

UNITED NATIONS

0063957



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

MAY 28 1985

UN/DA/S/12124

1942nd MEETING: 13 July 1976

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1942)	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

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.

1942nd MEETING

Held in New York, on Tuesday, 13 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/1942)

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 4.05 p.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 decisions taken by the Council at previous meetings [1939th to 1941st meetings], I invite the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Israel, Kenya, Mauritania, Mauritius, Qatar, Somalia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon and Yugoslavia to participate in the Council's 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; Mr. von Wechmar (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Camara (Guinea), Mr. Waiyaki (Kenya), Mr. El Hassen (Mauritania), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Oyono (United Republic of Cameroon), Mr. Hussen (Somalia) and Mr. Mujezinović (Yugoslavia) 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 Council that, in addition, I have received a letter from the representative of India 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 India to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

3. I invite the representative of India 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 it is his turn to speak.

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

4. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the first speaker, I should like to remind the members of the Council that, besides the documents listed in the

agenda, the documents relevant to the item under discussion are the following: S/12131, S/12132, S/12134, S/12135, S/12136 and S/12140.

5. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, the delegation of the Republic of Panama wishes to associate itself with previous speakers and to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of July. We are certain that you will do an outstanding job in carrying out your delicate responsibilities.

6. My delegation also wishes to express its appreciation to Ambassador Jackson of Guyana for his extraordinary performance as President of the Council for the month of June, which was a credit to him, to his country and to Latin America.

7. It was with genuine regret that the delegation of Panama learnt of the death of Mr. Chou-teh on 6 July in Peking. This illustrious Chinese statesman was Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China, and we join in the tributes to the memory of this legendary hero of the great Chinese nation. May I reiterate to Ambassador Lai Ya-li, our colleague, Mr. Chou Nan, and the members of the Permanent Mission of China our most sincere condolences.

8. The death of Mr. Gustav Heinemann, an eminent international personality who was President of the Federal Republic of Germany from 1969 to 1974, prompts my delegation to express its condolences to the people and Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on this irreparable loss.

9. Furthermore, the delegation of Panama wishes to express its solidarity with Indonesia in connexion with the earthquakes which have caused thousands of deaths in that country, and we hope that dynamic and generous international assistance will be forthcoming so as not only to alleviate suffering but also to meet the needs of the population groups that were affected by the earthquake.

10. The breach of the peace which occurred in Uganda has deeper causes than those which appear on the surface and which deserve the conscientious and sustained attention of the international community. The reasons for the tragedy which started with the hijacking of the French aircraft may be identified through the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism,¹ which, when referring to political terrorism directed against States and to its underlying causes, recognizes that a social group or a population resorts to terrorism and to violence when its rights are trampled underfoot, when it is the victim of political, social or economic injustice, and when all recourse to legal procedures to obtain justice is fruitless.

11. But there are also other causes which result from the world situation and which require that all States Members of the United Nations, and in particular the most developed countries, co-operate tangibly for their solution. These are problems which, as they become more acute, will bring about major social turmoil, and unless they are given priority will cause the destabilization of mankind. One of the most urgent problems was highlighted in the report of the World Food Council, which recently met in Rome. The report states that unless the nations make greater joint efforts, the world is headed for a disastrous global famine by 1985. On the other hand, the recent Habitat Conference held in Vancouver has shown that the world population, which is now 4,000 million, will double within the next 30 years. Therefore, public services will also have to double. Health problems will assume tragic dimensions. Accordingly to the same sources, although 60 per cent of the world's population lives in rural areas, there is a steady outflow of migrants to the urban areas, so that within the next 25 years most of the inhabitants will be massed in the cities, thereby naturally aggravating urban problems. United Nations experts estimate that in order to meet the population growth, developing countries will, in the next 20 years, have to create as many jobs as the developed countries have created over the last 200 years. Three quarters of the world's population live from hand to mouth in developing countries while 80 per cent of the world's wealth is concentrated in the hands of 20 per cent or less of the population. The housing problem is taking on the proportions of Dante's inferno. In 1974, the developing world had to import 27 million tons of cereals and this is expected to rise to 80 million tons in the next decade. About half the cities of Latin America lack piped water and sewerage. In some parts of Africa and Asia, only one house out of five has piped drinking water. United Nations specialists estimate that 500 million children—that is to say, one eighth of the world's population—suffer from malnutrition.

12. In contrast with this ominous social picture, the Secretariat's latest figures for military expenditures for 1973 was between \$205,000 million and \$235,000 million at constant 1970 prices, and \$240,000 million to \$275,000 million at 1973 prices. This figure is higher than the estimated combined gross national product of the developing countries of southern Asia, the Far East and Africa, and far higher than that of Latin America.

13. In the opinion of experts, all this will bring about tremendous complications in human settlements in future years. It is also considered that all the factors to which we have referred, which together promote urban concentrations of population and poverty, are also an invitation to terrorism, which may be individual terrorism, political terrorism or State terrorism.

14. Panama attaches the utmost importance to the complaint made by the Prime Minister of Mauritius.

the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, of "the act of aggression" by Israel against the Republic of Uganda, the impact of which has been clear from the significant number of States not members of the Council who have attended these meetings to put their views on.

15. The delegation of Panama would like to avail itself of this opportunity to reiterate to the Organization of African Unity its unalterable anti-colonialist stance and its opposition to any kind of discrimination. For years in the United Nations, we have been on the side of the African peoples, which have been steadily struggling to eradicate from their continent the inhuman practices of racial discrimination. *Apartheid*, which is the most shameful manner of oppressing peoples, has been energetically rejected by the Government and people of Panama. Everywhere, Panama has raised its voice, loud and strong, against the régimes of white supremacy which, running counter to the advance of history, persist in keeping large groups of African peoples under the most humiliating and absurd exploitation.

16. Because of the deep and unstaunched wounds to its sovereignty and territorial integrity in its geographical heartland, Panama cannot be indifferent to the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of any country in Africa or in the world.

17. Panama knows full well how painful colonial situations are because it is itself divided by the colonial enclave of the Canal Zone, which has deprived the Panamanians of their two main ports on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. This untenable situation is a permanent source of tension and exposes the inhabitants of my country to unforeseeable consequences and risks. The inalienable rights of the Panamanian people have been trampled underfoot for 73 years by a treaty giving the other party the lion's share treaty which is absolutely without justification nowadays. It is therefore perfectly natural for Panama to be a firm supporter of the United Nations policy of decolonization.

18. In this year of the bicentennial of the independence of the United States, and as we celebrate the Amphictyonic Congress convened by the Liberator Simón Bolívar, which is linked to the best values of democracy, human rights, fundamental freedoms, national sovereignty and anti-colonialism, we hope that a final agreement will be reached for a just and equitable treaty which will meet Panama's claims. The protracted negotiations with the United States, which have been going on for 12 years, will be delayed somewhat further because of the North American elections. But our Head of Government, General Omar Torrijos, has set the target of 1977 for the decolonization of Panama. Torrijos has declared that by 1977 the patience of the Panamanians and the excuses of the United States would be exhausted. Panama cannot be out of touch with history or contemporary thinking. All the major international canals with the sole excep-

tion of the Panama Canal are under the control of the territorial sovereign. Just as the Suez Canal is Egyptian and the Kiel Canal is German, the Panama Canal must be Panamanian. That is our absolute right.

19. In this debate there has been no lack of countries reproaching the United Nations for its apparent ineffectiveness in maintaining international peace and security. Those who speak thus overlook the constructive achievements of the Organization, which, like the wolf of Roman mythology, has suckled and sustained the political existence of many States. But this has not made the Organization immune from attack because of its creative activities for the benefit of mankind. Like Prometheus, it is exposed to the vulture of ingratitude which devours its entrails.

20. Those who criticize the United Nations are not censuring the Organization but the Governments of its Member States. The effort to reorganize the international community within the system of collective security which the San Francisco Charter attempted to shape is the responsibility of all States, which have not only committed themselves to act in such a way as to maintain international peace and security but have agreed to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter.

21. In debating the item on its agenda regarding the complaint made by the Prime Minister of Mauritius, the Council must necessarily confront two acts of violence: one perpetrated by an extremist group of Palestinian Arabs and Europeans, calling itself the "Gaza Brigade of the Guevara Group of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine", which hijacked the Air France airbus over Greece, taking 256 hostages, who were flown to Entebbe Airport at Kampala; and the other perpetrated by forces of the Israeli army, which violated the air space as well as the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Uganda with an operation to rescue the Israeli hostages.

22. The International Court of Justice has established its own definition of an international illegal act. It defines such an act as one which violates a rule of international law and therefore gives rise to responsibility.

23. Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which was the outcome of a trend in public opinion produced by the tragic results of the Second World War, 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."

24. It was precisely my country, Panama, which submitted the proposal which gave rise to resolution

178 (II) of 21 November 1947 whereby the General Assembly decided to instruct the International Law Commission to prepare a draft declaration on the rights and duties of States, taking as a basis for discussion the draft declaration on the rights and duties of States presented by Panama. The Draft Declaration on the Rights and Duties of States [*General Assembly resolution 375 (IV), annex*] prepared by the International Law Commission at its first session, which in general follows the text submitted by the Panamanian jurist Mr. Ricardo J. Alfaro, establishes *inter alia* that: every State has the duty to refrain from intervening in the internal or external affairs of any other State; every State has the duty to refrain from fomenting civil strife in the territory of another State, and to prevent the organization on its territory of activities calculated to foment such civil strife; every State has the duty to refrain from resorting to war as an instrument of national policy, and to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of another State, or in any other way inconsistent with international law and order; every State has the right of individual or collective self-defence against armed attack.

25. My country has a well-established tradition of protecting human rights and the principles of international law regarding friendship and co-operation among States, which is proved by the historical evidence that the first draft of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Rights and Duties of States were submitted by Panama as one of the priority tasks of the Organization which came into being as a result of the San Francisco Charter.

26. There can be no doubt, then, that in the case we are discussing there are two acts of force without legal basis—one committed by a State against another Member State and the other carried out by civilians moved by political passion.

27. If aggression, as defined in General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), 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", it is obvious that the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Uganda by the military operation carried out at Entebbe Airport by the Israeli army constituted a use of force not authorized by the Charter, which only permits enforcement actions by the United Nations or legitimate individual or collective self-defence against armed aggression. Israel was not the victim of an armed attack by Uganda, and therefore its act of aggression was not legitimate. Israel's invoking the right of self-defence to justify its act parallels the mental attitude of those advocates of terrorism who argue that against arbitrariness, injustice, the denial of fundamental human rights and trampling under foot of the right of self-determination, any act of violence to change the

existing situation is an act of legitimate self-defence. Nevertheless, those who study and interpret contemporary insurrections consider that terrorism has failed as a system of revolutionary struggle and that organized political terrorism is a perversion of political struggle. But, even so, terrorism continues to be an instrument of political combat nevertheless. The extremists have not abandoned it in their efforts to agitate public opinion and mobilize the masses.

28. Concerned at the frequency of such acts, the General Assembly adopted its resolution 3034 (XXVII) entitled "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". Under that resolution, the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism was established. It consisted of 35 members and met under the chairmanship of the present Foreign Minister of Panama, Mr. Aquilino Boyd, at United Nations Headquarters, from 16 July to 11 August 1973. At the conclusion of its labours the Committee submitted its report on international terrorism to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session.¹ Action on this is still pending, but it is to be on the agenda of the thirty-first session. The Secretary-General has been referring to it in his annual reports on the work of the Organization in the last few years.

29. In the course of the Committee's work Venezuela submitted a draft proposal which constitutes a good summary of the concerns of the Committee regarding the definition of international terrorism and its underlying causes. According to the Venezuelan proposal, international terrorism is

"Any threat or act of violence which endangers or takes innocent human lives, or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms, committed by an individual or group of individuals on foreign territory, on the high seas or on board an aircraft in flight in the air space superjacent to the open or free seas for the purpose of instilling terror and designed to achieve a political goal.

"Inhuman repressive measures carried out by colonial or racist régimes, and all measures conducive to the exercise of alien domination, in denying peoples their legitimate right to self-determination and independence and other human rights and fundamental freedoms, shall also be deemed to be acts of international terrorism.

"Serious bodily harm, murder, the taking of hostages, kidnapping, the sending of letter-bombs and damage to objects and property, when committed in foreign territory, or by or against foreigners, for the purpose of instilling terror with a

view to achieving a political objective, shall also be deemed to be acts of international terrorism, since they constitute offences against social morality and violations of the dignity of the human person.'"²

30. In our opinion, the work of the Committee is a splendid contribution that should be taken into account in any future action, especially as regards the underlying causes of international terrorism and measures for its prevention. Some delegations have invoked as justification for Israel's action the right of that State to protect its nationals who had been kidnapped on foreign territory. We must point out, however, that the International Court of Justice at The Hague, though admitting that it is an elementary principle of international law that a State has the authority to protect its nationals who have been harmed by acts contrary to international law committed by another State, at the same time limits that right to the exercise of diplomatic or international judicial action and, in any case, to the means for the peaceful settlement of disputes laid down in Article 33 of the Charter.

31. The military action taken by Israel is not, therefore, characteristic of the right of a State to protect its nationals, as this right is envisaged in the Charter among the peaceful means for the settlement of disputes, but rather becomes an act of armed intervention such as those frequently resorted to by powerful countries against the weaker countries. The grievous occurrence at the Entebbe airport, resulting in a tragic toll in dead and wounded that has brought grief to homes and families in Uganda, Israel, Germany, England and Arab countries, demands concerted action on the part of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretariat to eradicate the causes that underlie acts of terrorism and the hijacking of aircraft in flight, involving grave danger to the life and well-being of the crew and disregarding the most elementary humanitarian considerations.

32. The presence, in actions of this kind, of Palestinian Arabs has, without doubt, as its underlying cause resentment at the delay in implementing the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine, rights which include, by decision of the General Assembly, the right to self-determination and the right to national independence and sovereignty. We are in favour of respect for and recognition of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States in the region and of their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from the threat or use of force.

33. The Government of Panama, with all due respect to the members of the Council who have sponsored the draft resolutions submitted for its consideration, is of the opinion that the question cannot be resolved by condemning either Israel or those responsible for the hijacking of the Air France airbus, or through the award of reparations to the Republic of Uganda. My delegation will therefore abstain when the two draft resolutions are put to the vote.

34. Mr. DATCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, in offering you our most cordial congratulations on your assumption of the Presidency of the Council for the month of July, I should like to assure you of the confidence and unreserved support of the Romanian delegation. Your outstanding personal qualities, your long and rich diplomatic experience, so well known and highly appreciated, are for us, we are convinced, the best possible guarantee that the deliberations of this important body will be conducted in a competent and impartial fashion. It is with both pleasure and satisfaction that I also venture to mention on this occasion the excellent relations existing between Romania and your own country, Italy, as well as the long-standing ties of traditional friendship between our two peoples of common origin.

35. Allow me also to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessors in the chair, Mr. Wills, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guyana, and Ambassador Jackson for the competence with which they directed the Council's debates during the long month of June.

36. The Romanian delegation would like to associate itself, too, with your own words, Sir, in conveying to the delegation of the People's Republic of China its profound condolences on the grievous loss sustained by the fraternal people of China at the passing of Comrade Chou-teh, a distinguished leader of the Chinese Party and State, who devoted his whole life to the struggle for the victory of the cause of the social and national liberation of the Chinese people and for the triumph of the revolution and the building of socialism in the People's Republic of China.

37. We should also like to express our profound condolences to the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany on the death of the former President, Mr. Gustav Heinemann.

38. The Council now has before it the complaint submitted by the Prime Minister of Mauritius, current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, in connexion with the military raid by Israel on Entebbe Airport in Uganda. The account of the facts by the parties concerned indicates that the armed action undertaken by Israeli troops was aimed at freeing a group of passengers detained as hostages at that airport following the hijacking in flight on 27 June of an Air France airbus. Another result was that the military raid on Entebbe caused the death of many Ugandan citizens and also considerable material damage.

39. The Romanian delegation believes that the Council, in considering the item on its agenda, should have in mind the provisions of international law as laid down in the Charter and in the documents of the United Nations. It should be stressed in this connexion that the Charter of our Organization enshrines the principle that it is the duty of States in their relations

with all other States to refrain from the threat or use of force. This principle forms part of the *jus cogens* and is of universal application. It is true that Article 51 of the Charter recognizes the right of States to legitimate individual or collective self-defence but this right may be exercised only when the State concerned is the victim of an armed attack. In the case before the Council the conditions of Article 51 of the Charter have not been met.

40. Romania disapproves of and condemns acts involving the threat or use of force in international relations, as well as armed attacks on the territory of other States and, indeed, any attempts to violate the territorial integrity, sovereignty or independence of States wherever these acts may be committed and whatever the circumstances and the pretexts invoked. Experience has shown that such armed attacks and other similar acts involving the use of force cannot lead to a settlement of international problems; on the contrary, they only make them worse. Such acts cannot possibly be accepted or tolerated for the simple reason that they represent an infraction of international law, a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and an attempt to replace law by force.

41. As has been stressed in the course of this debate, the military raid on Entebbe formed part of a chain of events triggered off by the hijacking of the Air France airbus.

42. In this connexion we should like to make it clear once again that Romania disapproves of and condemns acts of international terrorism, including aerial hijacking and the taking of hostages. International terrorism is a profoundly negative phenomenon, a disturbing phenomenon which harms co-operative relations among States and confidence between peoples.

43. Acts of terrorism against innocent persons cannot be considered as revolutionary means of struggle, even if they are undertaken in a noble cause. Such acts have never had and cannot have the desired results. On the contrary, they are prejudicial to the genuine interests of the peoples' struggle against imperialism and for freedom and national independence.

44. Moreover, we should not confuse or identify the peoples' struggle for national liberation with terrorism. The struggle for national and social liberation is a legitimate and lawful struggle in keeping with the deepest aspirations of peoples. It is in keeping with the Charter and the norms of international law and has been so recognized by our Organization. That is why Romania has given whole-hearted support to the peoples struggling for their national liberation, and we are determined to continue doing so.

45. The violation of Ugandan sovereignty by Israeli military aircraft is an illegal act and, consequently,

inadmissible and dangerous to international peace and security. Such armed actions undertaken by States, with premeditation, against the sovereignty of other States cannot possibly be placed on the same footing, as the irresponsible acts of isolated individuals, in an attempt to justify such acts by individuals. That is why the Romanian delegation believes that the Council should take a firm stand, in keeping with the Charter, on acts of force committed against Uganda and in favour of respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of that country, thus ensuring the primacy of international law over force.

46. At the same time, we are aware that the dangerous spiral of violence and lawlessness in international life can be halted only by joint, concerted action by all Governments. We therefore believe that the United Nations and the Security Council should, with a view to finding appropriate remedies, give more consideration to the negative phenomena in international life which revive and foster hatred among peoples and which complicate and impair relations between States.

47. We believe that the action of the United Nations would be more effective if it were also to include preventive measures and if it were aimed at harmonizing the efforts of the nations for the achievement of the common goals of respect for international law and justice, in the interest of mankind as a whole without any discrimination.

48. Mr. ABE (Japan): Mr. President, I should like first to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of July. It is a particular pleasure for me to see you in the presidency because you are not only one of the most outstanding Ambassadors of Italy, with which my country has always enjoyed traditional relations, but you have for many years shown a particularly warm friendship towards me, both officially and personally. My delegation looks forward to working with you and with all the members of the Council under your wise guidance, and assures you of its full confidence, support and co-operation.

49. My delegation would also like to express its congratulations and appreciation to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guyana and to Ambassador Jackson for the exemplary manner in which they conducted our proceedings in the month of June, which were indeed demanding.

50. My delegation wishes to join other speakers in expressing to the delegation of China most sincere condolences on the untimely death of Chairman Chou-teh, who was one of the greatest leaders of the People's Republic of China.

51. My delegation would also like to express its sincere condolences to the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany on the demise of Mr. Gustav Heinemann, that country's former President.

52. My delegation has listened with the utmost attention to the statements made by the preceding speakers, particularly those of the representatives of the Republic of Uganda and of Israel [1939th meeting], the principal parties in the present dispute.

53. I should like to state, first of all, that my delegation followed with great anxiety the course of these events from its beginning on 27 June. Our concern was particularly grave since Japan itself has fallen prey to similar hijacking and international terrorism several times in recent years.

54. It is the firm belief of my Government that international terrorism, whatever form it may take, constitutes an abhorrent crime against mankind and must be denounced in the strongest terms by the world community. The countries of the world must take effective measures to prevent and eliminate such a crime against humanity, and they are required to co-operate fully with each other in attaining this goal.

55. Based on this conviction, the Government of Japan has taken an active role in formulating international agreements such as the Convention for the Suppression of the Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970,³ to which Japan is a party. Our Government has also constantly given full support to the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council designed to prevent and eliminate hijacking and international terrorism. Would any of the Member States represented on the Council or any of the delegations participating in the debate dare condone hijacking and international terrorism such as occurred in the present case? What we will need to do, therefore is to implement our common view to the fullest extent.

56. First, all possible measures must be taken to prevent such a crime. If they fail and the crime is committed, we must join our efforts in the fight against the common enemy, regardless of whatever differences, political or otherwise, might exist between us. It goes without saying that our efforts must be aimed above all at saving the lives of the innocent victims of the crime. The hijacking of an Air France plane was exactly the type of case which I have just described. Again this time, prevention was not found effective, but when the hijacking occurred, all the Governments involved made joint efforts to save the hostages of the plane. It is a matter of deep regret, however, that while most of the hostages could be saved, we had to see the loss of many human lives also. My delegation expresses its deep sympathy and condolences to those victims and their bereaved families. The tragic end of the incident underscores once again the need for reaffirming our determination to pursue all possible means, both preventive and punitive.

57. The Air France hijacking was terminated in an extraordinary circumstance, namely, military action by a State within the territory of another State. Al-

though the motives as well as the circumstances which led Israel to take such action were presented in detail to the Council by the representative of Israel, my delegation is bound to state that there was an act of violation by Israel of the sovereignty of the Republic of Uganda. This fact cannot be overlooked. My delegation strongly believes that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of any State must be respected by other States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and international law.

58. My delegation reserves its opinion as to whether the situation which led to the Israeli military action meets the conditions required for the exercise of the right of self-defence recognized under international law, as the Israeli representative seemed to contend.

59. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Mauritius for a point of order.

60. Sir Harold WALTER (Mauritius): Mr. President, yesterday, in the course of the debate, you were asked a very pertinent question: "When is a point of order a point of order?" [1940th meeting, para. 15.] Well, I am putting it to you today that this debate cannot be allowed to travel in a world of personal likings. The Council has a clear issue before it which you all agreed should be discussed. This issue today is haloed by something which is extraneous to the issue before the Council. And more than this: a draft resolution has been submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States of America [S/12/38] which is unacceptable, according to all norms of procedure and contrary to the issue which is before this Council.

61. The point of order arises from the fact that what is being discussed, apart from the very issue before us, which is clear, is not only extraneous to the issue, it is irrelevant to the debates. I humbly submit that we cannot allow, if only for the sake respecting the normal and correct procedure in our debates, something to be debated which is totally irrelevant and totally extraneous to the issue before the Council. If we want to discuss that issue, let it be put on the agenda; then we can discuss it. But can this draft resolution even be receivable when the issue before the Council is clear and has been accepted by the Council?

62. I submit, Mr. President, with all due respect—and you may rest assured of my collaboration and co-operation to help you in your difficult task—that you should give a ruling as to whether it is possible for an extraneous and irrelevant matter to be brought into our debate just for confusion—to hover around the main issue.

63. The PRESIDENT: In answer to the point of order raised by the representative of Mauritius, I might remind him that in the verbatim record of the other day's meeting this point of order has already been raised and settled. Nevertheless, out of respect for

you, Sir, I did not interrupt you when you raised this point of order which, to my mind, has already been settled.

64. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): I apologize for taking the floor now, but I should like to support the point of order raised by the Foreign Minister of Mauritius. In fact, my delegation raised the same point of order yesterday, and I think it was not settled. I made an appeal to you, Mr. President, and we are still hoping that you will do everything you can to keep the discussion in line and within the framework of the subject and the item agreed to by the Council.

65. The PRESIDENT: I might remind the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic that he himself said the other day, speaking about the draft resolution introduced by the delegation of the United Kingdom, that he agreed that there was no objection to the submission of a draft resolution—that any delegation had the right to introduce a draft resolution which it thought would be relevant to the item under discussion, and that this was a right he himself recognized. So I think this adds even more weight to what I stated before.

66. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): Yesterday, when I commented on the move made by the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States, I expressed my disappointment that it was not along the lines of the normal procedure of consultations, courtesy and the established practice in the Council.

67. As the representative of the United Kingdom said, there is nothing in the rules that can prevent him from presenting a draft resolution, to which I replied that I knew there was nothing in the rules to prevent him from presenting a draft resolution. But the point raised now is not a question of the right of any delegation to present a draft resolution; the question raised by the Foreign Minister of Mauritius was whether this draft resolution was relevant or irrelevant. It is not; it has nothing to do with the item we are discussing. This is the point of the Foreign Minister of Mauritius, and I agree with him in that.

68. Mr. President, we trust you, and we hope you will guide our work on the right path so that we can achieve success in our discussion in the Council. You are “commanding” our work, and as you say in your beautiful language, “*Chi commanda fa legge*”.

69. The PRESIDENT: I hope that our work is not a command.

70. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): I only wish to say that I agree with what the representative of Libya said yesterday, as reported in the verbatim record of our proceedings. He said this:

“I should like only to correct the representative of the United Kingdom. I did not say he did not

have the right to propose any draft resolution. I said it is a question of courtesy...” [1941st meeting, para. 192.]

and a little later on he said—and I agree very much with this:

“It is always a delicate matter. And then, after that, any country can propose a draft resolution.” [Ibid.]

And finally, he accused me of being “not orthodox” [ibid., para. 193].

71. It does seem to me that, whatever his views on my orthodoxy, my courtesy or my lack of normal consultation, the one thing it cannot be, with due respect to him or the Foreign Minister of Mauritius, is a breach of the rules of the Council. Any delegation has the right to propose any draft resolution. We have done so. The remedy thereafter, if it is put to a vote, lies with the members of the Council.

72. The PRESIDENT: May I appeal to our colleague and friend from Libya, as well as to all members of the Council, not to raise procedural questions. These have already been settled in my own mind; this is my own conviction. This was settled yesterday, and I think we should not go back to it. We have enough problems as it is, so we should proceed with our debate.

73. The next speaker is the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

74. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): May I, at the outset, express my delegation’s condolences to the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany on the passing of the former President, Mr. Gustav Heinemann, a leader of moral standing and outstanding qualities.

75. I can appreciate the concern demonstrated by the Foreign Minister of Mauritius in introducing his point of order.

76. The mention of such imagined errors in my speech as he may have drawn attention to was, I believe, prompted by expediency, and not by his own moral or legal convictions. I say this because we both benefited from the same education in the same distinguished centre of legal studies. The principles of natural and international law which we both absorbed entirely justified the Israeli action at Entebbe, as the Foreign Minister of Mauritius knows only too well.

77. The weight of the evidence to prove Ugandan complicity has been growing by the day as the detailed statements of the hostages are analysed and new evidence becomes available. We now know from the debriefing of the passengers that the map in the hands of the leader of the hijacking group, Wilfred Böse,

which he produced immediately after the plane took off from Athens, was already clearly marked with the route Athens-Benghazi-Entebbe. We know, too, as has indeed been published, that before the arrival of the plane at Entebbe, Idi Amin dispatched his personal plane to Somalia in order to pick up and bring to Entebbe the leader of the terrorists, who took control of the plane after it landed at Entebbe.

78. Furthermore, the members of the Council are fully aware by now that four terrorists hijacked the plane at Athens. The evidence which I have produced, and which other representatives have confirmed, shows that the plane was met at Entebbe Airport by reinforcements of terrorists, some five in number. Four terrorists hijacked the plane. Seven terrorists were accorded a State funeral with full military honours by the Government of Uganda. In other words, by all accounts—including, impliedly, by Ugandan accounts—terrorist reinforcements appeared on the scene in Entebbe. In fact, we know that they were driven on to the scene in two official Uganda cars, one driven by a soldier in uniform.

79. It is interesting to note that, despite the overwhelming body of evidence which confirms the fact that the hijackers were reinforced in Kampala, there is no reference to it directly in either President Amin's message contained in document S/12124 or the two statements made by his Foreign Minister here on Friday, 9 July [1939th meeting].

80. I listened carefully to the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Mauritius [1940th meeting], and nowhere was there any reference to the reinforcement of terrorists awaiting the hijackers at Entebbe. So far as is concerned, they did not exist. His eloquence in speech was equalled only by his eloquent silence.

81. Shortly after 101 hostages were released on 1 July, the following dispatch was sent from the Associated Press in Paris:

"Hostages newly released by hijackers of an Air France jetliner arrived here early today and said three or four heavily armed men, apparently Arabs, were waiting to reinforce four original hijackers when the plane commandeered over Greece landed in Entebbe, Uganda"

After the Israeli rescue operation, the French newspaper *Le Monde* gave full details of this act of aerial piracy in its issue of 5 July, which included the following:

"On their arrival at Kampala, they were joined on the field, immediately after landing, by a group of four or five Palestinians armed with sub-machine-guns."*

* Quoted in French by the speaker.

82. Similar reports appeared in many other newspapers and magazines and on many radio and television stations. All reports were based on information given by released hostages and government officials. There is not the slightest doubt in anyone's mind that in fact the hijackers were reinforced in Uganda. Careful reading of President Amin's message to the President of the Security Council at the statement by his Foreign Minister reveal an inadvertent, indirect admission of the fact that the hijackers were indeed reinforced by other terrorists in Kampala. In President Amin's message, he states that "the Israeli invaders quickly mounted an attack on the hijackers, killing seven of them" [S/12124, annex].

83. A similar reference to seven hijackers killed also appears in the Ugandan Foreign Minister's statement [1939th meeting, para. 31]. President Amin's reference to "seven of them" implies that there were more than seven. However, as we all recall, only four commandeered the Air France plane after it departed from Athens Airport. Thus, in fact, both President Amin and his Foreign Minister have implicitly admitted that the original hijackers were reinforced by more terrorists at Entebbe Airport. What better proof of Uganda's complicity in this crime does one need than the fact that Uganda allowed a reinforcement of four to five Arab armed terrorists to join the hijackers?

84. Furthermore, the important role played by the terrorists who joined the hijackers at Kampala adds further proof that the Entebbe part of the hijacking was a carefully planned operation which could not have been carried out without the complicity of the Government of Uganda. *The New York Times*, which was correctly referred to by the Foreign Minister of Mauritius as a highly respected newspaper, interviewed one of the released hostages, Mr. Michel Cojot, and the following was reported on 6 July:

"Although the West German man was clearly in charge on the plane, Mr. Cojot said, he added that it was equally clear that the four hijackers were simply the soldiers in the plot and did not have authority to negotiate for the hostages or to make any decisions beyond capturing them and keeping them calm.

" 'It was the three Arabs who joined them on the ground at Entebbe who were in charge of the further decisions', he said. 'The orders were coming from somewhere else. One of them spoke Spanish'."

85. In other words, the hijacking operation of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) could not have been carried out as planned unless the hijacked plane arrived at its predetermined destination, Uganda, where the leader of the operation was waiting.

86. If Uganda was not implicated, how did it happen that these reinforcements were allowed to drive up?

Why have those representatives, who have identified themselves in so moving a manner out of a feeling of common interest with Idi Amin's Uganda and with the cause of international terror, not addressed themselves to this rather strange development, which in itself proves their thesis to be false? Furthermore, if there was no connivance, where are the other terrorists? What has happened to the two or three survivors of the rescue operation at Entebbe Airport? Why have they not been apprehended and produced in accordance with The Hague Convention of 1970?³

87. Since the press has been quoted at length in our proceedings, let me do my share, too. Another detailed account of Ugandan collusion appeared on 5 July in *The New York Times*. Allow me to quote part of the article, for it summarizes numerous reports which confirm that the Ugandan authorities worked hand in glove with the terrorists. The report from Paris states:

"Officials and released hostages said here today that they had substantial evidence that President Idi Amin had been in collusion with the hijackers of an Air France airbus in the seizure of the plane as well as after it landed in Uganda.

...

"A highly placed French source said that President Amin had refused to allow Pierre Renard, the French Ambassador to Uganda, or a special French envoy to deal with the hijackers directly.

"...

"They also noted that during the first 24 hours after the aircraft reached Entebbe, the hijackers withdrew to rest and Ugandans guarded the hostages.

"Other evidence pointing to the Ugandan President's involvement with the terrorists was included in comments by French diplomats and the reports of hostages freed earlier by the terrorists...

"Among the passengers released last week were Michel Cojot and his 12-year-old son, Oliver. Mr. Cojot, a French management consultant, served as interpreter for the hostages, and negotiated on their behalf for small conveniences during the ordeal.

"Mr. Cojot said that he had 'not a shadow of a doubt' that the Uganda President knew of the hijack plan in advance and had prepared for the action.

"...

"Mr. Cojot said that after landing at Entebbe, Uganda's international airport, everyone remained on the plane for several hours.

" 'The terrorists packed up their grenades and put them back in the sacks they had carried aboard. They put the 7.65 Czech automatic pistols, which had never left their hands for a second during the flight, into their belts and sat down together in the front of the plane', he said. 'Until then there had always been at least one in front and one in back to cover us'.

"Mr. Cojot said that at that point he managed to talk with one of the crew members and suggested that it would be possible to overcome the four hijackers, who were grouped together without weapons in their hands, and for someone to slip out of the exit and summon help.

" 'We agreed, though, that the hijackers were acting as though they felt completely at home. The sudden relaxation of their previously thorough discipline showed they considered themselves on friendly ground'.

"...

" '...The whole time, we felt we were being guarded by both the hijackers and the Ugandans'.

"Friends of the hijackers who joined them at the airport appeared to be Palestinians, Mr. Cojot said. 'They came and went freely in a Datsun with local license plates and a diplomatic plate, carrying weapons', he added.

"The Uganda civilian manager of the airport had food and drink ready for the hostages not long after their arrival. 'But nonetheless I had to talk to him', Mr. Cojot said, 'because there weren't enough plates at one time and then not enough glasses. I was joking and said, 'Well, it must be hard to look after 263 unexpected guests'.

" 'The manager replied, 'Oh, but I was expecting you' ', Mr. Cojot said."

88. *The Washington Post* of 5 July similarly carried a detailed indictment of President Amin:

"The accounts of the 148 non-Jewish hostages released earlier in the week supported the Israelis' view.

"The freed hostages spoke of Amin's embracing the leader of the hijack gang and of the four hijackers then leaving the hostages to be guarded by Ugandan troops for 24 hours.

"Afterward, the two Arabs and two Germans who hijacked the Air France plane over Greece returned, looking refreshed after a night's sleep and a bath.

"The four hijackers were later joined by at least three Palestinians, and the gang was supplied with

additional automatic weapons, according to French and Greek hostages.

"A Greek ship mechanic, Christos Sarantis, speaking for the seven Greeks freed earlier in the week, said, 'We were guarded by black soldiers and by about a hundred persons in civilian dress, who had excellent relations and co-operated with the hijackers. There was full co-operation between Amin, his men and the hijackers.'"

89. I am fully aware of the statement made by Captain Bacos, as reported in *The New York Times* of 6 July and quoted here by the Foreign Minister of Mauritius. However, the overwhelming body of evidence corroborated by the majority of the hostages that were released—as was indeed, reported many times in the press—proves that indeed Ugandan troops participated together with the terrorists in guard duty over the 260-odd innocent passengers and crew. I regret that the Foreign Minister of Mauritius chose to ignore the extensive evidence available, which probes Uganda's collusion with the terrorists.

90. I have already, in my statement of Friday last, referred to the fact that the terrorists, always aided by the Ugandans, interrogated some Israelis, at times using force and even threats of death. *The New York Times* of Sunday, 11 July, carried a vivid description of one such interrogation conducted by both the terrorists and the Ugandans:

"During one period of questioning by the terrorists about what he really knew about Israel, Mr. Dahan was slapped in the face, punched in the back and his fingers were twisted backward. He was told to write long reports about Israel and he proceeded to turn in documents dealing with kibbutz life and how he picked grapefruit.

"After one of these exercises, a Ugandan tore the paper out of his hand and threw it on the floor, saying: 'This is not what we want. ... We want to know about the army. We want to know where the bases are. We want the name of your general.'

"A tall Palestinian carrying a gun and another called 'George' joined four Uganda officers in the questioning. At one point, George put a gun to Mr. Dahan's chest."

91. In view of the overwhelming body of evidence corroborated by most of the 260 passengers and crew of the hijacked plane, I am left with no other choice but to call the two statements of the Foreign Minister of Uganda nothing but the most formidable collection of distortions, half-truths, deliberate omissions and outright falsehoods the Council has heard in a long time.

92. I shall not tire the Council by listing each and every distortion. They are too numerous to count, and

it would prove very time-consuming. However, there is one abominable lie which my country cannot pass over in silence, and it is incumbent upon me to show the true faces of the President of Uganda and his Foreign Minister for what they are.

93. The Foreign Minister of Uganda has stated before the Council that

"When she"—Mrs. Bloch—"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...

"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 members of the invading force took away all the hostages—dead, injured or otherwise. ...

"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." [1939th meeting, paras. 254-256.]

So much for the statement of the Foreign Minister of Uganda before the Council.

94. I repeat that that is a damnable lie. Mrs. Bloch was visited in the hospital by a British diplomat on Sunday 4 July, after Israel's rescue operation at Entebbe Airport, as was clearly stated to the Council by the representative of the United Kingdom. The diplomat reported that she was being guarded by two men, and when he returned an hour later he was not allowed to see her. That diplomat, we were informed yesterday by the representative of the United Kingdom, is to be expelled from Uganda today.

95. And we now have the ominous news that the Government of Uganda is applying the threat of blackmail to foreign nationals in Uganda in connexion with the current proceedings in the Security Council. In other words, for the first time in history, a direct attempt is being made by threats of blackmail of the most ominous character to influence the proceedings in the Council.

96. How can the Council pass this over in silence? How can it ignore a blatant attempt to influence this body? How can the members of the Council ignore this flagrant attempt to interfere with their national sovereignty? This whole sordid affair condemns not only the Government of Uganda but all the countries which have spoken against the Israeli rescue mission during this debate. They have ignored the basic cause of this issue, namely the hijacking of the plane, and, for reasons of political expediency, they have not even had the good grace to say one word about the fate of an old lady of 75 dragged out of the hospital, in all

probability to the horrible fate that has been meted out to hundreds of Kenyan citizens in Uganda, a fate the nature of which has been described by the Foreign Minister of Kenya in the letter he addressed to you yesterday, Mr. President [S/12/40].

97. With all due respect to the Foreign Minister of Mauritius and to other members who have joined him in condemning Israel, the fact that they did not see fit even to mention in passing the fate of Mrs. Bloch and did not see fit to address an appeal to the Ugandan authorities with respect to her whereabouts removes from them the moral right to any standing in this debate.

98. The case of Mrs. Bloch only emphasizes in a most tragic manner the scope of the complicity of the Ugandans. And let me quote from a statement by Mr. Yigal Allon, our Foreign Minister, in the Knesset today:

"The disappearance of Mrs. Bloch constitutes an inseparable part of the whole hijacking incident. The fate which befell her gives vivid substance to the awful danger which threatened the lives of all the hijacked passengers at Entebbe until they were freed in the magnificent rescue operation conducted by the Israel defence forces. It also proves once and for ever how empty and devoid of content, human, moral and legal alike, were those voices which rushed to condemn Israel in the international arena for carrying out the elementary duty towards its citizens and saving them from this awful danger."

99. Again I wish to draw the attention of the Council to a fact conveniently ignored—namely, that to date, 10 days after the release of the hostages, the French Air France plane has not yet been released. Again, this is a significant factor, though perhaps a minor one against the background of the bloodshed, terror, human misery and suffering which that operation has entailed.

100. I do not wish to refute many of the speeches made at this table, because they have been made by countries whose régimes have so much in common with the régime in Uganda that there is no point in addressing myself to their remarks on a legal or moral basis. One of those countries is Somalia, which, as I have mentioned before, has become a centre for terrorist operations and a threat to its neighbouring State. The representative of Somalia furthermore went out of his way to misquote some of my remarks, a fact which does not surprise me. However, I should like to refer to some of the statements that have been made.

101. As to the Mexican letter [S/12/35] addressed to you, Mr. President, we have always followed with understanding the very active campaign that Mexico is conducting against the terrorism which affects it. We are therefore all the more surprised that Mexico is unable to reveal a similar measure of understanding

when action is taken designed to combat terror in cases where the victims are not Mexicans. It is utterly incredible and beyond the realm of comprehension that political expediency should dictate to the Government of Mexico and lead it to attack a small State defending itself against a common enemy of Mexico and Israel, namely international terror.

102. I cannot hide my amazement at the fact that the representative of Yugoslavia saw fit, this time too, as in cases in the past, to intervene on the side of those condemning Israel, in his anxious desire to demonstrate his loyal alignment with the remarks of the so-called non-aligned countries. If any country in the world should be interested today in a move against terror, if any country in the world should have had a word of condolence to say for the victims of the hijacking and terror, then it should have been Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav representative, let it be noted, had words of condolence for Uganda. Innocent Israeli hostages were killed too in this operation. Why had Yugoslavia not one word to say for them? It is sad indeed to see the Yugoslav Government, on each occasion in this forum, rushing to the head of the line in order to condemn Israel, regardless of the issue, blinded apparently by an extreme anti-Israel attitude and by an espousal of the cause of the new anti-Semitism in the world today. Yugoslavia, like many other countries which spoke in this debate, does not realize that international terrorism—from which it suffers no less than do others—will yet make them eat the words expressed by their representative on this occasion at the Council table.

103. Frankly, I regret perhaps more than many of the other interventions that of the representative of Tanzania. I regret it because of the personal high regard in which I hold him and because of the very great respect in which I, together with many others in Israel, regard his great teacher, the President of Tanzania, whose guest I have had the honour to be. In his legal arguments he conveniently forgets that the legal authorities which he quotes do justify, in international law, such actions as we are discussing, on the grounds of individual self-defence or collective self-defence, as I believe I pointed out when quoting at great length from authorities on international law in my speech last Friday. He and others quoted Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, obligating countries to settle their disputes by peaceful means. Let me again quote D. P. O'Connell in *International Law*, second edition,⁴ pages 303 and 304:

"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 intentions and effect to the protection of a State's own integrity and its nationals' vital interest, when the machinery envisaged by the United Nations Charter is ineffective in the situation."

104. One's mind tends to be dulled and one's memory to be hazed as the debate goes on in the Council. Let me remind the Council that we are talking about a decision by the Government of Israel to protect its citizens, hostages threatened with their very lives, over 100 men, women and children held at gun point by terrorists who had hijacked them, who recognize no sovereignty, know no law, and who have proved in the past that there are no limits to their bestiality. These are the self same people who shot diplomats, bound hand and foot; who murdered sportsmen at the Olympic games, bound hand and foot, and who, in the past, have held children hostage and were ready to slaughter them. These people were being aided and abetted by a Government headed by a racist murderer who had applauded the slaughter of the Israeli sportsmen, bound hand and foot, by the same terrorists; who had called for the extinction of Israel in the United Nations, and who had not only praised Hitler for the murder of 6 million Jews but had proposed building a monument to Hitler—a move which prompted even the Soviet Ambassador in Kampala to suggest to President Amin that he was going too far.

105. This was the problem that faced the Government of Israel: over 100 men, women and children, innocent hostages with terrorist guns pointed at them and with no doubt whatsoever in anybody's mind as to the intention of these terrorists to carry out their wicked plan and slaughter innocent people as they had done in the past. This is the picture which must be in the mind's eye of representatives as they discuss this problem.

106. I regret many of the remarks made by the representative of Tanzania because I suspect they do not reflect his true feelings of the true feelings of the Government of Tanzania.

107. I reject out of hand his ridiculous attempt to equate with an attack on Africa this Israeli rescue operation to save its citizens. How can the representative of Tanzania make such a remark? Would Africa have looked better if Palestinian terrorists, in connivance with President Amin, had slaughtered over 100 men, women and children? Would Africa have looked better with the blood of those innocent victims bespattering the soil of Africa?

108. Who has besmirched Africa? Israel, for exercising its right to save its citizens in accordance with international law? Or that racist régime in Uganda, waging a heroic war against a defenceless old lady of 75 years?

109. Who is threatening Africa? Israel, which has done so much to help so many African countries, including many today, in the fields of agriculture, of technology, of health? Or the country which has dispatched this week 30 fighter-planes as reinforcements to Uganda, namely the Government of Libya? Against whom are these planes directed and by whom are they

flown? You know as well as I do that they are directed against Kenya and Tanzania, which have been threatened and continue to be threatened openly in statements by the President of Uganda, and that the planes are flown by, amongst others, PLO pilots.

110. Who is threatening Africa and the Africans? Israel, whose refusal to be associated in any way with President Amin's proposal to invade and bomb Tanzania in 1972 brought about Uganda's break with Israel, or the Head of State who produced in Israel, and in other countries incidentally, maps describing his plans to invade Tanzania?

111. Who has treated Africa with contempt if not the President of Uganda, who has labelled the President of Tanzania, a man of international stature and standing, in words which are despicable and disgusting and which I do not wish to repeat because of the high regard which I and my people have for the President of Tanzania.

112. The representative of Tanzania says he "would have preferred principles to be given priority over expediency" [1941st meeting, para. 118]. What principles are you talking about? The principles of Uganda which are reflected in the grim recital of murder, kidnapping and banditry in the document distributed today by the Foreign Minister of Kenya? Have you said one word here against these Ugandan principles? Is it principle or expediency which brought you, the distinguished representative of a very distinguished country, to be a co-sponsor of this draft resolution with Libya, the pay-master and centre of world terrorism and the country which is supplying fighter aircraft to Uganda? You know as well as I do that those planes will not be used by Uganda against Israel.

113. If you, my dear friend, wish to discuss principles and expediency, by all means let us do so. But let us spell them out too. Let us not be selective about principles and expediency, just as we should not be selective about terror and rescue operations.

114. I can only reiterate what I said on Friday: let us stop being selective. If terror is bad, it is bad everywhere, for everybody and on every occasion. It is bad whatever the colour, race, creed or nationality of the terrorist. It is bad whatever the colour, race, creed or nationality of the victim. That is the issue before us. That is the issue with which the United Nations had failed to deal. That is the issue which will plague the whole world until we deal with it.

115. I listened to the remarks of the representative of Pakistan. Frankly, I would have accorded them more respect if they had not come from the representative of a régime which has locked up its entire political opposition in gaol. Here was the miserable apparition of the representative of a State whose own people were brutally driven out of Uganda by the racist régime of Idi Amin falling over himself to in-

gratiate himself with the oppressors of his own kith and kin. How despicable can one be?

116. The representative of the Soviet Union asked me why we did not quote the documents of the United Nations banning aggression in international relations. The representative of the Soviet Union must be aware that the Definition of Aggression adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1974 [resolution 3314 (XXIX)] has been widely criticized in all legal circles. It is not a binding statement of international law and does not, incidentally, rule out an act like that carried out by Israel.

117. When the representative of the Soviet Union asked why Israel did not make a complaint to the Security Council, I did not know whether he was naïve or whether he assumed that I was naïve. Let me assure him that at least in this respect I cannot be characterized as such, and I have no doubt that he is anything but naïve.

118. I ask the representative of the Soviet Union: had we submitted a complaint, would the Soviet Union have supported us? Why was there no Soviet statement when the plane was hijacked? Why have they not condemned the terrorist acts of the PLO on many occasions in the past? Why did they not issue a statement or an appeal when the innocent hostages were being held at Entebbe? Why did not the representative of the Soviet Union have even one word to say about the fate of Mrs. Dora Bloch? Or one word of appeal directly to the representative of Uganda in this respect? After all, you have influence in Uganda.

119. Is the representative of the Soviet Union not aware that since 1954 the Soviet Union has blocked every attempt on the part of Israel to bring its case to the Security Council? For 22 years we have had no remedy in the Council because of the Soviet veto. We are used to cynicism in this body but the cynical question of the representative of the Soviet Union—"Why did we not complain to the Council"—when he knows in advance that, without regard to the substance of the claim, he would have vetoed it, is, I submit, the height of cynicism.

120. I note the Soviet representative's concern for the inviolability of African territory, and I sincerely trust that his touching concern will be reflected in his country's policies and actions. The representative of the Soviet Union talked about aggression and the inviolability of territorial integrity and national sovereignty. On these subjects I defer to him, having regard to the Soviet Union's very considerable record in these respects in Hungary, in Czechoslovakia and in other countries in Eastern Europe. My colleague from China could doubtless elaborate on this subject.

121. Let me assure the representative of the Soviet Union that the people of Hungary in 1956 and of Czechoslovakia in 1968 would have been only too

delighted if the Soviet intervention had been to save 100 hostages and had been of a duration not exceeding 53 minutes, as was the case at Entebbe. At that time the Soviet Union went to great pains to explain its position. Sergei Kovalev, in "Sovereignty and the international duties of socialist countries", published in an article in *Pravda* on 26 September 1968, explained the Soviet Union's justifications of such actions as follows:

"Those who talk about the illegality of actions of the allied socialist countries in Czechoslovakia forget that in a class society there is not and there cannot be a law that is independent of class."

In a civilized society there is not and cannot be law that is independent of the loftiest principles of man, namely, the freedom and dignity of man. That, my colleague from the Soviet Union, was the principle that Israel was defending at Entebbe.

122. Perhaps the most indicative of all in attitude of Governments is the document from Algeria [S/12132], which was welcomed yesterday by the representative of the Soviet Union. It is indeed appropriate that Algeria should speak out for the terrorists and hijackers, having regard to the fact that it was Algeria to which the first hijacked plane in operations against Israel in 1968 was directed. Algeria was directly involved in that operation and blazed the way for future terrorist exploits. One could hardly expect Algeria, which has played such a prominent part in the history of air hijacking, international kidnapping and the use of diplomatic immunity for terrorist purposes, to forfeit its place in the "hall of fame" of international terrorism. They had to get into the act. After all, what Amin did two weeks ago, they did in 1968.

123. In the course of all these discussions some delegations have tended to ignore the group which organized this hijacking, namely, the PLO. The PLO has issued a statement disassociating itself from this operation. This is a lie. The PFLP, to which the hijackers belonged, is a constituent member of the PLO. Members will recall that in the past the PLO denied any knowledge of the Black September organization, although Yasser Arafat's second-in-command actually commanded it. They were the group which, according to the President of the Sudan, Yasser Arafat personally instructed to execute the American and Belgian diplomats in the Saudi Arabian Embassy in Khartoum in 1973.

124. The PLO's policy is a matter of record. It is one based on the most brutal terrorism, in the course of which attacks have been made upon innocent people, including unsuspecting women and children. These gangs have cut down pregnant women in cold blood at Kiryat Shmona, have shot Olympic athletes bound hand and foot, have hijacked planes, have engaged in open assassination, have held small school children

hostage in Ma'alot, causing the death of over 20 children and over 60 wounded. These are the same individuals who tried to impose a reign of terror on the Palestinian Arabs in the West Bank and Gaza, killing cold-bloodedly those suspected of not agreeing with them. These are the same individuals who planned the assassination of the Heads of five Arab States at Rabat in 1974. Fourteen members of the PLO were then arrested by Morocco. These are members of the same organization which executed in the most cowardly manner Wasfi Tal, the Prime Minister of Jordan, during a visit to Cairo. One of the assassins, not content with shooting the Prime Minister in the back, felt obliged to drink his blood publicly on the steps of the Sheraton Hotel in Cairo. These are the same people who on 31 January 1974 sabotaged the oil installations at Singapore. These are the same people who gained control of the Egyptian Embassy in Madrid and held three members of the staff, including the ambassador, as hostages. These are the same people who murdered American and Belgian diplomats at Khartoum in 1973. These are the people who have been instrumental in destroying the Lebanese State, tearing it apart while the Security Council remains silent, killing tens of thousands of people and wounding thousands of others. These are the terrorists who kidnapped and held as hostages the ministers attending the Conference of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries in Vienna and were then released by the Government of Algeria in an act which constituted a blatant condoning of the criminal terror acts of that group. From there they proceeded to Libya, where they were greeted and embraced by Prime Minister Jalloud of Libya—the same terrorists who had shot one of Libya's citizens a day before in Vienna. These are the people who have brought misery, murder and assassination to the area of the Middle East and who have introduced terrorism as a form of international idiom—terrorism which affects innocent people wherever they may be.

125. I note too, as I am already discussing Arab complicity in terrorism, that the Government of Egypt has co-sponsored the decision of the Organization of African Unity to bring this matter before the Council. Let me remind the Council that the Government of Egypt released the cowardly assassins who shot Prime Minister Wasfi Tal of Jordan on the steps of the Sheraton Hotel in Cairo and then drank his blood. In 1970 the Government of Egypt released the terrorists from the Black September organization who had landed the hijacked Pan-American jumbo plane at Cairo airport and had blown it up at that airport.

126. I listened carefully to the long-drawn-out point of order made yesterday by the representative of Libya, and I must admit that I quite appreciate his concern—which he expressed again today. Who but the representative of Libya, a country which has been the paymaster and haven of international terrorism, would want to avoid a discussion in the Council on this evil, international terrorism? Libya's role in sup-

porting international terrorism financially, militarily and politically and its involvement in attempts at the assassination of foreign leaders, including Arab Heads of State, is known to all of us, and I need not repeat it here.

127. However, the motivation behind the timing of the point of order is quite clear in view of information revealed over the weekend by the President of Egypt. In an interview with the Egyptian newspaper *Akhbar El-Yom*, as reported by the Middle East News Agency on 10 July, President Sadat, who only last week expelled the Libyan Ambassador for complicity in acts of terror, discussed publicly and on the record Libya's criminal involvement in international terror.

128. It is apparent that Libya is the haven and refuge for the most wanted international terrorists, whose colleagues were among those who carried out the hijacking of the Air France plane to Uganda. Indeed, while the deliberations in the Council were proceeding, forces financed and backed by Libya were actively continuing subversive operations in Sudan against the Government of Sudan.

129. What further evidence is necessary to prove that Libya has forfeited its right to vote on this question and indeed is disqualified to be a member of the Security Council, a body charged with the duty to promote international peace and security?

130. In conclusion, may I express my appreciation to those representatives who have had the courage to take a stand clearly and unequivocally on the side of human decency and human freedom and against the scourge of international terror and those countries that support it, whether by commission or by omission.

131. The eloquent and moving statement by the representative of the United States, and the call of all the other delegations that urged this body to take action, must evoke an echo throughout the world, regardless of political differences. I urge those countries that have already expressed their views on this issue at this table to join together to take action against hijackers and international terrorism. I am sure that many will follow their lead. This series of meetings will decide in more ways than one whether the United Nations will continue its downward path in the grip of despots or will reassume its rightful role on behalf of humanity and international peace.

132. The PRESIDENT: I should like, if I may, to insert a personal note at this stage in order to lower the temperature of this debate.

133. Speaking as the representative of Italy, I would say that I am pleased to see this debate being increasingly brightened by the use of Latin words. As President of the Council I would note that delegations on opposite sides round this table have, fortunately, at least one thing in common, a knowledge of Latin.

I take that as the first, however small, sign of encouragement for the current President of the Council. At the same time, I would express the hope that the use of Latin will not lead representatives to indulge too much in the rehearsing of history.

134. The next speaker is the representative of India. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

135. Mr. JAIPAL (India): My delegation expresses its appreciation to the members of this Council for granting it this opportunity to give its views on the complaint before them. Allow me first of all, however, Sir, to extend to you my delegation's congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. You have been conducting the Council's deliberations with the customary zest and vigour that are characteristic of the people of the great country that you represent, and we have no doubt that the Council will benefit greatly from your diplomatic skill and experience.

136. I should like to convey to the delegation of the People's Republic of China my delegation's condolences on the passing away of Marshal Chou-teh, who was a great soldier and an outstanding leader of the Chinese people.

137. We should like also to convey to the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany our condolences on the passing away of Mr. Gustav Heinemann, who was President of the Federal Republic of Germany from 1969 to 1974.

138. We are participating in this debate because the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, consisting of some 48 African States, has declared that the Israeli attack on Entebbe Airport constitutes not only aggression against Uganda but also a danger to Africa generally and to international peace and security. We fully sympathize with the 48 African States and share their concern—the more so because they are all non-aligned and are members of the movement of non-aligned countries.

139. The issues before the Council are exceedingly complex because of the historical circumstances which have given rise to them—circumstances which have become even more complicated by the terrifying frustrations of the parties and peoples involved.

140. In the tragic incident now under consideration, the cause and the effect have become inextricable from their own previous history, and we are faced with a vicious circle. Even so, it is necessary to distinguish between the initial action and its final outcome, and to assess them separately as well as jointly, because the incident is riddled with unanswered questions.

141. At the outset, I should like to say that the Government of India has always deplored terrorist vio-

lence, hijacking of aircraft, and the taking of innocent passengers as hostages. We supported General Assembly resolution 2645 (XXV), which called upon all States to prevent such acts within their jurisdiction and to prosecute and punish the guilty persons. My delegation is also a party to the consensus decision of the Security Council of 20 June 1972, in which it condemned the hijacking of commercial aircraft [S/10705].

142. The facts of the case, according to the representative of France, are that the hijacking of the Air France aircraft took place on 27 June. May I say at this point that my Government deplores this hijacking, without any reservation. The French authorities took steps immediately after the hijacking to alert some of their embassies, including their embassy in Uganda, and asked them to seek permission for their aircraft to land, since it was running short of fuel. The French Ambassador to Uganda accordingly approached the Ugandan authorities, and permission to land, which was given immediately, according to the representative of France.

143. Now, there are conflicting versions as to what happened after the landing of the aircraft—mainly because different persons have given different versions, each from his particular observation point. The truth, therefore, may never be fully known, but certain facts have clearly emerged.

144. The facts are that negotiations began between the concerned parties and lasted for almost a week, during which 47 passengers were first released, and later another 100 passengers, by the hijackers. Further negotiations were proceeding concerning the terms and the place for the release of the remaining hostages, when Israel apparently came to the conclusion that the lives of those hostages who were Israeli nationals were in imminent danger. Thereupon, Israeli armed forces attacked the airport to rescue them. As a result, three hostages, one Israeli officer, several Ugandan soldiers and seven hijackers were killed. Many more persons were injured, and Ugandan aircraft and installations were damaged or destroyed.

145. While we deplore this loss of life and wanton destruction, the doubt that springs to mind is whether all this might have been avoided if negotiations had continued further. Would it not have been better to risk further negotiations than to risk a military operation that could conceivably have led to much greater loss of life? The fact that the nature of the military operation was limited to rescuing hostages should not hide the more important fact that it did involve a violation of the United Nations Charter, and a breach of Uganda's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Whether or not this breach is temporary, it is nevertheless a breach. If it had been a permanent breach, it would be tantamount to occupation of Ugandan territory. There can be no doubt on this score, and this fact is indeed readily admitted by all. However, some seek to justify it, while others question the justification

and its implications for relations between Member States.

146. Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter stipulates 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...”

It was therefore a very grave step indeed for Israel to have used force on Ugandan territory, and it is odd that in doing so it claimed the right of self-defence. Article 51 of the Charter recognizes the right of self-defence only if an armed attack occurs against a Member State. In the present case, it is Uganda that has been the subject of an armed attack by Israel.

147. In these circumstances, the Israeli attack is clearly a violation of Uganda's sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Council should not allow this attack to pass unnoticed in its resolution.

148. As to the hijacking, why was it not brought before the Council immediately after it occurred so that the Council might have recalled its decisions of 1970 and 1972, and thus perhaps strengthened the hand of Uganda? The Council should have taken up the question of the hijacking immediately after it occurred so that appropriate international measures might have been considered for dealing with it, and for preventing future hijackings in the manner now proposed by certain members of the Council. It would be tragic indeed to ignore the Israeli attack and to concentrate now only on anti-hijacking measures, however desirable and urgent they may be. Both aspects of the matter clearly ought to be dealt with in the resolution of the Council.

149. If the Security Council is to maintain international peace and security in terms of its responsibilities under the Charter, it should pronounce itself also on the Israeli attack. If it does not do so, it may well set in train a chain reaction whose repercussions may be even more tragic and far-reaching. This is indeed the concern that underlies the statement of the Assembly Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity. The representative of Tanzania stated yesterday that African States recognized the Israeli attack against Uganda as a serious challenge to Africa as a whole. They clearly feel that, but for the grace of God—or perhaps the fuel tank—it might have been any one of them. The Security Council should therefore reassure the African States in the manner requested by them.

150. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those delegations which wish to exercise their right of reply.

151. Sir Harold WALTER (Mauritius): I must say, after listening again to the representative of Israel, that

if a doubt existed in my mind as regards his mastery of the English language and the perfect art of oratory which he seems to play with, this doubt has disappeared. I confess, he is exceedingly good in the presentation of even the worst case that could ever be.

152. But that leads me to the following point: I am very surprised, after 25 years of parliamentary experience, to find the debate reaching the personal level. I would recall that in the course of my intervention I made it absolutely clear that I intended no personal attack on anyone, that I would speak only of the facts of the case which have been brought before the Council, which were being debated and commented on, and from which deductions were being made, and which are averred to be true.

153. The Israeli representative regretted that no one in the Council had said anything about what was alleged to be taking place in Uganda today. Well, let me put him right. As a matter of fact, after the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom yesterday, and the conversation he had with me, I immediately cabled my Head of State, as current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, requesting him to use all his influence in getting in touch with the President of Uganda to ensure that everything is done according to law, and that nothing as sinister as described should be tolerated.

154. In the course of his statement, the representative of Israel also said that I did not mention in the debate certain facts published in the press. Now he will recall that he has quoted *The New York Times* of Sunday, 4 July. Well, for his information, on Sunday I was still under my blanket until about 5 o'clock in the afternoon with a heavy cold and I did not read the Sunday papers. But I based my statement on the evidence that was given here. Since then the omission that the representative of Israel mentioned has been brought to my notice. It is abundantly clear that the omission was not malicious. Neither was it wilful nor was it deliberate. The facts alluded to were omitted because they were not brought to my notice and I did not come across them.

155. The representative of Israel also mentioned the systems of government of certain States which are similar to the one which he so cynically described. Well let me remind him that my Government is probably the pinnacle of democracy, where an apposition is allowed to criticize the Government every Tuesday and every Friday, where any motion against the Government can be introduced, and yet those very members on both sides who were throwing invectives at each other will sit down afterwards and have a drink together and mix socially. Never does it become personal. It is the subject-matter which is discussed.

156. I am here holding no brief for anyone. I am here holding a brief from the Organization of African Unity on a question of principle: whether the territorial

integrity and political sovereignty of one State Member of the United Nations, a State of Africa, has been violated—yes or no. But the way in which the debate has gone today, both the cause and the effect—as the representative of India has just said—have been blended together. It must be made abundantly clear that what the Organization of African Unity is seeking from the Council is words of warning, so that there could never be a repetition of such a violation of territorial integrity.

157. The representative of Israel has also quoted abundantly from the press. May I return the compliment and tell him that he, too, omitted something very serious from a responsible paper from which he quoted, *Le Monde*, of 9 July, which reads thus:

“In order to justify a violation of Ugandan sovereignty, the right of any State to protect its nationals is invoked, a right which certain jurists have described as the protection of mankind. However, to leave the appreciation of such a right to each State is not only contrary to commitments entered into by United Nations Member States, but is also extremely dangerous. Furthermore, it is forgotten that negotiations conducted by French diplomacy were under way and had already yielded results which were quite appreciable and that the negotiations were not broken off when the Israelis undertook their raid on Entebbe. Instructed by all interested States, France intended to pursue these negotiations to the end and would inevitably have established the responsibilities for failure in case of failure.”*

The Council should take note that in the same paper, *Le Monde*, we read this:

“The International Association of Democratic Jurists confirms its condemnation of the airbus hijacking in Kampala and the keeping as hostages of Israeli citizens and members of the crew. However, it notes that the airborne operation of the Israeli Army, undertaken at a time when negotiations were under way with the purpose of finding a solution, had the effect of violating the sovereignty of the Ugandan State and of causing many victims. It considers that the criminal act committed does not constitute a justification for recourse to force in violation of the most elementary rules of international law. “The International Association of Democratic Jurists protests against the statements of the heads of Government who congratulated the authors of an operation executed in violation of the United Nations Charter, which shows their racist temperament in holding of no account the territorial integrity of an African State and the lives of its nationals.”*

* Quoted in French by the speaker.

158. I am sorry if the representative of Israel took it amiss when I played on a question of semantics. I did that only to lighten the debate and not to leave it with the serious tone it then had. If the representative of Israel felt hurt and has taken amiss the pun which I tried to make on a word in putting it right, then I am exceedingly sorry. I can assure him that there was no intention of trying in the least to belittle his eloquence, which, I must say, few can equal. I can assure him that there was absolutely no intent to belittle what he had stated. As a matter of fact, if the Council will recall, I took the spirit in which this was said and played upon it when I said: “... the world does not belong to Rome nor are Romans allowed with impunity to trample upon other nationals through bloodbaths” [1940th meeting, para. 52]. That is what I said.

159. There is one last thing that I should like to make clear. The representative of Israel said that the letter which was sent to you, Mr. President, by the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity was co-sponsored by Egypt. This is incorrect. This is a resolution passed unanimously by the Organization of African Unity, and in the course of the resolution the Assembly of the Heads of State and Government charged the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mauritius by name, as I am the current Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and two other nations, Guinea and Egypt, to support Uganda in the submission of its case to the Security Council. Let the representative of Israel know that we all sympathize with the loss of lives which occurred there at Entebbe, that we all deplore international terrorism. But I hope he will have the courage, too, to say that what has bound the United Nations so far is that there should under no circumstances be a violation of the territorial integrity and political sovereignty of any country.

160. Now I want to ask the same question as appeared in *Le Monde*, again of 9 July: Would the permanent representative of Israel say that he would have dared to make the same raid if the plane had landed at Schiphol in Amsterdam or at Orly? Would he have done it? Probably yes. But according to all probabilities, I would say no. But it was Uganda. It could have been Kenya; it could have been Tanzania; it could have been Mauritius. The performing of a humanitarian act—and this is unchallenged, that the French Ambassador asked the Head of State of Uganda to allow the plane to land because it did not have enough petrol to go on and President Amin said yes to that—is what is today to be compared with the vitriolic words we have heard about certain representatives in the Council.

161. Mr. ABDALLA (Uganda): The allegations made by the Israeli delegation are not true. In the first place, on the question of complicity, the Israeli representative has referred to Mr. Cojot's words, but Cojot is just one of the people who have had something to say on the Entebbe incident. On the other hand, some

accounts have been given by other members of the crew which are favourable to my President. For example, the plane's mechanical engineer and captain gave accounts that may be found in *Le Monde*. As regards Mrs. Bloch, I have nothing to add to what I told the Council on Friday. As I said then, the Israeli invading forces took away with them all the hostages remaining at Entebbe, including Mrs. Bloch.

162. Let us not digress. We have come here to condemn the Israeli aggression and nothing else. On behalf of the Ugandan delegation I therefore totally reject all the allegations levelled against my country by the representative of Zionist Israel. Most of what he said is nothing but a pack of lies.

163. This debate is dragging us nowhere but to a pack of lies and confusion, and, Mr. President, it is your responsibility to guide this Council so that we can arrive at a concrete condemnation of Israel.

164. Israel, of course, has the right to boast here of the killing of Ugandan officers and men and the destruction of property, and those so-called super-Powers try to cover up for Israel. Perhaps it will not take a long time; it will, perhaps, be by the will of God; but those who say they are super-Powers today will be buried.

165. We are not children, although we are small countries. We are not to be toyed with.

166. Israel condemns Uganda, all the African States and the third world for what it has done. Because we are small, we cannot fight the United States, the United Kingdom and Israel. We have no arms. We have nothing to bring them to their knees. But I am telling you that one day we shall be vindicated by history.

167. I reserve my right to reply further at a later stage.

168. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): Again, the representative of the racist terrorist entity of Israel has come to attack my country and my leaders, as he has attacked many other countries and leaders. We have become accustomed to the traditional Israeli false allegations, gross fabrications and immoral distortions. We know he is trying to avoid the main issue, which is the felonious and criminal Israeli attack on a sovereign State Member of the United Nations in violation of all established rules of international law and morality.

169. Mr. Herzog has again been very generous to my country. As I have already said, I am impressed by how much he hates my country and my leaders. He knows he is lying as usual.

170. I replied to him briefly last Friday. For the moment I would refer the Council to my earlier brief

and incomplete reply. I need not take long this time, especially since I have spoken at every meeting since last Friday. I do not want to abuse the indulgence of members. I reserve my right to speak again to answer the false allegations and cynical distortions of the representative of the Zionist entity.

171. I know I cannot match the representative of the racist régime of Tel Aviv in his indecent language. My knowledge of English is limited and humble. It is not my mother tongue, as it is that of the Irishman representing the Zionist entity. I am limited to correct—I mean morally correct—and polite English. Out of respect for this august body I will be precise and clear, and I will put simple honest facts and truths against his lies, distortions and immoral allegations.

172. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): The hour is late, and I believe we are all somewhat tired. As I said last night, we should try to debate this problem with as much composure as possible, calmly and without emotion. If I exercise my right of reply at this late hour it is only because some of the statements made by the representative of Israel cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. If the necessity arises, I will of course ask the indulgence of the Council and reply more comprehensively to some aspects of the statement of the representative of Israel. In fact—I must be quite frank about this—I did not intend to exercise my right of reply this time. I have felt all along that it was not absolutely necessary to exercise one's right of reply unless one was forced to. Particularly in the case of the representative of Israel, I would have refrained from doing so, if only because I know that, as a result of his usual complaints and lamentations, he always finds himself isolated, whether in the Council or in the General Assembly. I do not want to give him the privilege of having to answer so many statements in exercise of the right of reply. But despite all those considerations I think it is my duty to clarify a few points.

173. First, I do not know whether I should say I feel flattered, but certainly I would say that I noted that the representative of Israel devoted a considerable part of his statement to replying to mine. I think the Council will make its own judgement on that. There are, however, a few things the representative of Israel said which I must rebut immediately.

174. My many friends both within the Council and outside it can accuse me of a number of things but certainly not of saying things I do not believe, and I want to assure the representative of Israel that I am not in the habit of making statements that do not reflect my feelings. I should like the Council to believe me when I say I suppose I am better placed to know the position of the Government of Tanzania than the representative of Israel. I hope he will grant me that much.

175. The representative of Israel took issue with my statement that the Israeli military action at Entebbe

constituted a threat to the African continent. Apparently, he chooses conveniently to ignore the fact that this position is in fact a position that has been articulated much more forcefully by the distinguished Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, the Prime Minister of Mauritius, in his telegram to the Security Council. If I may refresh the memory of my colleague from Israel, I would refer only to one sentence in that telegram, circulated as an annex to document S/12126:

“This unprecedented aggression against Uganda by Israel constitutes a danger not only to Uganda and Africa but to international peace and security.”

This is a solemn statement, solemnly sent to the Council by a responsible Head of Government and a responsible leader of Africa, specifically mandated by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government. It was not a statement lightly made. Neither, for that matter, was the statement issued by my Government lightly made.

176. The military action undertaken by the Israeli authorities at Entebbe constitutes nothing short of a flagrant violation of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of Uganda. Since this debate started I have heard a number of statements made both by the representative of Israel and by those in the Council who seem to share some of his views and nothing in those statements has denied this important factor, the factor of the violation of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Uganda.

177. When we say that the Israeli action constitutes a threat not only to Uganda but to Africa as well, we do not say so lightly; because from our own history, from our own experience of centuries of colonization, we know that a flagrant action against one African State should be a lesson to other African States. In the particular case of the Israeli action, we have on record the parallel example that Israeli actions normally give to Africa's worst enemies. I remember very vividly—I have not been long in this Organization, but I know—that when the Israeli authorities started their so-called series of blitzkrieg strikes against their Arab neighbours, the first people to applaud this new rule of international law were the Fascist régimes in southern Africa. There was jubilation in Rhodesia, jubilation in Pretoria, whenever the Israelis attempted their raids, whether on Lebanon, in Jordan or on other Arab States. It is not surprising, therefore, that in this particular case of the Israeli raid at Entebbe, one of the most glowing commendations, the most glowing congratulations to emanate from other States came from no less a person than Mr. John Vorster, the Prime Minister of the racist régime in South Africa, who considered the action by the Israeli a daring exploit, and who, for obvious reasons, will, I suppose, be planning how to put into practice what he has learned from the Israeli action.

178. Therefore—and I say this in all solemnity—we view the Israeli action against Entebbe not only as a threat to Uganda but as a threat to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of African States. We consider this a very dangerous precedent in international relations, all the more dangerous because it is the rights of smaller and less powerful nations that are under attack. I entirely concur with the Foreign Minister of Mauritius that there have been hijackings before, but that the Israeli authorities would never undertake a military operation in Athens, in Paris, in London, or elsewhere in Europe, to say nothing of the United States or Canada. That is unimaginable.

179. The representative of Israel more or less challenged my position and said, perhaps by implication, perhaps directly, that my Government and I myself preferred expediency to principles. He gave what I consider to be a long lecture on principles. But I want to assure the representative of Israel that we in Tanzania attach the greatest importance to principles. And I must say, with all candour, that it has not been easy to do so. More often than not, we have suffered because of that. There are members of the Council who know that, and if it becomes necessary I will ask the indulgence of the Council again to go into the details of a number of situations where the Government of Tanzania has taken a position of principle which has caused it economic and other difficulties. So we do not need to be lectured about principles. We think, in fact, and we have consistently maintained in this Organization, that the only way in which countries like ours, the smaller countries, can defend themselves is through their firm attachment to principles—principles of international law, principles of international morality, principles of international co-operation, and above all the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. These are the only safeguards which can ensure the survival of smaller countries, because no matter how much we may try, it is inconceivable, at least in the foreseeable future, that we shall be in a sufficiently powerful military position to defend ourselves in the way that those who are mightier and more powerful can. Therefore, we attach importance to principles.

180. So far as the sanctity of human life is concerned, we have made it clear before, and I want to make it clear again, that to my Government and my people, no less than to myself personally, life is sacrosanct; the loss of human life is to be regretted, whether it be Jewish life, African life, Arab life or any other type of life. Human life must be preserved, human life must be protected, and every step must be taken to ensure the preservation of that life. I am, however, disturbed that the representative of Israel, who has been so eloquent in his defence of the sanctity of life and who has made such powerful presentations in defence of those whose lives were, from his own point of view, at stake, omitted to express any lamentation, any profound regret, for the lives of the

Ugandans that were lost at Entebbe as a result of the Israeli military action. And yet the representative of Israel, in his presentation at the beginning of the Council's session, was the very first one to talk in terms of avoiding selectivity, and to express his Government's fear of the selective process that he says was undertaken at Entebbe. We would have expected that he would at least tell the Council how sorry his Government was for the death that its troops had inflicted on so many Ugandans, for the damage and destruction that they had caused to the people of Uganda. This, in the view of my delegation, does not do much credit to the argumentation of the Israeli representative about the sanctity of life, or to his accusations—indirect as they may be—that those of us who have failed to make reference to one specific case or another are in any way unconcerned with the sanctity of life.

181. The Israeli representative again tried to take issue with us because we have emphasized that the issue before the Council is the violation of Ugandan sovereignty. I deliberately did not indulge in a procedural discussion on whether or not we are discussing hijacking because I am quite aware of the rules of procedure of the Council. I am also aware of the practice in the Council that, even if an issue is not on the agenda and even if an issue is completely irrelevant to the topic, members of the Council are free to say what they like, and there is no way in which the President of the Council or any other member of the Council can prevent anyone from saying what he wants to say.

182. Because of the considerations I have deliberately refrained from saying whether or not our meeting has been convened to discuss hijacking. But no matter what consideration one may give to the conduct of the debate, one thing remains patently clear, that is that the Council was convened, following the specific request of the Organization of African Unity through its Chairman, only for the purpose of discussing the flagrant violation of Uganda's sovereignty. It is therefore to this particular point that we are addressing ourselves.

183. We have said it before and I shall say it again, I note how selective the representative of Israel is in quoting. I was impressed when he quoted extensively the other day the resolution of the Organization of African Unity, adopted in 1970, on the question of hijacking. I note, not without concern, that he has deliberately omitted to quote equally extensively from the resolution most recently adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity condemning the Israeli violation of Uganda's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

184. I have one last point. The representative of Israel referred extensively to the relationship between Tanzania and Uganda and the relationship between Uganda and Kenya and the situation in East Africa. As the representative of Tanzania I am perhaps in a

better position to know the state of affairs between Uganda and Tanzania. But, with all respect, I beg to submit that we are not discussing here Uganda-Tanzania relations; we are discussing here Israel's violation of Uganda's sovereignty and territorial integrity. In all humility, I also beg to submit that we are not discussing here the international situation in Uganda, nor people's likes and dislikes in so far as the Government of Uganda is concerned. It is not Uganda which is being discussed here; we are discussing an action against Uganda; and nothing would be more hypocritical, I submit, than to transform the victim of aggression and make him the principal culprit and the principal villain of our deliberations.

185. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I did not intend to speak, but the representative of Israel in his statement today—or, rather, in the lecture which he gave us all here—did not answer everything that was said at previous meetings on this matter and, quite rightly, the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania has just pointed out that we are discussing only one fact: the aggression by Israel against Uganda. No other proposals exist here, and no one officially put forward any other proposals.

186. The representative of Israel has two standards which he applies to these events; he creates two moralities. He tries to justify what is difficult to justify. On Friday and today he attempted to accuse us. He accused the entire Security Council; he accused the United Nations; and he even proposed that some members of the Council should be expelled, clearly transcending everything that is relevant to the item under discussion.

187. The most dangerous thing is not what is said here by the representative of Israel—he has only repeating time-worn false allegations—but what he has called for, and what he has called for is that we should follow the example set by Israel in attacking Uganda, killing Ugandan citizens, doing a great deal of material damage and not even apologizing or wanting to apologize to the Government. But no one would want to follow Israel's example. We cannot apply a double standard to human life. The lives of Ugandans are as precious as other people's. We think that it is not right to kill anyone and we condemn the armed attack by Israel against Uganda.

188. There is something else that surprises me in this matter. The United Nations, after all, created Israel, and it is rather strange to hear here in the Security Council the representative of Israel making such insulting, I would even say such cynical statements about the organization which founded that State, breathed life into that nation. Whatever has happened since then, it is equivalent to a son saying to his mother: "Go to the devil, mother, although you gave birth to me." There is no moral or international law that can justify such an act.

189. The representative of Israel in his statement today used the Council to accuse all those who assessed the action of the Israeli soldiery as an act of aggression against a small, sovereign and independent African State, the Republic of Uganda. This is not a new manoeuvre. This is the first time I have met here with the representative of Israel around this table, but I am perfectly familiar with his previous statements. This is not the first time that he has had recourse to such fallacious statements as he has made here today in his attacks against other countries; it has already become a system. His whole statement today was designed to divert the attention of the Council from the item on the agenda, the act of aggression by Israel against Uganda. No matter what he says, no matter what jurists he quotes, it is a fact that he is asking us to discuss some other matter. We are ready, along with other States, to take new additional measures against acts of international terrorism.

190. But let us put things in their proper place. What we are discussing today is the armed attack by Israel against Uganda, the killing of Ugandan citizens, the material damage inflicted on Uganda. As the representative of Tanzania quite rightly pointed out, the representative of Israel did not even express any regrets about that. He wanted people to express regrets about other things.

191. In an attempt to divert the Council's attention from the item on its agenda, the representative of Israel—in accordance with what has become his system—had recourse to lying attacks and fabrications. I would even say, although I do not like to use coarse language, but I am practically forced to do so here, that he made slanderous attacks on my country, among others. As I said earlier, he has attacked practically all the members of the Council, attacks that cannot be justified in this chamber. But the representative of Israel miscalculated. No doubt he is a good lawyer, but I would not say that his juridical practice can be applied to politics. Whatever relations his country may have with other countries, he must not forget that sovereign States are represented on the Security Council and that this is not the place to discuss the actions, policies or régimes of other countries, if such questions are not on the agenda. Today, there is just one item on the agenda. I have stated what that item is.

192. But the representative of Israel did not shrink from making slanderous attacks. What is he trying to do? He is trying to prevent a concrete, businesslike discussion of the item on the agenda and to confuse it with other matters. Most of the members of the Council and most of the non-members who have spoken here have condemned the act of aggression against Uganda. Today, the representative of Israel appealed to us to follow his example. But in that case, it would not be international law that would govern relations between States; it would be the law of piracy and aggression. That conclusion cannot be avoided.

193. The representative of Israel had recourse to his normal Zionist attacks against the Soviet Union. He should rise above such things. After all, he represents a country; he does not represent some organization. He will understand what I mean. The lack of foundation for his slanders against my country is obvious. I have no intention of dwelling upon the matters he referred to. In due course, if I deem it necessary to do so, I shall go into more detail in answering his accusations.

194. The delegation of the Soviet Union categorically rejects the representative of Israel's cynical attempts to confuse the issue we are discussing, to camouflage it. I want to put this courteously, so I would merely say that the representative of Israel should think over everything that was said before his statement to the Council.

195. His attempt to justify the act of aggression that is committed by references to the right of States to defend their citizens was unfounded and inadmissible. No matter what references the representative of Israel has recourse to, no matter what authorities he invokes, he still gives the impression of being unable to conceal the fact that Israel has committed a flagrant act of aggression against a small African State. I believe, I hope, I am convinced that no State will want to follow Israel's disgraceful example. Actions of the kind we are discussing create dangerous threats to peace in Africa—and not in Africa alone. We really must reflect on this matter in the Council and ponder it seriously.

196. Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan): The representative of Israel, in referring to the statement I made yesterday, did not mention any of the arguments or facts presented in that statement. It is significant that he did not do so but, instead, made some irrelevant and false remarks about my country.

197. The representative of Israel said that he would have dealt with more respect with my remarks had they not come from the representative of a régime which has locked up its entire political opposition in gaol.

198. The representative of Israel is a soldier—or at least he was a soldier until he came here. But perhaps he has some qualified person on his staff who could easily have briefed him on the actual situation in my country. As his knowledge of the conditions in my country appears to be rather rudimentary, judging from his remarks today, we have no option but to state the facts very briefly for his benefit.

199. The Government of Pakistan is a democratic Government, duly elected by the people of Pakistan in free fair elections. The system of government is parliamentary in character, and the Government of the country is accountable to the Parliament, consisting of the elected representatives of the people.

200. We are indeed touched by the concern expressed by the representative of Israel for the political opposition in my country. However, he is factually incorrect when he says that the entire political opposition has been locked up in gaol. The fact of the matter is that only one opposition party, which according to the evidence available was acting against the territorial integrity of the State, was banned. That ban was subsequently, after due process of law, upheld by the Supreme Court of Pakistan.

201. Perhaps the representative of Israel will be interested to know that in Pakistan there are other opposition parties, such as the Muslim League, Jamat-e-Islami and Jamat-e-Ulema-e-Islam, and that all these opposition parties are actively and fully participating in the work of the national Parliament and the provincial assemblies.

202. I hope that in future the representative of Israel will operate within the parameters of the subject of our debate and not make such patently false and irrelevant statements against a Member State.

203. Mr. MUJEZINOVIC (Yugoslavia): In his second speech, the representative of Israel mentioned my country. He said that Yugoslavia was anxious to demonstrate its loyal alignment with the remarks of the so-called non-aligned countries. In this regard, I should like to say that not only were we anxious to express our solidarity with the position taken by all non-aligned countries, and not only those that spoke at this meeting on the item on the agenda, but that Yugoslavia is actually a country that has, together with all other non-aligned countries, been active in evolving and formulating a policy of international relations which is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. That means that we are advocating the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and national independence which have become the basic principles of the policy of non-alignment and which have, from the very inception of this Organization, been the principles of the United Nations. So we are not a so-called non-aligned country, we are a movement dedicated to those principles, and we shall carry on our struggle for the implementation and strict observance of these principles in international behaviour. Naturally, whoever violates those principles will be condemned by all of the non-aligned countries, including my own—which happens to be a founder member of the non-aligned movement. So I am very happy that the representative of Israel mentioned that we have demonstrated our solidarity with our brothers from the non-aligned world.

204. Secondly, the representative of Israel said that Yugoslavia was apparently blinded by an extreme anti-Israeli attitude and by an espousal of the cause of the new anti-Semitism in the world today. Well, I think Mr. Herzog has not the least moral right to be speaking about anti-Semitism in connection with Yugoslavia. I should like to remind him that during our liberation

struggle which we fought against the Nazis from 1941 to 1945, many Jews were in the National Liberation Army; that many Jews became outstanding leaders of modern Yugoslavia; that all Jews in Yugoslavia enjoy the same rights that other nations and nationalities enjoy, and that we have very active members of the Jewish community in the political, economic, diplomatic and other services of modern Yugoslavia. That is one thing. The other thing is that all those who were active anti-Semites and who were associated with the Nazi atrocities during the Second World War fled from Yugoslavia and are still living in the countries which, unfortunately, are supporting Israel's irresponsible behaviour in international relations. So I would like to tell the Israeli representative that he should address himself in this respect to them, and ask for the eradication of anti-Semitism in those countries, not in our country.

205. The representative of Israel said that international terrorism, from which other countries suffer no less than Israel, will make their representatives eat the words they spoke in this debate. Everybody is aware that this represents a threat—which is normal for the Israeli representative, because he has been threatening everybody in this chamber and the policy that he represents is nothing but a threat to peace and security in the world. It is all the more dangerous as it comes in the context of his efforts to justify the 53-minute-long aggression against and violation of the national sovereignty of an independent State Member of the United Nations.

206. I should like to express my complete agreement with the statement by my friend from Tanzania that the attempts to justify the temporary aggression are actually the real danger of today, because we all know that there are no long-lasting aggressions, nor can there be without lasting and grave consequences for international peace and security.

207. So what we have to face today is actually Israel's new practice in international relations of trying to legalize and to get support for its act of aggression and its temporary violation of territorial integrity. But I am sure that Israel will not get that support. On the contrary, I am sure that the entire international community—and this international organization especially—will find ways and means to prevent such behaviour and such practices.

208. Regarding the remarks of the Israeli representative that I did not say anything in my speech about other victims of the raid, I should like to advise him to read my speech once again to see what I said.

209. In conclusion, let me say that all this shows that Israel, whose policy of aggression is very well known to the world community and to our Organization—and which has been condemned repeatedly and most strongly by the vast majority of the Member States and by all peace-loving forces in the world, continues to defy the fundamental norms of behaviour

among States as laid down by the Charter. Israel has once again manifested its aggressive intentions by resorting to aggressive action. The treacherous Israeli air raid on Entebbe Airport in Uganda clearly shows that Israel continues to flout the decisions of the United Nations and the interests of the international community, and that it persists in its policy of aggression, threatening the security of other independent countries and thereby jeopardizing international peace and security. The first and especially the second statement made here by Mr. Herzog are nothing but a confirmation of such behaviour, which is deeply rooted in the expansionist character of Israeli policy. Therefore, I have nothing to add to what I said yesterday in this chamber.

210. I reserve the right to speak more comprehensively at a later time, if need be.

211. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): I fail to understand the statement made by the Libyan representative to the effect that I hate Libya. I never said so. Indeed, some of my best friends are Libyans.

212. I should add that it is, perhaps, germane to quote President Nimeiri of Sudan, who said only yesterday in a speech that "the international community, as it is represented in the Security Council, must adopt resolutions which will put an end to the madness of the Libyan régime, a régime which threatens the security of the entire region, Arab and African". I did not say that; President Nimeiri said it.

213. And President Sadat announced yesterday that "it is no secret that the notorious terrorist, Carlos, is now residing in Libya", and he went on at great length to describe Libya's implication.

214. It might interest my Libyan colleague to know that we have here a wire service report to the effect that the Secretary of Libya's ruling Arab Socialist Union, Mr. Mohammed Hejazi, who is visiting Australia at the moment, said that he did not support the attack on the freedom of Uganda, but that since the hostages were Israeli passport holders the Israelis did—in his view—what they had to do. That is said just as a matter of curiosity.

215. I should like to assure the representative of Yugoslavia that I did not make any threat. I had no intention of doing so. I made a statement of fact, and I personally hope and pray that it will not come true, because I trust that neither Yugoslavia nor any other country will ever have to face the dilemma which my Government had to face 10 days ago.

216. In reply to the Foreign Minister of Mauritius and to my colleague from Tanzania who asked me, "Would Israel have carried out similar rescue operations in Amsterdam, Paris, Athens or other European cities?", my reply is so obvious: none of the Governments mentioned would ever have stooped so low as did the Government of Uganda; they would never have become accomplices of international terrorism.

Indeed, in two of the cases mentioned, in the past they have actively collaborated in action against terrorism when it occurred on their soil.

217. Finally, in reply to the representative of the Soviet Union, let me remind him that the United Nations did not create Israel. Israel was created over 3,000 years ago and was a nation dispensing moral values to the world thousands of years before the Soviet Union was ever dreamt of. The United Nations merely reaffirmed the debt owed to the Jewish people by history and by the world.

218. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): As I said before, I will answer the fabrications, allegations and distortions of the representative of the Zionist entity later on. But now he obliges me to speak again just to say that Mr. Herzog can have Libyan friends. No problem. As an Irishman and as a Jew. We have nothing against the Irish and we have nothing against the Jews. We are fighting the Zionist aggressors and the terrorists.

219. Also, I want to point to another aspect of Mr. Herzog's statement. He is repeating, again and again, that Libya is the paymaster of international terrorism and that it is promoting international terrorism. I do not know what is behind that. This whole question of international terrorism poses a big question mark. Who is perpetrating international terrorism? What is international terrorism? Who is responsible for international terrorism? There may be many groups known as international terrorists but which have their own national or ideological background. But many groups are penetrated. Maybe one day we shall know the truth. Mr. Herzog was the head of the secret service of his country, in his counterfeit State, Israel. Maybe one day he will write his memoirs, when he has retired to his green Ireland. At that time he will not be bound by the laws of secrecy of this counterfeit State, Israel. Maybe Israel will be history by that time.

220. The PRESIDENT: There are no other delegations wishing to exercise their right of reply. I shall now call on the representative of China who would like to respond to some words addressed to his delegation.

221. Mr. CHOU Nan (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Allow me, in the name of the Chinese delegation, to express deep thanks to the representatives of Panama, Romania, Japan and India for the cordial sentiments they have shown in connexion with the passing away of Chairman Chou-teh.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

Notes

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 28.

² *Ibid.*, p. 23.

³ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 860, p. 105.

⁴ London, Stevens and Sons, 1970.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах по всем районам 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.
