

UNITED NATIONS

005356



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UNI LIBRARY

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

MAY 28 1985

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

1941st MEETING: 12 JULY 1976

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1941)	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.

1941st MEETING

Held in New York, on Monday, 12 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/1941)

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 4.20 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 its 1939th and 1940th meetings, I invite the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Israel, Kenya, Mauritania, Mauritius, Qatar, Somalia, Uganda and the United Republic of Cameroon 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. Hussen (Somalia) and Mr. Oyono (United Republic of Cameroon) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter requesting an invitation to participate in the Council's discussion from the representative of Yugoslavia. 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 Yugoslavia to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

3. I invite the representative of Yugoslavia 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. Mujezinović (Yugoslavia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

4. Mr. BOYA (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, before coming to the question now before the Council, allow me to extend to you the sincere congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of July. My delegation believes that, thanks to

your outstanding qualities as an experienced and tried diplomat, the Council's debates will take place in a calm climate of sincere co-operation. Your country, Italy, and mine, the People's Republic of Benin, have long been committed to mutually advantageous co-operation, which is making constant progress both in the European Economic Community and within the specific framework of relations between our two countries.

5. I should like to renew to your predecessor, Ambassador Jackson of the Co-operative Republic of Guyana, my delegation's sincere congratulations for the impartial and outstanding manner in which he led our debates for the month of June. My delegation was particularly honoured because the distinguished Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guyana presided over our last meetings. This was an outstanding and noteworthy tribute to the importance that all third world nations attach to the noble ideals of the United Nations for the safeguarding of international peace and security.

6. Finally, I should like to take this opportunity to extend the Beninese delegation's most sincere and heartfelt condolences to the Chinese delegation at the passing of a great and unforgettable son of China, Comrade Chou-teh, member of the Central Committee and President of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China. Comrade Chou-teh will always be an example of a revolutionary patriot of great stature, who participated in an outstanding manner in the struggle for national liberation and in the creation and consolidation of socialist China.

7. My delegation associates itself fully with the clarification made this morning by the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic; this is why it will limit itself strictly to the item inscribed on the agenda, that is, Uganda's complaint regarding Israel's aggression on its territory.

8. The matter brought before the Council by the last summit meeting of African Heads of State meeting in Mauritius is one of principle which can be approached very simply. There is no need to go outside this precise framework, clearly defined by the 48 African Heads of State, and lose ourselves in conjecture or in the various byways of international politics, in order to approach the consideration of the question whose immediate or far-reaching implications for international peace and security are all too evident.

9. Indeed, what is at stake here? This is an act of aggression perpetrated against Uganda. Can we forget what led to this reprehensible act of which Uganda was the victim? Can we forget that Uganda, in agreeing to allow the hijacked aircraft to land at its airport, only acceded to the request of a great nation which, in any case, was only trying to save its aircraft and the lives of the innocent passengers?

10. Have we, then, the right to pelt President Idi Amin with insults and to paint such an unpleasant portrait of him when we know that, out of all the actors in the tragedy at Entebbe, it was he who, in the final analysis, helped to bring about a dénouement which has been described as fortunate? Can we regard President Idi Amin as an accomplice in this act of aerial piracy without vigorously condemning that great Power, a party to the Hague Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft,¹ which asked a small country to harbour the hijackers and the hostages? In fact, what we are seeing is tremendous hypocrisy on the part of the great Powers. Let us suppose for a moment that the hijacked aircraft had landed in the Soviet Union, for example. Do the members of the Council think that in that case Israel would have dared to commit this foul act? Of course not.

11. The Council, which has the lofty task of maintaining international peace and security at all costs, must examine impartially and without ulterior motives this flagrant and premeditated act of aggression that has been whole-heartedly criticized by Africa and unanimously condemned by the peace-loving and justice-loving peoples of the world.

12. Africa as a whole has its eyes on the Council, and it rejects in advance any manoeuvre aimed at getting the Council to discuss a question that is not before it. No excuse, no justification—however intelligently presented by the Israeli aggressors and their friends—can push into the background the obviously criminal nature of this act, whose consequences are so serious. Indeed, the facts themselves prove that statement to be true.

13. President Amin, who deserves our sympathy and our full solidarity, took personal charge of the situation with a view to settling the matter peacefully and saving innocent lives. At every stage of the events connected with the tragedy, he did everything he could to preserve the lives and safeguard the security of the hostages aboard the French Airbus diverted to Entebbe. The best proof of this is the impartial tribute paid to President Amin by the flight engineer of the Airbus in Paris, on behalf of the crew and the passengers—a tribute later confirmed by the commandant of the plane. All the hostages, without exception, were given special attention by the President of Uganda. He made medical supplies and food available to them. Clippings from the international press also prove that the passengers of the airbus hijacked to Entebbe were not subjected to bad treatment or any demonstrations of hatred on the part of the Ugandans, who, on the contrary, scrupulously observed the rules of African hospitality.

14. Another very important element which attests to the good faith of the President of Uganda and which helped considerably to relax the very tense atmosphere was that he was able to obtain the progressive release of a large number of hostages. It should be

added that the President of Uganda was able, at the expiration of the first deadline set by the hijackers, to obtain an extension of the deadline until 4 July. That deadline had not yet been reached when the Israeli aggressors put their diabolical plan into effect.

15. Finally, although Uganda no longer has diplomatic relations with Israel, is it not a fact that President Amin agreed to admit to his territory a special Israeli envoy entrusted with the task of following the negotiations for the exchange of Palestinian prisoners for the 103 hostages, almost all of whom were Israeli?

16. The revelations widely disseminated in the international press have proved, *a fortiori*, that the President of Uganda and his people had been duped in a most dishonest and inadmissible way. This precious Israeli negotiator was nothing other than a terrorist saboteur officially sent to Uganda by Israel. He was nothing but a super-spy whose mission was to prepare the ground by destroying the telecommunication facilities, thereby making it easier to carry out a reprehensible crime that was such a danger to international peace and security.

17. As to the alleged connivance of the President of Uganda with the hijackers, that was an accusation which they did not hesitate to make, for everyone knows that the people of Uganda and the overwhelming majority of the international community support the Palestinian cause, which is a deeply just cause.

18. In the light of the foregoing, all of the actions taken by President Amin throughout the tragic events in Entebbe reflect a deep and praiseworthy humanitarian concern.

19. The false accusations and lies of the enemies of Africa and of the freedom of peoples are aimed solely at sowing confusion and division. Israel's criminal raid in Entebbe is an outright act of aggression that flies in the face of international law, which Israel regards as a mere scrap of paper.

20. The Israeli aggressors, their protectors and their admirers have deliberately created a dangerous precedent which, it must be honestly acknowledged, will pose a constant threat to the collective security which the United Nations, through our Council, is responsible for preserving. No criminal act by isolated individuals, no matter how reprehensible it may be, can justify any nation's resorting to the law of the jungle.

21. Those who, unscrupulously and deliberately, have implicated themselves in this criminal act of war have inevitably given Israel *carte blanche* and are prepared to condone a repetition elsewhere. Therein lies the true danger—that mankind may once again be plunged into nightmare, with the crumbling of all the values and noble ideals that inspire the United Nations. It is to protect those values and ideals that the nations of the world, powerful and weak, large

and small, rich and poor—with due respect for their diversity, have joined together in the United Nations.

22. By their act of aggression the Israeli authorities have placed themselves beyond the pale of international law and justice. The Council must realize this and do all it can to safeguard and strengthen international peace and security.

23. My delegation unequivocally and vehemently condemns Israel's act of aggression against Uganda—an act which has caused many Ugandan casualties vast material destruction which have evoked unanimous sympathy for the Ugandan people. Hence it is absurd, if not immoral, to consider that act a victory, for it can in no way brighten tarnished image of the Israeli Zionists in the comity of nations.

24. As a matter of fact, Uganda is not the only victim of this tragedy. The victims are the peoples of Africa, indeed, the peoples of the entire world, who are struggling against all forms of domination in international relations. Israel's aggression is consistent with the logic of international imperialism, which will stop at nothing in order to impose its law.

25. Israel's aggression confirms us in our position regarding Israeli zionism, which remains a political doctrine of aggression and domination, a bridgehead for the scourge of international imperialism.

26. For all those reasons, Israel's act of aggression against Uganda cannot but receive unanimous disapproval and unreserved condemnation. Israel must be required to pay compensation for the damage inflicted on Uganda.

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

28. Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): Sir, may I at the outset congratulate you upon your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of July. Your wide-ranging experience and diplomatic skills qualify you to guide the deliberations of this august body. My delegation takes special pleasure in seeing you presiding over the Council, as you represent a country with which the Somali Democratic Republic has strong and long-standing ties of close friendship and co-operation. Once again, I am pleased to renew my country's appreciation to your country for the sincerity and good faith with which Italy carried out the Trusteeship Agreement relating to Somalia. I should like to express my delegation's thanks to you and to the rest of the Council for having permitted my delegation to take part in the debate.

29. At this moment, and before I go further, allow me to express my delegation's heartfelt condolences to the delegation of the People's Republic of China

upon the demise of Comrade Chou-teh, whose qualities as one of China's greatest revolutionary leaders will be imprinted on our memories throughout the years. I request the representative of China to convey our sincere expression of sympathy to the Government and people of China.

30. We asked to participate in this debate to add our voice to those who preceded us, and to urge the Council to condemn, in the strongest possible terms, the Zionist régime in Tel Aviv for the naked act of aggression which it has committed against the people and Government of the Republic of Uganda. We ask the Council to do so because what is at stake here is the very existence and sovereignty of a Member State. Not only does this act of terrorism and aggression unleashed by the Zionist régime against Uganda on 4 July threaten the purposes and principles of the United Nations and its Charter, but it constitutes a danger to international peace and security.

31. It is with great indignation that the people and Government of the Somali Democratic Republic view this unprovoked and unlawful act of aggression. This feeling of indignation is aptly summed up in the telegram transmitted by Jaalle Mohamed Siad Barre, President of the Somali Democratic Republic, to Idi Amin, President of the Republic of Uganda. In that telegram, the President of the Somali Democratic Republic stated:

[*The speaker read out the text quoted in document S/12136.*]

32. The Republic of Uganda is not the first peace-loving country whose sovereignty and territorial integrity have been violated by the arrogant racist Zionist régime. Since its illegal occupation of the Arab land of Palestine 30 years ago, this régime has been engaged in committing unprovoked aggression against sovereign nations. For an illustration of Israel's habitual transgression and its unbelievable, barefaced inclination to indulge in an unrestrained attitude, we need only look at the surrounding Arab States. We can recall the numerous occasions on which the world came to the brink of an all-engulfing war because of the callous behaviour of the Zionist régime in the Middle East and its utter disregard for international law. The plight of the Palestinian Arab nation is a perfect example of the fiendish mentality of the Israeli régime.

33. It is a well-known fact that this racist Zionist régime has been engaged, through the years, in wilful violence and subversion in Africa and elsewhere. It is fitting in this regard to quote from *The New York Times* of 10 July, which, in a long article dedicated to the discrediting of the Head of State of a Member State of this Organization, touched incidentally upon Israel's open interference in the internal affairs of other Arab and African countries. It stated, *inter alia*: "Israel's interest in Uganda was largely motivated

by the Sudanese civil war, in which southern Sudanese... had been fighting for 10 years with northern Sudanese". Though it is a well-recorded fact, the paper has reconfirmed that throughout this long period Israel continued to supply arms shipments to the southern Sudanese. Other countries, including my own, have also been subjected to the same unwarranted interference in a variety of forms. Uganda is only the latest victim of the continuous terror and intimidation perpetrated by Israel.

34. Numerous hijackings, most of them politically motivated, have taken place over the years. The victims of these acts have been innocent civilian citizens of different nationalities. The international community has consistently demanded the release of these innocent people and their safe conduct to their destinations. Yet, we all know that the safety of such victims, important and legitimate as it is, cannot be a justification for a blatant act of aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State and the wanton killing of its innocent citizens. Such a despicable act could only be committed by Israel which, assured of the full support of a powerful country and always shamefully anxious to display its arrogance, has made it a major principle of its governmental policies to espouse State terrorism. Such an attitude is not the least surprising, for Israel is itself a product of terrorism.

35. Israel also made it a habit that it is customarily expected for its delegations at international forums to remind us, as it did before the Council on 9 July [1939th meeting], of the Nazi holocaust in Europe in order to enlist sympathy and support. Israel should realize that, if the world condemned Hitler and his Nazi philosophy based on racial purity, it is only logical that Israel too must expect the same from the world community as it practises policies similar to, if not identical with, those of Hitler yesterday and those of Pretoria's white minority régime today.

36. The Zionist régime claims that it was alone in planning and executing its atrocity in Uganda. The Government and people of the Somali Democratic Republic find it very hard to believe that Israel did not get a helping hand from its customary supporters in conducting this sordid affair, as has been the case in all its past military adventures. We feel strongly that the conspiracy is larger than has been admitted to, that the truth will come out in time, and that whoever took part in this shameful act will ultimately be uncovered.

37. The representative of Israel tried to convince us—especially the members of the Council—that even my country, Somalia, was involved in the hijacking of the French airbus. He tried to make the participation of the Somali Ambassador in the negotiations for the safety of the hostages look as if the Government of Somalia was linked to the venture. This sinister allegation is unfounded and slanderous, to say the

least. The reason why the Somali Ambassador accepted the plea to participate in the negotiations, apart from his natural sympathy, compassion and concern for human life, was that he was the dean of the Arab Ambassadors accredited to Uganda. In that capacity, as has been explained by President Idi Amin in his communication contained in document S/12124, the Somali Ambassador agreed to participate in the negotiations along with his French counterpart. It is difficult to believe that the Israeli representative would have the insolence to distort the facts and to attempt to discredit the compassionate action undertaken by the Somali Ambassador. Had the Somali Ambassador done otherwise and refused to lend his requested services to the cause of saving the hostages, it would, in our opinion, have been an unforgivable act on his part. For this reason there is no room for the Israeli allegation. However, this is merely another demonstration of the desperate and cynical attitude which the Zionist régime has for anything that smacks of humanitarianism.

38. Throughout his statement, the Israeli representative endeavoured to drive a wedge between the Arab States and the African States by acting as a self-appointed devil's advocate. It is not, of course, new to us that he should do so, because we know the history of Israel and the fact that it thrives on sowing seeds of trouble and subversion. We know, too, that the Tel Aviv régime derives its inspiration, strangely enough, from discord and violence.

39. In his fruitless groping for previous examples of what I can describe as "justifiable violence", the Israeli representative once again attempted to feed us another distorted version of the unfortunate incident at Loyada, a small village on the border of the Somali Democratic Republic with so-called French Somaliland. If the Zionist representative had any desire for the truth, he would not have blinded himself to the facts of that incident. If it were not for his deviousness, he would have recalled—for it is there in the records of the Council—that, first of all, the vehicle in which the children were held was in a territory under French rule, and not in the Somali Republic's territory, as he would have us believe. The Zionist representative, in his desperate groping for an elusive justification of his régime's shameful and unprecedented action, assembled examples of other activities involving violence which had been committed by other Powers. He cited incidents such as the *Mayaguez*, Loyada and Entebbe—all of which are incidents of aggression by those States whose arrogance of power has made them oblivious to respect for the principles of international law and for equality and sovereignty among nations, large and small, the very principles this Organization was created to safeguard and uphold. We believe that it is the duty of the Council to reject such a contention, which, if it went unchallenged, might undermine the very reason for the existence of this world body. This idea is nothing but a suggestion we should return to

the law of the jungle, where only the strong would survive.

40. Even the Organization of African Unity was not spared indiscriminate harassment on the part of the Tel Aviv representative. He felt no shame in offending an organization of 48 independent States. Allow me to refer to what he said in this connexion:

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

Such insolence on the part of a régime that fully shares with Pretoria's minority régime the belief that they are superior races and that other races are inferior to them is preposterous and utterly unacceptable. Africa makes no compromise on the rejection and denunciation of such and absurd notion.

41. In conclusion, I should like to emphasize once again that my delegation urges the Council to take adequate and prompt measures against the Israeli régime and to condemn it for its unlawful act of aggression against the Republic of Uganda.

42. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Somali Democratic Republic for the congratulations he conveyed to me. I am particularly grateful to him for his reference to the close historic links between the Somali Democratic Republic and my country and to the satisfactory way in which Italy has carried out the mandate conferred upon it by the United Nations. Having myself been involved in that task, in however small a role, I fully share some happy remembrances with my Somali colleague.

43. The next speaker is the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table.

44. Before I give him the floor, I should like to convey to him and to the Government and people of his country, on behalf of the Council and on my own behalf, our most sincere condolences upon the demise of a former Head of State, Mr. Gustav Heinemann, who was President of the Federal Republic of Germany from 1 July 1969 until 30 June 1974. In this connexion, I wish to recall a significant event which occurred during his tenure of office: the admission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations.

45. I call on the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany.

46. Mr. von WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. President, let me, on behalf of my delegation, thank you and the other members of the Council for the kind words of condolence that you

have expressed on the occasion of the untimely death of the former President of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Gustav Heinemann.

47. My delegation would first like to express its gratitude to the members of the Council for authorizing our participation in this debate.

48. It is for the first time that the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany addresses the Security Council. We are particularly pleased that this should occur under the presidency of the representative of Italy, a country with which we are closely united as friends and as partners in the European Economic Community. Mr. President, your wisdom, skill and long experience in international affairs will guarantee the most objective guidance of the Council's procedures.

49. Allow me on this occasion to extend to the delegation of the People's Republic of China the sincere condolences of my delegation on the recent death of Mr. Chu-teh, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China and an outstanding leader.

50. In the Federal Republic of Germany we have watched with consternation and sympathy the hijacking of a commercial airliner, the holding hostage of its more than 250 passengers and crew and the sufferings of those victims, including many women, children and elderly people.

51. It was with profound relief that we learned of the failure of the terrorist action and the rescue of the hostages at the very last minute before the announced intention to kill them was carried out. We deeply regret the loss of lives that occurred.

52. The Federal Republic of Germany was directly affected. It was intended to compel the Federal Government, under threat of death to the hostages, to release criminals who, as is well known, in no sense can be called freedom fighters but are persons convicted of, or under criminal investigation for, the murder of a judge and other capital crimes under penal law.

53. We regret that German nationals were among the kidnapers. If it should be found that they had accomplices in my country, these will be severely punished.

54. The kidnapers' plot, which outraged the international public, was marked by a total disregard for the fundamental human rights of innocent persons and was a barbarous assault on the States they tried to blackmail. In view of the kidnapers' publicly announced determination to kill the hostages, the rescue operation was undertaken to resolve a situation which must have appeared hopeless.

55. It has been alleged that the Federal Government participated in the operation to save the hostages and that it knew about the rescue plan in advance. This assertion is false and without any foundation.

56. We hope that this debate will clarify the course of events at Entebbe airport. Their consequences are grave. They concern us all. New international tension has been created.

57. In the Federal Government's view, this new case of taking hostages has clearly shown once again that an escalation of force, whatever reason may be given for it, jeopardizes international security and threatens the foundation of normal intergovernmental relations. We appeal to those responsible to unite in declaring that such acts of violence committed against innocent and uninvolved human beings must never be a means of enforcing political interests and objectives.

58. In our view, this most recent hijacking drama, no less than the assault on the ministers of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries in Vienna in December 1975, was nothing but a criminal act. The drama at Entebbe is a challenge to the world Organization, whose primary task is to safeguard peace.

59. The community of nations has failed so far to create effective instruments to combat terrorism and in particular the taking of hostages. This was rightly pointed out earlier by several speakers in the Council. The United Nations should now address itself to this task, and without delay.

60. The Federal Government urges the General Assembly to consider this issue at its next session. Priority should be given to international measures to prevent the taking of hostages. We strongly request the preparation of a convention on international measures against the taking of hostages which will ensure, in particular, that those perpetrating such acts are either extradited or prosecuted in the country where they are apprehended.

61. Faced with this common threat, let us set aside differences and take concrete action now.

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

63. Mr. MUJEZINOVIĆ (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you on your assuming the presidency of the Council for the month of July. The excellent and friendly relations existing between Yugoslavia and Italy, as two neighbouring countries, give me added pleasure in doing so. Your skill and experience in both bilateral and multilateral diplomacy are a guarantee that the Council, faced with complex and responsible tasks this month, is in very capable hands indeed.

64. Before I proceed to the question on the agenda, I should like to express my deep condolences to the representative of the People's Republic of China on the tragic occasion of the passing-away of Chairman Chou-teh, an outstanding statesman and a great leader of the Chinese revolution.

65. The United Nations and the international community as a whole have recently again been placed in a situation which not only constitutes a violation of the basic provisions of the Charter but which also directly threatens the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of an independent and non-aligned country, a State Member of the United Nations. As a response to the unacceptable method of blackmail using the lives of innocent passengers—something the international community cannot tolerate, irrespective of the motives of those involved in such a dangerous undertaking—an act of aggression was committed which constitutes a threat to international peace and security. The Israeli military intervention at the Ugandan airport of Entebbe constitutes an open act of aggression and a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent and non-aligned country.

66. The Yugoslav people and Government condemn this act most emphatically, an act in which many innocent people lost their lives and considerable material damage was inflicted. This action is unprecedented in the relations and behaviour of States. At a time when the whole international community is striving to preserve peace and security in the world, when efforts are being made to ensure that the letter of the Charter relating to the peaceful solution of disputes and the prohibition of the use of force for the solution of international problems will be fully respected, this most recent act of State terrorism sets a precedent that could have unforeseeable consequences for international and inter-State relations.

67. I am convinced that all the Member States and the international community are acquainted with the position of non-aligned Yugoslavia with regard to terrorism in general. I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to repeat what my Government has already stated many times in various international forums, namely that non-aligned Yugoslavia, a Member State of the United Nations since its founding, condemns most energetically every terrorist attack and the hijacking of planes regardless of who the perpetrator is and for what purpose it is done. However, we should like to point out that it is inadmissible to react to terrorist acts of individuals or groups, which are condemned by the international community as a whole, through a terrorist attack such as that of the State of Israel against a sovereign and independent country. A halt should be put to such behaviour by means of the broadest action of the whole international community, primarily through the United Nations. Any encouragement of such behaviour or open support of any act of State terrorism is, in the

opinion of my delegation, contrary to the Charter and to the international rules governing relations among States. Far from promoting international peace, this has a negative impact on peace and might have very grave consequences for security in the world.

68. The member States of the Organization of African Unity at their recent meeting in Mauritius thoroughly examined this latest act of State terrorism by Israel and adopted appropriate decisions. I should like to express the full support of my delegation for the stand adopted in this regard by the Heads of State or Government of African countries at this meeting.

69. In conclusion, may I express, on behalf of my delegation, our deepest condolences to the people and Government of Uganda and the families of all citizens who were innocent victims of the military intervention at Entebbe Airport.

70. Mr. SCRANTON (United States of America): First of all, Mr. President, I should like to say how pleased I am to see you in the President's chair during this debate. With the artistry of Leonardo da Vinci, the structural genius of Michelangelo, and the practical imagination of Galileo in your veins, I am sure that your long experience and your diplomatic skill will make yours one of the outstanding presidencies of our régime.

71. I should also like to pay a tribute to Mr. Wills, the Foreign Minister of Guyana and to Ambassador Jackson for the competent way in which they presided over the many meetings and the many consultations that were held last month. Incidentally, I hope that the representative of Guyana will thank Ambassador Jackson for his comments about the 200th anniversary of our independence.

72. Also, I should like to convey to the delegation of China my sincere condolences and sympathy on the death of Chairman Chou-teh, and to the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany the same feelings concerning the death of Mr. Gustav Heinemann.

73. And last but by no means least, I thank the Foreign Minister of Mauritius for quoting me this morning—and may I, incidentally, say that I thought his delivery of what I said was far better than mine.

74. The Council has been convened to discuss the military operation of Israel to rescue the hostages that were held by air hijackers at Entebbe Airport in Uganda. The Government of Uganda has condemned Israel for what is termed "aggression against Uganda". Israel has been accused of violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Uganda, of wantonly destroying sections of Entebbe Airport, and of killing a number of Ugandan soldiers. These are very grave charges and it is clearly the duty of this Council to consider them in light of the facts and of international law.

75. As members of the Council know, I spoke several times earlier this year in the Council defending the principle of territorial sovereignty in Africa. I reaffirm that today. In addition to that principle, there are other basic principles and issues at stake in the question that is before us. We must be deeply concerned over the problem of air piracy and the callous and pernicious use of innocent people as hostages to promote political ends. The Council cannot forget that the Israeli operation in Uganda would never have come about had the hijacking of the Air France flight from Athens not taken place.

76. Let us review the circumstances surrounding the Israeli action at Entebbe Airport. On 4 July, in order to rescue the remaining 100 hostages that had been hijacked in the Air France airbus and taken to Uganda, Israel sent a small military force to Entebbe. This force succeeded in rescuing the hostages and returning to Israel. Three of the hostages, one Israeli soldier, seven of the terrorists and a number of Ugandan soldiers were apparently killed and several Ugandan aircraft were destroyed. The Israeli force was on the ground for one and a half hours and departed for Israel as soon as it was possible to do so in safety.

77. Israel's action in rescuing the hostages necessarily involved a temporary breach of the territorial integrity of Uganda. Normally, such a breach would be impermissible under the Charter of the United Nations. However, there is a well established right to use limited force for the protection of one's own nationals from an imminent threat of injury or death in a situation where the State in whose territory they are located is either unwilling or unable to protect them. The right, flowing from the right of self-defence, is limited to such use of force as is necessary and appropriate to protect threatened nationals from injury.

78. The requirements of this right to protect nationals were clearly met in the Entebbe case. Israel had good reason to believe that at the time it acted Israeli nationals were in imminent danger of execution by the hijackers. Moreover, the actions necessary to release the Israeli nationals or to prevent substantial loss of Israeli lives had not been taken by the Government of Uganda, nor was there a reasonable expectation such actions would be taken. In fact, there is substantial evidence that the Government of Uganda co-operated with and aided the hijackers. A number of the released hostages have publicly related how the Ugandan authorities allowed several additional terrorists to reinforce the original group after the plane landed, permitted them to receive additional arms and additional explosives, participated in guarding the hostages and, according to some accounts, even took over sole custody of some or all of the passengers to allow the hijackers to rest. The ease and success of the Israeli effort to free the hostages further suggests that the Ugandan authorities could have overpowered the hijackers and released the hostages if they had really had the desire to do so.

79. The apparent support given to the hijackers by the Ugandan authorities causes us to question whether Uganda lived up to its international legal obligations under The Hague Convention of 1970.¹ The rights of a State carry with them important responsibilities which were not met by Uganda in this case. The Israeli military action was limited to the sole objective of extricating the passengers and crew and it terminated when that objective was accomplished. The force employed was limited to what was necessary for the rescue of the passengers and crew.

80. That Israel might have secured the release of its nationals by complying with the terrorists' demands does not alter these conclusions. No State is required to yield control over persons in lawful custody in its territory under criminal charges. Moreover, it would be a self-defeating and dangerous policy to release prisoners, convicted in some cases of earlier acts of terrorism, in order to accede to the demands of terrorists.

81. It should be emphasized that this assessment of the legality of the Israeli actions depends heavily on the unusual circumstances of this specific case. In particular, the evidence is strong that, given the attitude of the Ugandan authorities, co-operation with or reliance on them in rescuing the passengers and crew was impracticable. It is to be hoped that these unique circumstances will not arise in the future. We of course strongly defend the concept of national sovereignty and territorial integrity. Moreover, the United States deplors the loss of life and property at Entebbe and extends its sympathy to those families who were bereaved by events originating in acts of terrorism that they neither supported nor condoned.

82. The United States delegation believes very strongly that the Council should address itself to the causes of incidents such as that which occurred last week in Uganda. We believe that the Council should once again take positive action to put an end to such senseless violence. We believe the United Nations should do everything within its power to ensure against a recurrence of this brutal, callous and senseless international crime of hijacking—the crime which gave rise to the Israeli action. At the very least, it seems to us, the Council should immediately record its collective view that international terrorism—and, specifically, hijacking—must be stopped. There is ample precedent for taking such action. The United Nations has spoken out strongly against hijacking and interference with international civil aviation a number of times. On 9 September 1970 the Council adopted by consensus resolution 286 (1970), appealing “for the immediate release of all passengers and crews without exception, held as a result of hijackings” and calling on States “to take all possible legal steps to prevent further hijackings or any other interference with international civil air travel.” Later in the autumn of 1970 the General Assembly adopted its detailed resolution 2645 (XXV) condemning “without excep-

tion whatsoever, all acts of aerial hijacking...". The resolution, which the Assembly adopted by an overwhelming vote of 105 in favour and none against, with 8 abstentions, further declared that "the exploitation of unlawful seizure of aircraft for the purpose of taking hostages is to be condemned", and it called for every effort to make a success out of the then forthcoming negotiations at the diplomatic conference in The Hague for an anti-hijacking treaty. Again acting by consensus, the Council on 20 June 1972 [S/10705] stated its grave concern "at the threat to the lives of passengers and crews arising from the hijacking of aircraft." The Council called upon States "to deter and prevent such acts and to take effective measures to deal with those who commit such acts". In addition, there already exists an international legal obligation for all States to prevent terrorist acts. The Declaration of Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, contained in General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), declares:

"Every State has the duty to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts in another State or acquiescing in organized activities within its territory directed towards the commission of such acts, when the acts referred to in the present paragraph involve a threat or use of force."

83. Concerning air hijacking in particular, 12 members of the Council have ratified the Hague Convention of 1970. Over half the members of the international community have accepted this Convention, including Uganda and Israel. The purpose of the Convention is to promote the safety of international civil aviation. It seeks to discourage hijacking by creating the realistic prospect of severe treatment by States of persons hijacking aircraft. To achieve this objective the Convention requires every Contracting State to make hijacking an offence punishable by severe penalties. Each Contracting State is also bound to take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over the offence of hijacking and any other act of violence against the passengers or crew of a hijacked aircraft which comes within its territory. According to the Convention, a Contracting State shall take all appropriate measures to restore control of the aircraft to its lawful commander. It must also facilitate the continuation of the journey of the passengers and crew as soon as practicable and shall without delay return the aircraft and its cargo to persons lawfully entitled to their possession. Finally, it must take the hijackers into custody and either prosecute or extradite them. These are high standards—no one denies that—but they are very reasonable standards. My Government does not believe that the Government of Uganda has lived up to its legal obligations under the Hague Convention to which it is a party.

84. The United States believes that the United Nations should go much further in addressing itself

to the evils of international terrorism. In 1972 we proposed a draft convention to the General Assembly, which provided, *inter alia*, that a signatory State either prosecute persons in its jurisdiction who commit any acts of international terrorism or extradite them to the State in which the crime was committed. Unfortunately, nothing has yet come of our initiative because of disagreement over the definition of terrorism.

85. With regard to air hijacking in particular, the United States has repeatedly pressed in the International Civil Aviation Organization for the adoption of an independent convention enabling States parties to act in concert against a State, even if not a party, that harbours hijackers or saboteurs or that fails to return an aircraft, passengers or crew. We shall continue to urge the adoption of such a convention because we believe that it could provide for world-wide enforcement of the fundamental legal principles reflected in the Hague Convention.

86. The Council can and should reaffirm its own stand in opposition to air hijacking which was expressed in the Council's consensus decision on hijacking adopted on 20 June 1972. Let us condemn the taking of innocent people as hostages. Let us deplore the threat to innocent human life at the hands of terrorists. Let us also reaffirm our dedication to the preservation of the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of every Member State. Most important, let us take a firm stand against terrorist hijacking—one of the most dangerous threats to peace and security in the world today.

87. Those are the measured and considered views of my Government concerning this episode, views with which I totally concur. But I ask you, Mr. President, and my other colleagues here to bear with me a few minutes longer, for I wish to make some personal comments about this episode in the context of the image of the United Nations itself, and particularly the Security Council.

88. My tenure here, as you all well know, has been of very short duration—approximately four months. In that period of time the Council has been in session almost continuously. With rare exceptions the issues before it have been exclusively those of the Middle East—outstandingly—and southern Africa.

89. To our Arab friends here and elsewhere, the United States delegation has made it clear on several occasions that problems in the Middle East are by no means totally one-sided. Each of us, I am sure, has individual pictures and vivid images that dwell in our minds whenever matters concerning the Middle East confront us—as they have many times over the last four months. In my personal experience, there is outstandingly a visit to a refugee camp south-west of Amman, where decent people were living under very trying conditions only with the help of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, having been expelled from

their homes in some cases not once but twice, in 1948 and 1967. And another picture which will never leave my mind is the condition of Karamah after the raid on that village. On the other hand, there is an equally vivid picture of Jews with access now to pray at the Wailing Wall. Or, even more vivid, those horrors—and you must all remember them—of Buchenwald, Dachau and Auschwitz.

90. To my African friends here and elsewhere I must say that on the issue of the liberation of southern Africa my Government has put itself squarely on the side of those who seek majority rule, with the determination that it be achieved by peaceful means. I am very happy that that policy has been adopted while I have been here.

91. But to my Arab and African friends I say here and now, loud and strong, that there may have been mixed pictures concerning some of the questions that have confronted the Council in the immediate past, but to my mind there is no doubt on this one—not one iota of doubt.

92. Why do I say that so strongly and so deeply? Yes, there was a temporary breach of the territorial sovereignty of Uganda, and let us hope that that never happens again. But there is another value, another judgement which surpasses that one in importance.

93. Like most of you, I have never been the head of a nation nor had the responsibilities thereof, but I have been accountable for the safety and protection of 12 million people in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. During that period of time—even though hardly under the same circumstances, I know—there were several occasions on which incidents concerning the safety, the protection and the lives of Pennsylvanians came to my office. Action thereon had to be decided by me, the ultimate executive authority in the Commonwealth. That was my first and foremost responsibility. It is the first and foremost responsibility of all Governments to take such decisions.

94. In this episode, that responsibility lay with the Government of Israel to protect its citizens, hostages threatened with their very lives, in mortal danger in a far-away place. Those innocent people were subject to the terrorist hijacking of the airplane on which they were rightfully flying, and further subjected to a six-day terrorizing experience in a foreign country, seeing other persons freed while the Jews were forced to remain; subjected at gunpoint to seven hijacker terrorists who know no law; aware that the only possibility of freedom came from a Government whose Head had previously rejoiced at the slaying of Israeli athletes at Munich, called for the extinction of Israel and praised that madman Hitler, who had on his evil conscience—if he had any conscience at all—the murder of 6 million Jews.

95. In such circumstances, it seems to me that the Government of Israel invoked one of the most re-

markable rescue missions in history, a combination of guts and brains that has seldom, if ever, been surpassed. It electrified millions everywhere, and I confess I was one of them. It was justified—truly justified—because innocent decent people have a right to live and be rescued from terrorists who recognize no law and who are ready to kill if their demands are not met.

96. Who has a conscience about this? We should, every single one of us. I assume that every one of us wants to do all in our power to avoid such episodes in the future. This is one episode in a series of cases of hijacking by terrorists about which we can do a great deal. I believe that if it really wants to, the United Nations, including the Security Council, can wipe such episodes off the face of this earth. As my Government has stated in this message I have just finished delivering, we can do this—I have pointed out how. We must do this; and then, and only then, will our consciences be clear for the future. They will never be clear for the past.

97. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): It is always difficult to speak after eloquent speakers; it is much more difficult to speak after Ambassador Scranton. I cannot possibly surpass him in commending you, Mr. President, and in expressing my delegation's appreciation at seeing you presiding over our deliberations. The Tanzanian delegation and I personally have had the pleasure of working with you in the course of several months, and in fact several years, both in the Council and outside it. We know of your diplomatic skill, your statesmanship, your capacity for work, your moderation and, above all, your patience. With those qualities, I am sure that our deliberations are in the right hands as we discuss this important, somewhat emotional, and yet crucial matter.

98. Allow me also to pay a tribute to the Foreign Minister of Guyana, Mr. Wills, and to the representative of Guyana, Ambassador Jackson, for the way they conducted our deliberations last month with such distinction and effectiveness. Theirs was not an easy period, and the fact that they were able to deal with the matters before us with so much skill and dedication, and with firmness and fairness, is a tribute to their statesmanship and ability, and, above all, was a credit to their country.

99. Allow me now to join those of my colleagues who have preceded me to express our heartfelt condolences to the Chinese delegation and, through them, to the Chinese Government and people on the most untimely passing away of Mr. Chou-teh, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress. Having had the honour and the pleasure of representing my country in China at one point, and after having had the personal pleasure of knowing Marshall Chou-teh, I know how much the Chinese people and Government are mourning this great loss.

I want to assure them that we of Tanzania, as indeed, in fact—as has been rightly pointed out in this Council—the international community, mourn his departure.

100. We are dealing with a matter of momentous implications for the principles of the Charter. By the time we finish these deliberations and take our decisions we shall have either condoned lawlessness or reaffirmed the principles which are laid down in the Charter. Either way, the implications of our actions will have tremendous effect. If we condone lawlessness and disrespect for all that the international community has held so dear, we shall be saying that the Charter and what it stands for does not mean much. We shall, in fact, be saying that we can always make exceptions, depending upon how circumstances suit our own interests. If, on the other hand, we reaffirm our total commitment to the provisions of the Charter, we shall have declared, before all the world, that the United Nations and all its Member States will not tolerate lawlessness and disregard for order in the world.

101. That is why my delegation has taken the issue that is before us so seriously—for we believe that there cannot be any future for the world, especially for the small States Members of the Organization and those outside the Organization, if the principle of lawlessness—the principle of unilateral action—is to be the order of the day.

102. On 4 July the Israeli Government embarked on a mission which involved the use of force against Uganda, an African State and a Member of the United Nations. In the process, Israeli forces took action against lightly armed Ugandan forces stationed at the airport of Entebbe. No one can doubt that such action breached the provisions of the Charter. In fact, many of the spokesmen who have preceded me in the Council, while trying to justify and rationalize the position of the Israeli Government, have not been in a position to say that what the Israeli action amounted to was not a violation of the provisions of the Charter. Still more, the Israeli action resulted in the loss of human life, which, in the view of our delegation, could have been avoided had the normal process of negotiations been left to take its course. In that context, the Israeli action can be said to have constituted not only a violation of the sovereignty of Uganda, but indeed an act of aggression against a Member State of this Organization.

103. The Israeli Government and all those who support it in this matter have attempted to justify its action in this grave violation of international law. It must have been clear, however, to everyone on the Council who has followed the events surrounding this violation that such attempted justification has, in fact, been based on false premises. It would appear that, notwithstanding the initial statements made by the Israeli representatives—or the Israeli Government spokes-

men—to the effect that they would be prepared to negotiate, Israel had all along been preparing to take armed military action against the Republic of Uganda. Thus the violation of the sovereignty of Uganda, which was carried out on 4 July, was not really a failure of the negotiating process but a pre-determined illegal action on the part of Israel. It is clear, therefore, that such justification is without substance.

104. I have just referred to the failure of the Israel case on the facts. Yet Israel has no case even in international law as it exists now. Whatever might have been the law in the past, and whatever writers and jurists of the past might have seen as law with regard to the right of a State to protect its nationals abroad, such is no longer the case now. The advent of the law of the Charter did away with all the traditional methods for a State to obtain satisfaction on a unilateral basis by employing measures short of war which were being resorted to in the past. Then, as people realized the injustices involved in the previous system, the law began to change, starting with such areas as the prohibition of the use of force in contract debts. Then came the Kellogg-Briand Pact. We all know what that pact prohibited. In the end came the Charter of the United Nations, which settled the question beyond any doubt.

105. Many writers on international law agree on this. I could quote many eminent authorities on international law in this matter. In this intervention, however, I will confine myself to two such writers. One is an eminent lawyer Georg Schwarzenberger, who has the following to say in his book, *International Law*³ on page 58 of volume II:

“... The *Corfu Channel (Merits) case* (1949) appears to bear out the view that, within the international quasi-order of the United Nations, the threat or use of force by individual Member States against one another and against non-member States is illegal, unless justifiable on grounds of individual self-defence or collective defence under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.”

According to Hans Kelsen, the Charter of the United Nations goes much further than its predecessors. It obligates the Members of the United Nations not only not to resort to war against each other but to refrain from the threat or use of force and to settle their disputes by peaceful means. The use of force—the so-called enforcement action—is allowed by the Charter only as a reaction of the Organization against a threat to peace or a breach of the peace.

106. Taking into account the history of international law on this matter, the statements I have just quoted are quite adequate to demonstrate the emptiness of the Israeli case, for it cannot be argued that the aggression committed by Israel against Uganda was done for purposes of self-defence. Neither can it be argued that such use of force was a reaction of the United Nations.

Of course, it is not denied that the use of force was involved. Under those circumstances, there is no other conclusion except that the Israeli action was illegal. It was in that context that the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania issued a statement to condemn the Israeli action against Uganda, part of which reads as follows:

"The Government of the United Republic of Tanzania condemns this reckless and unwarranted Israeli action. It considers such a violation of the sovereignty of an African State by Israel as a matter of grave concern to the entire international community, and more particularly to the Organization of African Unity States. In expressing its outrage against the Israeli invasion of Uganda, the Government is not in any way insensitive to the plight of the hostages, Israelis as well as others, who were taken by the hijackers. In fact, Tanzania has followed with great concern and sympathy their predicament. We have always maintained that such endangering of human life is something that must be avoided and that no efforts be spared to avoid recurrence of incidents of this nature. In the particular case of the hijacked plane to Entebbe, we were concerned with the lives of all hostages and had hoped that everything would be done so that no single life was lost. Regrettably, Israel's irresponsible military action has frustrated our hopes."

The statement continues:

"The flagrant violation of a country's sovereignty is a matter which should cause an outraged international community, but for Africa Israel's action has serious implications. The fact that Israel has committed this action against an independent African State shows the contempt that it has for Africa and the African people, for this is not the first time that Israeli citizens have fallen victims of hijacking and other actions. It has happened elsewhere. Yet Israel has not even once mounted anything of this nature against those countries. It is the contempt which Israel has for the sovereignty of Africa which has prompted it to act in such an arrogant and lawless manner."

107. The violation of the sovereignty of a country is a serious matter which goes to the very foundation of a world governed by law. The International Court of Justice underlined the importance of this in the Corfu Channel Case⁴ when the United Kingdom Government conducted an operation in the territorial sea of Albania, allegedly because of the extreme urgency of the matter. After rejecting the reason of extreme urgency, as advanced by the United Kingdom, the Court stated as follows on page 35 of its judgment:

"... The Court can only regard the alleged right of intervention as the manifestation of a policy of force, such as has, in the past, given rise to most

serious abuses and such as cannot, whatever be the present defects in international organization, find a place in international law. Intervention is perhaps still less admissible in the particular form it would take here; for, from the nature of things, it would be reserved for the most powerful States, and might easily lead to perverting the administration of international justice itself.

"... Between independent States, respect for territorial sovereignty is an essential foundation of international relations."

Bearing these views of the Court in mind, we must here draw the necessary conclusions from this flagrant violation of Uganda's sovereignty by Israel. To us, the Israeli action reflects a careless disregard of Africa's sovereignty and the territorial integrity of African States.

108. In the words of the Tanzanian Government's statement,

"This dangerous precedent of arbitrary violation of Africa's sovereignty by the Israeli authorities must not be taken lightly. Free Africa has the right to recognize that this challenge and provocation against Uganda is in fact a challenge and gross provocation against the whole of Africa. Africa must take all the necessary measures and precautions against a repetition of this heinous crime from any quarter."

109. The Israeli military action at Entebbe cannot be taken lightly. It is a dangerous precedent which, if allowed to go uncontested, would usher in a new era in international relations, an era of lawlessness. We in Africa cannot but recognize that this provocation against Uganda is a serious challenge to Africa. It is, above all, I submit, a challenge to the Charter. The Security Council, which was given the role of guardian of the peace throughout the world, cannot witness the violation of the principles of the United Nations without taking the appropriate corrective measures. The action that we shall take in this matter will give an indication of where the Council stands on this important issue. For us, the choice is clear. We shall not be a party to condoning lawlessness, under whatever pretext. It is with this consideration in view that the Tanzanian delegation, on behalf of the African members of the Council, and in response to the specific mandate entrusted to us by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, has the honour to introduce the draft resolution contained in document S/12139.

110. I must, at the very outset, apologize to my colleagues on the Council, the non-aligned members in particular, and to those members who have always worked very actively and closely with the African members of the Council, for not waiting for their response before introducing this draft resolution.

We appreciate that some of them were prepared to join in sponsoring the draft resolution which I am introducing, but because of circumstances beyond our control the African members of this Council were compelled to introduce it at this point. Members are aware that, contrary to the normal procedures to which this Council is used, in which due process of consultation takes place, we have already a draft resolution introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the representative of the United States [S/12138]. Being faced with this situation, the African members of the Council request the forgiveness of the other members of the Council, in particular the non-aligned and other members who had earlier intimated to us their readiness to join in sponsoring a draft resolution, for our inability to consult them in advance before presenting our text.

111. I need not dwell at length on the text since it will be circulated and members will have it at hand, but suffice it to say that the draft resolution addresses itself to the main topic before the Council, that is to say, the complaint brought before the Council by the Prime Minister of Mauritius in his capacity as the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity [S/12126] and the letter addressed to the Council by the President of Uganda concerning Israel's military action at Entebbe Airport [S/12124]. The Council has not been summoned to discuss the question of hijacking, *per se*. Speaking for my delegation, we are quite willing and prepared to discuss the dangers inherent in hijacking, because I do not believe that any member of the Council in his right senses could in any way condone the crime of hijacking. In fact, the representative of Israel yesterday did the Council some justice and a favour by quoting extensively from the resolution which was adopted by the Organization of African Unity clearly condemning the act of hijacking [1939th meeting, para. 125].

112. That remains the position of Africa. Africa has condemned hijacking in the past, Africa condemns hijacking now, and we shall continue to do so in the future. But the Council is not discussing the issue of hijacking. If our colleagues the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States had really desired to discuss, with their usual eloquence, the question of hijacking *per se*, they would have been welcome to do so. They should have placed an item on the subject on the Council's agenda so that it could discuss hijacking, and my delegation for one would have considered the item on its merits. But in this case Africa has come to the Council following the aggression committed against Uganda, following the blatant violation of Uganda's sovereignty, and I think it only fair that members of the Council should address themselves squarely to that particular problem.

113. I must say that my delegation is somewhat saddened by the way in which the violation of Uganda's sovereignty is being glossed over. I know there have been some peripheral references to it in some cases,

but essentially those who have spoken very strongly, and in some cases very powerfully, in condemning hijacking, in condemning the dangers inherent in the action, which none of us can condone, have not spoken with similar strength and similar determination on the blatant violation of the sovereignty of a Member State of this Organization.

114. The African draft resolution—because it is an African draft resolution—demands that justice be done to the Government and people of Uganda. Essentially, it demands that the fact of the violation of Uganda's sovereignty be taken into consideration and that that act be condemned. It also demands that the damage, both human and material, done in Uganda be compensated for, and it asks the Secretary-General to follow implementation of the draft resolution.

115. I have already stated that this is a draft which addresses itself squarely to the problem. My good friend and colleague Ambassador Scranton, for whom I have very high esteem and respect, has spoken very, very movingly about his own Government's position on this question. But I hope he will understand that from an African point of view, from the point of view of countries which have been subjected to humiliation for centuries, we must also speak forcefully and with no less vehemence at this arbitrary display of arrogance and power against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a country. We must also speak against the danger of allowing a precedent of this nature to go uncontested. We must speak in such terms because either we have international law we all respect, either we have a Charter of the United Nations to which we all adhere, or we do not. If you make one exception, then exceptions become the rule. Today it is Uganda; tomorrow it can be Tanzania; the day after tomorrow it can be any of the other countries. I am not naïve enough to presume that it could be the United States or the United Kingdom; I know that there have been hijackings and planes have taken in some Western European countries, but hijackings of the kind which happened at Entebbe were never attempted there. So I am not naïve enough to assume that any of these countries could possibly be a victim. But I am certainly conscious of the fact that what happened at Entebbe, if allowed, could be repeated, be it by Israel or any other country, against the smaller, less powerful countries and those countries whose strength depends upon scrupulous observance of the provisions of the Charter and the principles of international law as we understand them and the international law to which we all adhere as Members of the United Nations.

116. I know some have talked in terms of moral law. I am no lawyer, so I will not venture into that field. But certainly I would say that the same moral considerations and the same attachment we feel towards the sanctity of human life generally should equally apply to the sanctity of Ugandan human life. Many Ugandans lost their lives as a result of the Israeli

action. Certainly, if we are determined to save hostages from hijackers—a determination we all share—we must equally be concerned at the senseless loss of life inflicted upon the Ugandans. And not only upon the Ugandans. In a sense, the Israeli action also led to the killing of some of the very hostages the Israeli Government attempted to save—in addition, of course, to the killing of those who perpetrated the hijacking.

117. We are concerned that, in the midst of the euphoria that has been generated in some quarters as a result of the action, very little has been said about the damage done to Uganda and the destruction caused in Uganda in terms of both human life and material damage. We think such expressions of jubilation, such congratulations, are most unfortunate, because if we believe in the sanctity of human life, then we must universalize that belief. We must not demonstrate our happiness because the Israeli action has been termed a daring raid, without taking due account of the fact that in the course of that “daring act” so many African lives were lost.

118. This has, unfortunately, been a highly emotional debate. We would have preferred it to take place in a calmer atmosphere. We would have preferred the members of the Council to assume their responsibility in a calm, deliberate and serious manner. We would have preferred principles to be given priority over expediency. We would have preferred the case of the violation of Uganda’s sovereignty to be treated on its merits. We would also have preferred the question of hijacking, with all its implications, also to be treated on its merits. Unfortunately, we see a trend, and a deliberate trend, to give priority to the question of the hijacking without giving the same priority to the violation of Uganda’s sovereignty.

119. The draft resolution I have the honour to introduce on behalf of Benin, the Libyan Arab Republic and my own delegation addresses itself squarely to the problem raised by the African members of the Council on behalf of the Organization of African Unity and the affected party.

120. In conclusion I should like to say that we know that the issue of hijacking has been discussed in several forums of the Organization. We want to make it clear that we do not condone hijacking. We want to make it clear that we condemn hijacking. We also want to make it clear that we believe every effort must be made to ensure that innocent travellers and innocent lives are duly protected. But, with the same strength and the same vehemence, we want to insist that international law and international morality be observed. As I said at the outset, either we have international law, either we have international morality or we do not; either we respect the Charter of the United Nations, or we violate its provisions. And then we cannot claim that we are operating on the basis of law or on the basis of justice.

121. Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan): Mr. President, I join my colleagues in congratulating you, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the current month. We are certain that with your deep understanding of the current complex international scene and the problems which are now before us, as well as your high qualities as an accomplished diplomat of a country which has contributed greatly to the evolution of modern diplomacy, the Council’s deliberations on the issue before us will be conducted in an exemplary manner and the Council will acquit itself well in the tasks entrusted to it under the Charter.

122. May I also express our admiration and thanks to your predecessor as President of the Security Council for the month of June, Ambassador Jackson of Guyana, for the tact, patience, understanding and energy with which he directed our almost continuous deliberations last month. We were also indeed honoured to have the Foreign Minister of Guyana preside over a part of our deliberations.

123. I also join previous speakers in expressing our heartfelt condolences on the sad demise of Mr. Chou-teh, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress of the People’s Republic of China. Chairman Chou-teh was a distinguished son of China and a brave fighter for its freedom from foreign domination and internal oppression. The Government and the people of Pakistan share in full measure the grief of the Government and the people of China at this great loss.

124. We also wish to convey our sincere condolences to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on the untimely death of Mr. Gustav Heinemann, the former President of the Federal Republic of Germany.

125. The Security Council is meeting at the request of Sir Seewoosagur Ramgoolam, Prime Minister of Mauritius and the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity. Speaking on behalf of all the Heads of State and Government of that organization, then assembled for a summit meeting in Mauritius, he has asked the Council to consider a “wanton act of aggression against a Member State of the United Nations” [S/12126, annex]. We had earlier been informed by the President of Uganda about the details of this attack, which took place at 1 a.m. on 4 July 1976, when Israeli military aircraft carrying personnel of the Israeli armed forces secured a landing at Entebbe Airport in Uganda under false pretenses, launched an armed attack on units of Uganda’s armed forces, killing or wounding a hundred members of the Ugandan army, destroyed a number of civilian and military aircraft at the airport, and damaged the airport and its installations.

126. We have examined with great care the message from the President of the Republic of Uganda and listened attentively the statement of the distinguished

Foreign Minister of Uganda at our meeting on Friday [1939th meeting]. The facts narrated in the Ugandan account have been fully corroborated by the other accounts of the same events that have appeared in the international press—by no means unfriendly to Israel—and, equally important, by the statement of the representative of France at our meeting on Friday.

127. The representative of Israel has tried to justify his country's aggression against Uganda by accusing its Government and its President of complicity with the hijackers. Let us look at the facts.

128. The aircraft was allowed to land when it had only 15 minutes' fuel for flying. The only alternative, in fact, for it was to crash with its more than 250 passengers. The permission to land was given by Uganda not only at the request of the hijackers but also, and this is perhaps more important, as the representative of France informed us in his statement, in response to the specific French request to the same effect. The representative of France has told us:

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

129. The representative of Israel tried to establish that the landing of the hijacked plane at Entebbe Airport was an act of collusion between the hijackers and the Ugandan authorities. We wonder whether, in view of the French statement I have just quoted, he would like to reconsider this allegation; otherwise, it would lead to the obviously absurd conclusion that France too was an accomplice in the scheme for the hijacking of its own plane.

130. The fact that President Idi Amin visited the hostages almost every day, provided them with all possible amenities and secured the release of 47 hostages on 30 June and another 100 on 1 July, and was able to obtain extension of the deadline, speak for themselves. These were positive steps and have been so acclaimed generally. According to *The New York Times* of 5 July, the 12-member crew of the hijacked Air France plane issued a statement on their return home, praising President Amin of Uganda for his role in the events at Entebbe Airport. Also, Captain Michel Bacos scotched the assertion, made by Israel, that Ugandan soldiers had been substituted for the hijackers guarding the hostages.

131. We are not unaware of the accusations against Uganda which have appeared in the press and which have been quoted by the Israeli representative here. The fact that most of them were made by those who were rescued by the Israeli task force and came from

a country which had just committed an act of aggression against Uganda has to be taken duly into account in assessing their veracity.

132. We have been told that this armed raid was only a rescue operation to release the remaining hostages from the “terrorists”. How then should one explain the wanton destruction of Ugandan civilian and military aircraft stationed on Uganda's national territory, and other extensive damage caused to property by the Israeli troops? Further, in the euphoria over this “brilliant rescue operation”, it should not be forgotten that the 103 hostages could have lost their lives and this so-called legend could have resulted in yet another bloody massacre.

133. The Israeli Prime Minister has stated, “Terrorism will find us neither immobilized nor hidebound by routine” [S/12123, annex]. In this instance, routine appears to be the new term for the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the established norms of international state behaviour.

134. Without disregarding the other elements of the situation, to which I shall return shortly, it cannot be denied that this act of Israel's constituted an act of aggression as defined in the Definition of Aggression in the annex to General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX). Article 1 reads as follows:

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

It is also relevant here to quote article 5, paragraph 1, which reads:

“No consideration of whatever nature, whether political, economic... or otherwise, may serve as a justification for aggression.”

In the opinion of the Secretary-General, who has spoken without fear or favour, “this constitutes a serious violation of the sovereignty of a State Member of the United Nations.” We entirely endorse these remarks of the Secretary-General.

135. The representative of Israel has attempted to divert our attention from our main task by trying to establish that the issue before the Council is the issue of terrorism. In his statement he declared that he stood here, as an accuser on behalf of free and decent people in this world, against the forces of evil which have unleashed a wave of piracy and terrorism that threaten the very foundations of human society.

136. This is indeed a strange claim from the representative of a country which the free and decent people of the world, through their representatives in the United Nations, in both the General Assembly and the

Security Council, as well as in other international organizations, have repeatedly condemned and deplored for over two decades for its actions in violation of customary and conventional international law and norms of conduct among civilized nations.

137. In fact, by the record of its own past deeds, Israel falls into the category of the accused. For decades a sizeable portion of humanity, the Palestinian people, a people who sought no more than to stay and live in their own homes and hearths, have been subjected to terrorism, bloodshed and war by the forces of Zionism, resulting in their expulsion from their own homes. Not satisfied with this, Israel continues to attack the Palestinian refugee camps, the pitiful shelters for the old, the women and the children—yes, even babes in arms—causing widespread death and destruction.

138. The long catalogue of violent events and naked acts of terrorism by the Zionists which preceded and followed the establishment of Israel is too long and too well known to be read out here. However, it conclusively established the fact that organized and well-planned acts of terrorism were undertaken repeatedly, first in establishing the State of Israel, then in enlarging its boundaries and, finally, in attempting to intimidate its neighbours and the free and decent people of the world who dared to oppose Israel and its policies. Further, the Zionists, now in this very city where the United Nations is situated, commit acts of violence and threaten the representatives of countries which do not support Israel. How can Israel arrogate to itself the right to speak on behalf of the free and decent people of the world, least of all on the issue of terrorism?

139. We shall not hesitate to discuss, here and now or later and elsewhere, the evil of terrorism. We in Pakistan have never condoned or supported acts of terrorism, nor have we ever countenanced acts of State piracy. There is a clear and distinct difference between an individual act of terrorism and an act of aggression by a State through the use of its own armed forces against the territory and sovereignty of another State. This difference is visible to all except those who prefer not to see it. But if we have to discuss the issue of terrorism—and we are willing to discuss it now or at any time—it has to be discussed in its entirety and in all of its facets.

140. First, the term "terrorism" is selectively employed in many cases. How many leaders of liberation struggles waged by different peoples of the world have been branded as terrorists by the occupying colonialist Powers? The inexorable march of history having crowned these peoples' struggles with victory in Africa, Asia and Latin America, these same "terrorists" have rightly been acclaimed as heroes and are now serving as Heads of State in many parts of the world. Secondly, it has been reported that Israel is

considering the imposition of the death penalty on all "terrorists" captured by it.

141. All of us understand that liberation movements embody a people's yearning for self-determination and sovereignty. They are merely impelled to greater effort by repression, which only intensifies their quest for independence. The prolonged and sustained heroic struggle of the people of Palestine will continue, by whatever name one may call it, till their wrongs are redressed and injustices undone. One would have expected the inevitability of the outcome to be recognized. The inability of the Council, however, to affirm the rights of the Palestinian people, the same inalienable rights that we all recognize for other peoples of this world, can only strain their patience. If some of them resort to senseless acts of violence in sheer desperation, in all honesty we too, as members of the Council, should share some of the blame. Naturally, one cannot and one does not condone such acts by an individual or individuals, but neither can we accept them to be used as pretexts or justification for an act of State aggression.

142. In any event, Israel has not been authorized to act as a policeman of the world. No amount of rhetoric and excellence of eloquence—which we readily recognize and concede—can be allowed to cloud the issue now before the Council, which is aggression by Israel against Uganda. This, in the opinion of my delegation, is the issue on which the Security Council has been asked to pronounce itself. The Council cannot but pronounce in one way, that is, uphold the principle of sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and condemn acts of State aggression. The Council will be failing in its duty if it does not condemn the act of aggression committed by Israel against Uganda. It has resulted in an extensive loss of life and property, for which Israel should pay compensation. The Council could do no less than demand that such compensation be paid by Israel.

143. In view of these considerations, my delegation considers that the draft resolution which has just been introduced in the Council by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania in document S/12139 is the minimum the Council could do, and we urge our colleagues to endorse it and adopt it.

144. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): It is always more difficult to speak last, but I have turned out to be the last at the request of two previous speakers.

145. First of all I should like to congratulate you as President of the Council for the month of July. You do not have an easy task. The first matter which you will have to deal with here, together with us, is not an easy one. Nevertheless, your experience and all your knowledge can be useful in helping to solve this problem correctly, in accordance with the aspirations of peoples and with the interests of strengthening

peace and security throughout the world. A wise solution can only further enhance your prestige as President of the Council for July.

146. I should like, in passing, to note with satisfaction that in recent years Soviet-Italian relations have been developing favourably and on a stable basis. This is in keeping with the interests of the peoples of both our countries and with the interests of the easing of international tensions and the strengthening of peace and international security. Just as our relations as States are making progress in other fields, our delegation is willing to cooperate with you here as well in order to find a just and wise solution to the matter under consideration.

147. The delegation of the Soviet Union would also like to express its gratitude to your predecessor as President of the Council for the month of June, the representative of Guyana, Ambassador Jackson, as well as to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guyana, Mr. Wills, under whose skilful guidance the Council did a great deal of arduous work and considered a series of important and complex international problems, the positive solution of which would promote and strengthen international peace and security.

148. In connexion with the death of the Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China, Comrade Chu-teh, we would like to convey our condolences to the Chinese delegation. At the same time, I would like to quote the text of the message sent to the Standing Committee by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, which reads as follows:

"The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics extends to you and to the entire Chinese people its deepest condolences on the passing of the Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, a glorious veteran of the Chinese revolution, Comrade Chu-teh.

"The memory of Comrade Chu-teh, an outstanding revolutionary and internationalist, legendary commander and fighter for the liberation of China, will always remain in the hearts of the Soviet people.

We would ask that our sincere sympathy be transmitted to the family and loved ones of the deceased."

149. The Security Council is yet again considering matters related to the actions of a State represented here, Israel. These are actions which on more than one occasion have been judged to be aggressive. This time the aggression has been committed against a small sovereign African State, Uganda, located thousands of miles from Israel.

150. When you, Mr. President, gave the floor to the representative of Israel, I thought that the delegation of Israel might have lit upon something unusual and that it would help us to solve this matter in a positive manner, would express its regrets at what had happened and perhaps would propose some kind of measures to settle this exceptionally unpleasant and dangerous phenomenon of a military incursion of Israel into Uganda. None of the reasons which have been adduced here can justify the fact that a small State was subjected to aggression by Israel, armed and supplied with everything necessary for this by other States.

151. The representative of Israel spoke here not as the accused but in the role of the accuser; he blamed everyone. One only has to look at the verbatim record to see that all were guilty except Israel. Also guilty in this regard is the United Nations, including naturally the Security Council.

152. What is the situation? The flight carried out, the material destruction wrought, the substantial number of Ugandans killed are all regarded by Israel as a measure which is just or at least justified. But there exist no such laws in the world, no moral or international laws, which could justify such aggressive action. The Israeli Air Force invaded the territory of Uganda and violated the sovereignty of that small State. It conducted an attack on Entebbe airport. This attack resulted, as I have already said, in the loss of many human lives and in substantial material destruction. As is evident from the message of 4 July from the President of Uganda to the President of the Security Council and to the Secretary-General [S/12124, annex] and from the information submitted to the Council by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Uganda [1939th meeting], many innocent people perished as a result of this piratical attack of the Israeli Air Force, planes were destroyed which were not participating in any operations against Israel and also the old airport of Entebbe.

153. How can one appraise such actions? Whatever may be said here, whatever quotations and references may be made, this is an act of aggression. And only with this as a basis can we correctly assess what has been done and think of ways to prevent similar acts in the future.

154. The representative of Israel began his speech [*ibid.*] with references to a principle of Roman law: a State has the right and the duty to protect its citizens. This is elementary. A State has among its tasks the obligation to protect its citizens; otherwise, it would not be a State. But the means of defence are different. Perhaps the representative of Israel will recall that based on this principle Roman troops appeared in the territory where there is now a conflict that has not yet been settled. Is that why he found a reference to this principle appropriate?

155. The delegation of the Soviet Union fully shares the views expressed by 48 African countries in the unanimously adopted resolution of the Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, which roundly condemns Israel's aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Uganda. The Soviet delegation also agrees with the appraisal of this aggression given in the telegram which the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, the Prime Minister of Mauritius, addressed to the President of the Security Council on 6 July, wherein it is rightly stressed that "This unprecedented aggression against Uganda by Israel constitutes a danger not only to Uganda and Africa but to international peace and security" [S/12126, *annex*].

156. The Soviet Union shares the view of the non-aligned countries with regard to Israel's aggression as set out in the message of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Algeria, Mr. Bouteflika, addressed to the Secretary-General on 8 July, in which it is pointed out that "This act cannot but arouse the indignation of the non-aligned countries and constitutes a dangerous precedent in the conduct of international relations, opening the way to all kinds of adventures" [S/12132, *annex*].

157. As I have already mentioned, the representative of Israel tried in every way possible to justify the aggression committed against Uganda. He brought in quotations from the pronouncements of various jurists and referred to various types of conclusions. But all of that is purely subjective, for indeed we do have laws adopted by the United Nations, decisions approved by the Security Council, by other international organizations. Why did the representative of Israel not quote those documents which prohibit the use of force against any State?

158. The Soviet Union, concerned such acts of lawlessness, had earlier submitted to the United Nations a proposal on the non-use of force in international relations. We shall fight for its implementation, and we are certain that many countries will support us on this.

159. The representative of Israel could not justify the action carried out against the people of Uganda; he made his accusations here in vain. He should have played another role, and I think that perhaps it is not too late for him to do this in the course of the discussions of the Council.

160. Israel's wanton attack comes fully within the Definition of Aggression adopted without a vote by the General Assembly in resolution 3314 (XXIX), which was just quoted from by the representative of Pakistan. It states outright that "Aggression is the use of armed force by a State against the sovereignty... of another State". What more do we need? Make any references you want here. Refer to anyone, beginning with Adam and Eve and ending with our time, and you will never

be able to justify the act of an aggression that was committed. It cannot be justified.

161. If the representative of Israel really wanted to accuse someone—and this as mentioned by someone who spoke before me—he could, in accordance with existing rules, have made a complaint to the Council, and that complaint would have been considered. But no complaint was made. Why was that not done? Because Israel cannot justify what was done on the night of 3 to 4 July. It was an act of aggression, and nothing else.

162. However much the representative of Israel may have tried to refute the irrefutable, the armed action against Uganda is an act of direct, flagrant aggression and an outright violation of the Charter of the United Nations, especially of Article 2, paragraph 4, which states:

"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."

Was this known to those who planned such a hostile action against Uganda—against the peoples of Africa? It is known, and that is why Israel was not the one to raise the matter in the Council. We are prepared to discuss any item which you might ask to have placed on the agenda. Acts of international terrorism are a dangerous phenomenon against which we must fight, and the Soviet Union is willing to do everything in its power to create conditions whereby acts of international terrorism, the hijacking of planes, the death of innocent people—the elderly, women and children—would no longer be possible.

163. Our position on this matter was set forth clearly in the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, A. A. Gromyko, at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, on 26 September 1972. Comrade Gromyko stated:

"On the basis of positions of principle, the Soviet Union opposes acts of terrorism, which disrupt the diplomatic activities of States and their representatives, transport communications between them and the normal course of international contacts and meetings, and it opposes acts of violence which serve no positive end and cause loss of human life."⁵

The Soviet Union consistently opposes acts of terrorism, and we are prepared to do our part in order to end this phenomenon and to find ways to fight it.

164. But we cannot replace one matter with another. We are now considering not the matter of international terrorism but an attack on Uganda, the killing of Ugandans, the destruction of Entebbe Airport, and

other material destruction inflicted by the Israeli action against that State.

165. There is a great gap between individual acts of terrorism and an attack by one State—in this case, by Israel—against another. Therefore a policy approved by a State cannot be considered exceptional, even in the case in question. A unilateral attack by one State on another without an appeal to the Security Council or to the United Nations is aggression. That cannot be denied.

166. Official approval or justification of this Israeli act against Uganda may arouse regret, and not only regret for the very people who approve such acts are encouraging new actions inimical to the peoples of Africa—and not only of Africa. Some organizations, encouraged by the attitude of officials in the United States, have committed acts against the United Nations and its eminent leaders. Does this not explain the published newspaper reports of hostile attacks by organizations well known to you, and the demands for the resignation of the Secretary-General? And things will go even further; the consequences will go much further than this act of aggression.

167. With regard to the statement of sympathy for Israel made by one of the organizations in the United States, we should ponder the fact that the campaign of praise for such actions could have consequences here in this country which would aggravate the difficulties encountered by the Missions to the United Nations. It has already been spoken of here, and indeed I can say that on more than one occasion our Mission and its living quarters, service facilities and personnel have been subjected to attacks by various types of organizations. How can these organizations act this way in one case when, in another case, they are prepared to justify an act sanctioned by a State? This is a dangerous precedent with far-reaching consequences.

168. The Soviet delegation therefore feels that the Council must condemn in the most vigorous manner the Israeli aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Uganda, an independent State and a Member of the United Nations. It seems to me that the proposals made earlier orally and now issued in a draft resolution are quite logical in this connexion: to compel Israel to compensate Uganda for the material damage done in connexion with this attack. In addition, the Council must give a serious warning to Israel that such acts of aggression will not go unpunished in future.

169. We have just seen the draft resolution submitted by Benin, the Libyan Arab Republic and the United Republic of Tanzania [S/12139]. It seems to me that this draft resolution could be a good basis for a just and wise decision in the Council.

170. I should like to say in conclusion that the peoples not only of Africa but of the entire world must

and will draw conclusions from this act of aggression. There cannot be a double standard with regard to different States. There is one standard international law and it is set out in the documents and decisions of the United Nations. Sooner or later, this will be understood by those who planned the Israeli action against Uganda. It would be better if it were sooner rather than later. Once a well-known English statesman, Disraeli, who later became Lord Beaconsfield, said that time was a great healer. I think that this applies to Israel as well. But it would be better if the time were short and not prolonged.

171. In our view, the authority of the Security Council will to a great extent depend on the decision it takes and what it does on the question under discussion. This decision must not be merely another document for posterity.

172. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for his congratulations and kind remarks about me. I especially appreciate the expression of confidence and solidarity which he conveyed to me personally. I appreciate even more what Ambassador Kharlamov had to say about the improvement in the relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Italy. Having had the great honour of serving my country as Ambassador to Moscow in 1974 and 1975, I can bear witness to that effect and even draw some satisfaction from having contributed to the best of my capacity to the betterment of our relations and to the establishment of more fruitful relations, especially in the economic field, to the advantage of both the Soviet and the Italian peoples.

173. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I am grateful to you for allowing me to speak again today in this debate. I shall be brief. I have asked to speak on instructions from my Government to report to the Council on some disturbing developments which have taken place in Uganda since this debate began today.

174. The Second Secretary in the British High Commission, who saw Mrs. Bloch in hospital, is to be expelled with his wife as of the deadline of midnight tomorrow. The High Commission has also been told that two members of the British community are also to be expelled tomorrow, and serious threats have been made against the British community in general. That small British community in Uganda has shown its dedication to that country by their long service there—indeed, the highest single occupation now being those involved in missionary work.

175. A particularly sinister aspect of these threats is that action is to be taken after the Council's debate. May I add that we are fully convinced that our High Commission has performed its diplomatic duties in a proper manner and its reporting on recent events has been accurate throughout.

176. It is fortunate that the Council is sitting on this issue at this moment. It gives me the opportunity of bringing these facts to the attention of the international community as a whole at the earliest possible moment.

177. Mr. CHOU Nan (China) (*translation from Chinese*): All the representatives who spoke at our meeting this afternoon have expressed condolences on the passing away of Chairman Chou-teh. On behalf of the Chinese delegation, I wish to express deep thanks to all of them for their kind sentiments.

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

179. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): I have listened, as have all the members of the Council, with great interest and attention to the statement of Governor Scranton, the representative of the United States. This statement, in the view of my delegation, contains very serious and important elements and we cannot take it lightly.

180. What Ambassador Scranton said merits deep study by us, not only because of the importance of the subject that we are discussing, but also because it comes from the representative of one of the super-Powers. The statement of the representative of the United States contains some serious threats and pseudo-legal arguments in support of the Israeli aggression. My delegation will reply to this statement after careful study.

181. I said that it is very important to study this declaration because it comes from a super-Power, from a country which has a long and sinister record of aggression against sovereign, independent States—I may mention the Dominican Republic, Cuba and many others—from a State whose organizations and secret services are very active in many regions of the world, and—if we believe the American mass media themselves—even penetrate the so-called terrorist groups.

182. My delegation reserves the right to reply to the statement of the representative of the United States.

183. Permit me also to place on record a statement on behalf of my delegation. At the beginning of this morning's meeting I addressed an appeal to you, Mr. President, to use your authority with a view to limiting the debate to the item under discussion, which is the wanton act of aggression committed against Uganda by the Zionist entity.

184. It was not without reason that my delegation made that appeal and expressed its reservations. The position of the Western countries was clear from the outset. The general jubilation, the hysterical euphoria and the language of the Western mass media indicated that the Western Powers, or the majority of them at

least, especially those which created Israel and those which have appointed themselves its protectors and paymasters, were determined to try to broaden the debate, interpret the item on our agenda broadly and confuse the issue so that they could provide a cover-up for the naked aggression of their protégé, the Zionist entity.

185. The move made by the representative of the United Kingdom on his own behalf and on behalf of the representative of the United States in proposing the draft resolution in document S/12138 confirmed our doubts about a Machiavellian plan being prepared in order to divert the Council's attention from the agreed agenda. The hasty introduction of that draft resolution without any appropriate consultations—at a time when the representatives of the African States on the Council had prepared a working paper and were engaged in sincere and delicate informal negotiations and consultations in order to arrive at an agreed text—proves that those two Powers are not serious about the matter. They do not want to achieve anything. They want only to use this debate for propaganda purposes. They plan to use it as an element of demagoguery and as a political fanfare to cover up the Israeli aggression and to try to justify the Israeli raid and dangerous attack in violation of the Charter and established international legal and moral principles.

186. Once more the West is teaching us lessons. We had a working paper. We were negotiating it with them in all good faith. But their response was to propose a counter-draft resolution in order to sabotage our action and, as I said this morning, to hijack the debate and confuse the issue. They know their draft will be still-born and has no chance of adoption. We know, and they know, and everybody knows that they can and will use the absurd right of veto to kill our draft. But, as I have said, it is just an act of propaganda and blackmail.

187. Finally, I would express the deep concern and disappointment of my delegation that two responsible permanent members of the Council have departed from established practice and from the normal procedures as well as from the rules of fair play and courtesy among colleagues in this august body.

188. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): Reluctantly, in view of the diatribe we have just listened to, I feel I must at least allow myself a few sentences.

189. I utterly and totally reject any allegation that what the United States and the United Kingdom have done is contrary to anybody's established practice. With great respect to the representative of Libya, my tenure on the Council has been short but it has been somewhat longer than his, and from my limited experience I am not aware of any rule of procedure I have departed from.

190. It is quite untrue to say that anybody was negotiating with me about a draft. It is, however, true to

say that a large number of members of the Council were shown our draft towards the end of last week.

191. I think one perhaps also ought to say this. There is a very simple rule in the Security Council, and it is a very good one. If the representative of Libya does not like the draft resolution we have proposed, his remedy is very simple. It is to vote against it. And at some stage, no doubt, he will do precisely that.

192. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): 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, of the normal processes and of established practice that we circulate a working paper, discuss it and negotiate it. It is always a delicate matter. And then, after that, any country can propose a draft resolution.

193. I know that the United Kingdom and the United States are permanent members of the Security Council and have been members since the inception of the Council. They have long experience, and they therefore know they have no excuse. If they were new States in the Council, as we are, they might be excused. But they have long experience. They know full well that what they have done is not orthodox.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

Notes

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

² A/C.6/L.850.

³ London, Stevens and Sons, 1968.

⁴ *The Corfu Channel Case, Judgment of April 9th, 1949, I.C.J. Reports, 1949, p. 4.*

⁵ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Plenary Meetings, 2040th meeting, para. 116.*

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 во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
