stands upon,
His time of fearing death.
Stoop, Africans, stoop
And let us bathe our hands in this act of bloodshed
Up to the elbows and besmear our swords.
Then walk we forth even to Entebbe
And waving our red weapons over our heads,
Let's all cry 'Peace, Freedom and Liberty'.”

72. Mr. HAYNES (Guyana): Sir, unfortunately Ambassador Jackson is not here. He has, however, asked me to extend to you his warmest congratulations and those of the Guyanese delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the

month of July. As your close colleague and neighbour in this Council, he has shared with you many pleasant moments as the Council sought to come to grips with many of the complex issues which have exercised our minds over the past 18 months. Ambassador Jackson and the rest of the Guyanese delegation have every confidence that your wisdom, your proven diplomatic skills, your tact and your patience will undoubtedly enable the Council to arrive at just decisions during your term of office. In the conduct of the work of the Council you can be assured of our complete support.

73. I wish also, on behalf of our Minister for Foreign Affairs and Ambassador Jackson, to express thanks for your very kind words regarding their conduct of the proceedings of the Council during last month. Of course, the successful conclusion of the issues before the Council last month was really due to the unstinted efforts of all members of the Council.

74. Permit me, on behalf of the Guyanese delegation, to extend to the delegation of the People's Republic of China our most sincere condolences at the passing away of Comrade Chou-teh, Member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. Comrade Chou-teh played a dynamic role in charting the process of liberation of the Chinese people. His efforts have served as an inspiration to many.

75. For many, the day of 4 July had been a time of rejoicing. Millions of Americans participated in a planned celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the securing of their independent State and of their resolve to defend that sovereignty. And in that celebration, those Americans were joined by others throughout the world who uphold the ineluctable triumph of the cause of freedom, the cause of integrity and sovereignty, and the cause of the liberty of the individual human being.

76. Yet others rejoiced for another reason, for on that day some people put into operation a plan of action which, from their limited perspective, was successful. I refer to the aggression conceived, prepared and executed by the Government of Israel against the black African country of Uganda, as well as to the reaction of peoples and Governments in some sections of the world.

77. But for others, 4 July was a day of mourning, for on that day Ugandans were shot at in cold blood by Israeli invaders. Many Ugandans were killed or wounded as a result of the brazen and naked military aggression by Israel against Uganda. The Ugandans mourned, and many of us mourned with them.

78. The reasons which summon the Council in to session today are older than the United Nations itself. Pre-eminent among them is the belief of some in their innate superiority and the desire by them and others to regulate inter-State relations on the basis of might and power.

79. On the other hand, the international community has, over the years, progressively elaborated a number of fundamental norms designed to give effect to the concepts of equality of States and of sovereignty and to lead to the conduct of international relations based on respect for international law. At the apex of that law stands the Charter of the United Nations.

80. In the present case, that is, the military action by Israel against Uganda, Article 2 (4) of the Charter enjoins all Member States, including the State of Israel, to

“refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State”.

Furthermore, after 25 years of labour and effort on the part of the United Nations, a definition of aggression [*General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), annex*] was universally accepted. One of the acts which that definition qualifies as an act of aggression is

“The invasion or attack by the armed forces of a State or the territory of another State, or any military occupation, however temporary, resulting from such invasion or attack”.

81. The action taken by the State of Israel against Uganda on 4 July is nothing but naked and brutal aggression. Guyana strongly condemns Israel for its aggression against the black African country of Uganda. On 8 July, my Government issued the following statement:

“The Government of Guyana condemns in the strongest possible terms the invasion of Uganda’s territory by Israeli military forces on 3 July 1976. This act is in total contravention of the norms of international law and more particularly of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, which calls for full respect for the territorial integrity of sovereign States. By its act the Government of Israel once more demonstrates not only its total disregard for these fundamental principles, but also for the independence and sovereignty of a black African State.

“The Government of Guyana is deeply concerned at the attempts already being made to romanticize the act carried out at Entebbe Airport in an effort to remove the focus of attention from what has been essentially the invasion of one territory by another. It is this invasion, this military adventure, this total disregard of the consequences of its act—consequences that may well result in the breakdown of peace and security in the area—that must excite the conscience of mankind and call down on Israel the full force of international sanction. If it is allowed to escape the full force of international sanction, a dangerous precedent will be created to the detriment of States whose only source

of strength lies in their respect for and faith in the principles of legitimate international conduct enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.”

82. Israel’s latest act of aggression against a Member State raises many fundamental questions. Not least among them is the attempt to romanticize the act and the sustained effort—some say, a deliberate effort—to hoodwink the international community into believing that the Israeli action was legitimate and justified. How else can one rationally view the persistence with which it is reported that the Israeli officer killed at Entebbe was “shot in the back”? How else can one view the fact that the release of a large number of hostages before 4 July has conveniently been erased from the outpouring of the mass media so readily available in New York? Why, one wonders, does Israel compare its violence against Uganda with the stamping out of the slave trade when Britain ruled the waves? Does Israel imply that international law has stood still since the nineteenth century? Or is Israel seeking to be clothed in the garb of an international buccaneer?

83. But there are other questions. First, can there be any doubt that unless Israel’s action is condemned by the Council, an extremely dangerous precedent for international lawlessness would have been created? For such a precedent would seriously threaten the security of small States and leave the integrity of their territory and their sovereignty exposed to the caprices of emboldened States willing to employ the methods of bandits. Finally, one must ask rhetorically, would Israel contemplate action of a similar kind against a European State?

84. Earlier I made reference to the attempts at justification of Israel’s action against Uganda. It is being argued that the principle of sovereignty is subordinate to the principle of human freedom and that Israel has the right, whenever it in its wisdom chooses, to violate the sovereignty of other States in order to secure the freedom of its own citizens. This is nothing but a modern-day version of gunboat diplomacy, for acceptance of such a principle will send the international community down a slippery path to a situation in which might and power reign supreme.

85. The principles by which the Council should be guided are those enshrined in the Charter, upheld and preserved from erosion by the vast majority of the international community. No State, not even the State of Israel, has the right to subvert those principles and to make them subserve its own national interests. To attempt to justify the Israeli action for short-term political objectives is to hold the entire international community to ransom. Those who, like Israel, seek to give legitimacy to the violation of the sovereignty of other States are making many small States, whose faith in and commitment to international law are unshakable, hostage to the dictates of naked power. Guyana cannot willingly be a party to any such machinations.

86. In like manner, Guyana holds dear respect for human life. We do not condone hijacking; we deplore every incident in which innocent lives of men, women and children are wilfully and uselessly wasted.

87. Those who seek to misconstrue the implications of the issue with which we are faced today—that is, the aggression of Israel against Uganda—only render more difficult the global search by the international community through the General Assembly for a solution to the phenomenon of international terrorism. Guyana, for its part, remains ready to make its contribution to that ongoing search at the appropriate time and in the appropriate forum.

88. Though not as readily reflected in the media of this environment, the voices of those against aggression have not been silent. Suffice it point out that the Foreign Minister of Algeria spoke for many countries and many peoples when he said:

“This act cannot but arouse the indignation of the non-aligned countries and constitutes a dangerous precedent in the conduct of international relations, opening the way to all kinds of adventures.” [S/12132, annex.]

And the Secretary-General himself has, in a statement as courageous as it is forthright, referred to the act as a serious violation of the sovereignty of a Member State. We note that the Secretary-General's observation drew stringent commentaries from some quarters. We, however, wish to assure him of our continued support for his dedicated efforts in the cause of peace and justice.

89. In conclusion, my delegation expresses the hope that, in pronouncing itself on this issue, the Council will have a clear perception of the real issue involved and that it will not be deflected by considerations of short-term political gains from discharging its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in a manner that is consistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

90. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): Mr President, first may I offer you the congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the office of President of the Council. It gives us particular pleasure to welcome you to this office as the representative of a fellow member country of the European Economic Community, with which we have extremely close and cordial relations. We are delighted that this important meeting should be taking place under your presidency. May I also congratulate your predecessors, the Foreign Minister of Guyana and Ambassador Jackson, for the skilful way in which they conducted our sometimes exhausting debates during the month of June.

91. I should also like to take this opportunity to extend our most sincere condolences to the delegation of China on the death of Mr. Chou-teh.

92. This meeting of the Council has been called to consider the events which took place at Entebbe International Airport on the night of 3 to 4 July, and in particular the action undertaken by the Government of Israel to secure the release of a number of Israeli hostages held there. As we all know, however, events did not start there but rather with the hijacking on 27 June of an Air France jetliner on a flight from Athens to Paris. At the outset, therefore, I must put on record in the strongest possible terms my Government's utter condemnation of this act of air piracy and of the subsequent holding hostage for several days of over 250 innocent passengers and crew at Entebbe Airport. It is intolerable to my Government that, in the year 1976, the international community should still be held to this kind of ransom by latter-day highwaymen. We believe it is the duty of the entire international community to make clear their condemnation and abhorrence of such evil actions, which put at risk the lives of the innocent and, indeed, strike at the fabric of the community of nations. We deeply deplore the loss of human life at Entebbe Airport which resulted from this action. At the same time, we are extremely pleased that the lives of so many of the innocent hostages were saved and that the hijacking attempt itself finally ended in the failure it so richly deserved.

93. Last Friday [1939th meeting], the Ugandan Foreign Minister, in replying to the representative of Israel, made some extraordinary and unfounded allegations about the case of Mrs. Dora Bloch, a British citizen with dual Israeli nationality. The true facts are as follows.

94. When we first had news of the hijacking of the Air France plane on 27 June, we inquired if any of the Israeli nationals among the passengers aboard had British nationality. Both Air France and the Israeli authorities later informed us that there were none still aboard. On Sunday, 4 July, we learned that among the hostages released on 2 July was Mrs. Bloch, who had been admitted to Mulago General Hospital. The British Acting High Commissioner in Kampala was immediately instructed to assist Mrs. Bloch in leaving Uganda.

95. A member of the High Commission staff visited Mrs. Bloch on the evening of 4 July in the hospital—in other words, long after the Israeli aircraft had left Entebbe Airport. It is simply not true to assert, as the Ugandan Foreign Minister did before the Council on Friday, that Mrs. Bloch had left hospital on the evening of 3 July and had been returned to Entebbe Airport so as not to jeopardize the lives of the other hostages. There is no doubt that she was still there after the Israeli action, and this is also confirmed by the fact that she was also seen in hospital by a member of the French Embassy. My Government is entirely satisfied that the Ugandans had custody of Mrs. Bloch at the time of the Israeli raid and thereafter.

96. On 9 July the British High Commissioner in Uganda was able to see President Amin. He told the President that my Government found it impossible to accept the Ugandan Government's statements, that there was great concern in Britain about Mrs. Bloch's fate and that he hoped an immediate inquiry would be conducted into her disappearance.

97. Her Majesty's Government's position is fully set out in a statement made today in the House of Commons by the Minister of State in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. I should like to quote directly from it:

"On 7th July I"—that is, the Minister of State—"told the House that we were sending our High Commissioner back to Kampala to discuss Mrs. Bloch's disappearance urgently and fully with the Ugandan Government. Mr. Hennessy"—that is, our High Commissioner—"saw President Amin on 9th July. On 10th July the Ugandan Government sent Mr. Hennessy a note which continued to deny knowledge of the whereabouts of Mrs. Bloch and repeated that Israel shouldered the responsibility for her as for all other hostages.

"As we said at the time, this is totally unacceptable in that Mrs. Bloch was seen by a member of the High Commission staff in hospital well after the Israeli operation at Entebbe Airport was over. We are just not satisfied with the results of any inquiries the Ugandans may have made.

"Our High Commissioner in Kampala arrived home this morning. I have had a report personally from him. As a result I deeply regret to have to inform the House that there seems little doubt that Mrs. Bloch was taken from her room in Mulago Hospital at about 9.30 p.m. local time on 4th July and that she is no longer alive. We extend our deepest sympathy to all her family. In whatever circumstances Mr. Bloch's death took place, the Ugandan Government must bring those responsible to justice."

98. From what I have already said it will be clear that I cannot tell the Council with any certainty what precisely happened to Mrs. Bloch. The strong probability is that she is now dead. There is only one Government that can know what happened to her, and if it does not know already it is the only Government that has the means of finding out—namely, the Government of Uganda. We now look to it to do so.

99. We have listened with great attention and interest to the accounts given earlier in this debate by the representative of Uganda and Israel of the events which took place from the time of the hijacking on 27 June to the action undertaken by Israel on 3 July. No one in this Council can have failed to notice the remarkably different interpretations given by the two representatives. What surely emerges very clearly

from all of this is the need to avoid a repetition of a situation in which, notwithstanding the preoccupation which many of us have with the obligation of every State to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States, a Government is driven to take unilateral action within the territory of another State in order to ensure the safety of its citizens. In the view of my delegation, it is on this aspect of the problem that the Council should concentrate its attention now, looking towards the avoidance of such events in the future rather than seeking to pass judgement on what took place at Entebbe.

100. This problem of hijacking is an international problem which faces us all equally. Already in the brief time that has elapsed since the events which we are considering, a further hijacking incident has taken place, this time involving a Libyan aircraft, which happily did not result in any casualties. Equally important, it is a problem which can be satisfactorily dealt with only by a concerted effort by the whole international community. I should say that in my country it would seem incredible if the Council should address itself to what happened at Entebbe without at the same time considering what should be done about hijacking. It would not only be incredible, it would be dishonest. We cannot examine half the case; we have to try to deal with the whole of it.

101. Already a certain number of steps have been taken in connexion with hijacking. Members of the Council will recall the decision which we adopted by consensus on 20 June 1972 [S/10705]. Other international action has also been taken in the form of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970;¹ the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, concluded at Montreal on 23 September 1971;⁴ and also the Standards and Practices Governing Airport Security and Aircraft Safety recommended by the International Civil Aviation Organization. What is needed now, it seems to us, is, first, to make the existing international action which has already been taken as effective as possible and to ensure the maximum compliance with it by all members of the international community. Second, we should consider whether there is any further action which the international community, and specifically the United Nations, can take to supplement these measures so as to prevent further acts of hijacking and to punish those responsible. Let us try to use the events of recent weeks as a catalyst for international action in this field to make it as certain as we can that future acts of hijacking will not succeed. Only in this way will we be able to make a real contribution to the solution of a problem which confronts us all, and to fulfil the primary aim of the Council in helping to maintain international peace and security.

102. The Council must now give thought to the terms of a draft resolution which comprehends the various

factors that have been stressed by different speakers here; and it must do so in no partisan, or one-sided, fashion but in a deliberate and considered way. If the Council were to ignore one or other of the principal strands, it could hardly expect the expression of its views to be acceptable to the world outside, the world of ordinary men, women and children who may find themselves caught up in, and indeed the victims of, violence, wherever they may live.

103. We, together with our colleagues in the delegation of the United States, have therefore set out to incorporate these various factors in a draft resolution [S/12138] which has now been submitted. We have tried to bring together the question of hijacking and the necessity to ensure safety of air travel, on the one hand, with the necessity to respect sovereignty and territorial integrity on the other.

104. Our draft starts by noting the letters of the two principal parties, and by recalling the concern of the international community for safety in air travel as exemplified by The Hague and Montreal Conventions and the obligations which those conventions impose upon the parties to them. I believe that those considerations are common ground between us all.

105. We then come to the operative paragraphs and start at the beginning, as the chain of events which ended at Entebbe started, with hijacking. Paragraph 1 condemns—and there surely is no one here who does not condemn—the hijacking. Paragraph 2 deals specifically with events in Uganda. It deplores the loss of life which resulted from that hijacking. With paragraphs 3 and 4 we move from matters of fact to the two principles on which the debate here has been concentrating: on the one hand, sovereignty and territorial integrity; on the other hand, the safety of international civil aviation. Paragraph 3 reaffirms the need to respect sovereignty and territorial integrity in accordance with the Charter and international law. Paragraph 4 looks to the future and seeks to engage the international community once again in finding further means of ensuring the safety of those who travel by air.

106. To sum up, this draft seeks to recommend, with a sense of balance and of justice, an outcome to this debate which would command a wide measure of support from the Council.

107. This is bound to be a difficult debate. It involves questions that affect us all. On the one hand, there is the principle of territorial integrity; on the other hand, there is the equally valid consideration that States exist for the protection of their peoples, and they have the right, perhaps the duty, to exercise that right.

108. In judging the events at Entebbe, these two principles have to be reconciled. They can be reconciled only by an approach along the lines of the draft resolution submitted by the United States of America and ourselves.

109. The international community is deeply divided on this issue. It is surely the function of this Council, above all, to try to bridge those divisions, not to deepen them. I therefore commend this draft resolution to the Council in the hope that, once the excessive rhetoric has subsided, wisdom and the rule of law may yet prevail.

110. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for the congratulations he addressed to me personally. I especially appreciated the reference made by Ambassador Richard to the close partnership of our two countries in the European Community.

111. Mr. SUNDBERG (Sweden): First of all, Mr. President, allow my delegation to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency for this month. Some time ago in the Council you expressed the hope that this month would be a quiet one. Your wish has obviously not been granted. But it is a source of great satisfaction to our delegation that it is under your wise and experienced leadership that we are now going to hold this important debate. Let me, at the same time, also express my delegation's great debt of gratitude to Ambassador Jackson of Guyana, and to his distinguished Foreign Minister, for the diplomatic skill with which they conducted the affairs of the Council during the indeed very busy month of June.

112. My delegation would also like to offer its sincere condolences to the delegation of the People's Republic of China on the death of Marshal Chou-teh, who had played such a leading and important role throughout the history of the People's Republic.

113. It is appropriate that the United Nations and, in particular, the Security Council should be the forum for a discussion of this terrible drama that has the attention of the whole world. The principles relevant to these events are of such importance for the security of all nations that a discussion here is indeed entirely justified. Our task is to assess what has happened against the background of the provisions of the Charter. We must undertake this task in a spirit of balanced judgement, keeping in mind the overriding interest, shared by all of us, of promoting equity and lawfulness in international relations.

114. Let me first of all, on behalf of the Swedish Government, express again our feelings of relief for the return of the crew and nearly all the passengers of the hijacked plane. I wish also to repeat our condolences and to voice our sorrow at the death of many persons from several countries.

115. The drama was started by an abhorrent act of terrorism perpetrated by a group of extremist Palestinian Arabs and Europeans. There is no excuse for this criminal act. Whatever the motives, whatever the circumstances, terrorist acts, such as the holding of hostages for ransom to achieve political

aims, must be categorically and unequivocally condemned.

116. We should remember that an action of this kind is a serious crime, whether it is undertaken in peace or as a method in armed conflict. Even in such a conflict, civilians are expressly protected under universally accepted standards. No claim by terrorists that their deeds are justified as a method of warfare can therefore be accepted.

117. There is widespread agreement that the world must react vigorously against terrorist acts and take all possible protective measures. New efforts must be undertaken to achieve broad international agreement to combat terrorism, in the form of generally recognized standards of international conduct. We must work towards general recognition of the clear obligation resting on every State to do everything in its power, where necessary in collaboration with other States, to prevent acts of terrorism and, even more, to refrain from any action which may facilitate the perpetration of such acts. In particular, any State where hijackers land with hostages must be prepared to shoulder the heavy responsibility of protecting all victims under circumstances which are bound to be difficult and delicate.

118. In the case which is now before us, queries have been raised which cannot be dismissed as to the compliance of the Ugandan Government with the principles just indicated.

119. The principle embodied in Article 2 (4) of the Charter is fundamental to the world order to which we subscribe as Members of the United Nations. We are thereby all enjoined "to refrain in [our] 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".

120. This principle has been quoted and invoked on innumerable occasions. This is understandable, for it seeks to protect a right which all peoples find basic: the right to live in peace in their own land. The upholding of this right is of particular importance to the small and the weak States. It is they which run the greatest risks of seeing their independence threatened and becoming the victims of outside intervention.

121. The Charter does not authorize any exception to this rule except for the right of self-defence and enforcement measures undertaken by the Council under Chapter VII of the Charter. This is no coincidence or oversight. Any formal exceptions permitting the use of force or of military intervention in order to achieve certain aims, however laudable, would be

bound to be abused, especially by the big and strong, and to pose a threat, especially to the small and weak.

122. In our view, the Israeli action which we are now considering involved an infringement of the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Uganda. We understand the strong reactions against this action, which cost the lives of many Ugandan citizens and led to heavy material damage. At the same time, we are aware of the terrible pressures to which the Israeli Government and people were subjected, faced with this unprecedented act of international piracy and viewing the increasing threat to the lives of so many of their compatriots. Furthermore, when the decision to act was taken, the Israeli Government was in possession of evidence which, it felt, strongly suggested that the Government which had the responsibility for the protection of the hostages did not do everything in its power to fulfil this duty.

123. The problem with which we are faced is thus many-faceted. My Government, while unable to reconcile the Israeli action with the strict rules of the Charter, does not find it possible to join in a condemnation in this case.

124. The events which we are considering should serve as a forceful reminder that the attempts to reach a political settlement of the situation in the Middle East, taking into account the legitimate interests of all parties, must now be intensified. The *status quo* does not give peace. Time does not work for peace. A very grave responsibility rests with all the parties to do their utmost in contributing towards the achievement of a just and lasting peace. The peoples in the area must finally have the opportunity to live without the constant threat of violence, terror and war.

125. Mr. CHOU Nan (China) (*translation from Chinese*): In their speeches at this morning's meeting, the Foreign Minister of Mauritius and the representatives of Guinea, Guyana, the United Kingdom and Sweden expressed condolences on the passing 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.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

Notes

¹ Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft (Hijacking), signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970 (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 860, p. 105).

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Sixth Committee*, 1369th meeting, para. 27. (The official records of the Sixth Committee are issued in summary form.)

³ Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972.

⁴ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 974, p. 177.