

Everett Carlson, the explosives expert, was released on May 3, 1976, only one week before the Boston courthouse bombing signaled a new escalation in "blind terrorist" attacks. Despite their known history of terrorist activities, none of the Thomaston-SCAR network were investigated in connection with the incident.

Some sources indicate that Aceto has been a police agent all along; other members of the network maybe hapless victims of Chomsky-Institute for Policy Studies-Law Enforcement Assistance Administration brainwashing programs. But clearly these individuals are just the gutter level of a network which extends into the highest circles of New England government officials and the federal Department of Justice. These forces' complicity in coverups of in-prison training and brainwashing, in the ongoing LEAA plans to extend the operation through parole reform, and in providing a continued free hand for terrorist operations like NEPA, are behind any further terrorist attacks.

## Release of "TIP" Brief Signals Massive CREEP Activation Against USLP

July 19 (NSIPS) — Terrorist Information Project, an outgrowth of Marcus Raskin's Counter Spy-Fifth Estate group, this week issued a public call for physical attacks and electoral black operations disruptions against the U.S. Labor Party's LaRouche-Evans campaign. The release of the TIP pamphlet, "N.C.L.C. — Brownshirts of the 70s," financed by major foundation money conduited through the Communist Party USA, the Socialist Workers Party, and the Institute for Policy Studies, came only hours before a highly suspicious automobile accident nearly claimed the life of a Detroit Labor Party Congressional candidate and an I.P.S. affiliated splinter party in North Carolina was fraudulently moved onto the ballot against the Labor Party.

In the next issue of New Solidarity, a full analysis and development of the significance of the TIP signal will be published. At this point, the following points establish the broadest outlines of this massive CREEP activation:

The "call to action" circulated in the TIP pamphlet has activated the entire Rockefeller private intelligence apparatus in a CREEP campaign to destroy the U.S. Labor Party and thereby destroy free elections in the U.S. The Institute for Policy Studies is at the center of this activation, which also involves Edward Levi's Justice Department, other "official" government agencies, the top Wall Street law firms including Arnold, Porter and Fortas and the Atlanticist-controlled above ground and "underground" news media. The Democratic Party Carter-Mondale campaign apparatus, directly overlapped with the 1972 CREEP operation that water-gated the Nixon administration, is a principal witting participant in this criminal conspiracy.

---

---

### Is Jimmy Carter Brainwashed?

NSIPS Special Brief

\$1.00

---

---

## NSIPS Special Report

# The UN Security Council Debate On The Israeli Raid Into Uganda

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., July 17 (NSIPS) — Last week the United Nations Security Council carried out a four-hour debate on the Israeli commando raid on Entebbe Airport, a raid on July 3 which resulted in the death of more than 20 Ugandan soldiers, the destruction of a number of Ugandan Air Force jets, and large-scale material damage to the airport. The raid was carried out as a pre-conceived implementation of the doctrine of "limited sovereignty" under which the so-called battle against "international terrorism" becomes the justification for wholesale violation of the territorial sovereignty and integrity of any state, particularly in the Third World.

The UN debate itself revolved around a dispute between the African, Third World and socialist members of the Security Council who insisted that the debate focus on the question of the Israeli violation of Ugandan sovereignty — and the Western powers, principally the U.S., Britain and the Israelis, who attempted to turn the council into a forum on "international terrorism." The debate was accompanied by a barrage of propaganda in the Atlanticist press designed to create an atmosphere of praise and celebration of the Israeli action as a model for dealing with "terrorism." Coverage of the debate itself played up the statements of the Israeli Ambassador Chaim Herzog and U.S. Ambassador Scranton, which portrayed the Israeli action as a justified response to terrorism and targeted numerous Third World states, including Libya, Somalia, Algeria, Iraq and others as responsible for terrorism. The Ugandan regime of President Idi Amin was charged with complicity in the hijacking of the Air France plane and cooperation with terrorists who held the hostages.

The Third World response largely focused on the dangerous precedent set by the Israeli action and called for the condemnation of Israel for a violation of the UN Charter and international law. The Organization of African Unity submitted a resolution — they filed the original complaint on which the meeting was based — calling for the condemnation of the Israelis and payment of reparations by the Israelis for their attack on Uganda. In response, the U.S. and Great Britain submitted a counterresolution which called for a condemnation of hijacking and terrorism while only abstractly "reaffirming" the concept of territorial sovereignty without mentioning the Israeli action.

The debate formally ended when a vote on the U.S.-Great Britain resolution failed to receive the 9 votes required for passage; the Western states voted in favor and the rest of the participants abstained or refused to participate in the vote, citing the irrelevance of the resolution to the actual question under debate. The African and Third World representatives tabled their own resolution when it became obvious it would fail to receive the required 9 votes. Under any circumstances, it would have been vetoed by the U.S.

The debate began with the bloodthirsty speech of Israeli Ambassador Herzog and the statement of the Ugandan Foreign Minister. Excerpts of the Israeli Ambassador's speech, and the speech of the representatives of the United States and of the Soviet Union are printed here. We add the comments of Libyan Ambassador Kikhia in reply to Ambassador Scranton and later to Herzog, in which for the first time, the real nature of international terrorism as a conspiracy of the Western intelligence agencies was broached publicly at the United Nations. In addition we print the text of the Mexican government letter to the Council.

**CHAIM HERZOG, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE  
OF ISRAEL TO THE UN  
ADDRESS TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL,  
July 9, 1976**

In more ways than one, this organization is in the accused stand today... There will be no excuse in history for this body or for the constituent members of this body if it fails to condemn terrorism....

I submit Sir that under the provision of article 23 of the Charter, the Government of Libya is disqualified from membership of the Security Council. Furthermore under Article 27 paragraph 3 Libya as a party to this dispute is disqualified from voting on this issue....

The airbus landed at Entebbe Airport on Monday 28 June, and the hijackers were met by a reinforcement of terrorists who awaited them at the terminal armed to the teeth with submachine guns and explosives.

President Idi Amin of Uganda arrived at the airport shortly before the hijacked plane landed and embraced the hijackers in a gesture of welcome and a promise of support and assistance. Ugandan soldiers were then positioned with their guns trained, not at the hijackers, but at the innocent civilians; men, women and children.

It has fallen to the lot of my small country, embattled as we are... to demonstrate to the world that there is an alternative to surrender to terrorism and to blackmail...

We call on this body to declare war on international terror, to outlaw it and eradicate it wherever it may be. We call on this body and above all we call on the member states and countries of the world to unite in a common effort to place these criminals outside the pale of human society and with them to place any country which cooperates in any way in their nefarious activities....

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

If this body fails to take action, we call on all freedom loving countries in the world to come together outside the framework of this body, establish accepted norms of behavior in relation to terrorists, and declare in no uncertain terms that each and every one of them will have nothing whatsoever to do with any country which violates these norms and which encourages terrorism.

**WILLIAM SCRANTON, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE  
OF THE U.S. TO THE UN  
ADDRESS TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL,  
July 12, 1976**

As members of this Council know, I have spoken several times earlier this year in this 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. This 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....

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. This right, flowing from the right of self-defense, is limited to such use of force as is necessary and appropriate to protect threatened nations from injury....

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, cooperation 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.

But the United States delegation believes very strongly that this Council should address itself to the causes of incidents such as that which occurred last week in Uganda. We believe that this 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....

Under such circumstances, it seems to me that the Government of Israel invoked one of the most remarkable 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.

**MR. KHARLAMOV, REPRESENTATIVE  
OF THE USSR TO THE UN  
ADDRESS TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL,  
July 12, 1976**

The Security Council is yet again considering matters related to the actions of a State represented here, and that State is Israel. Furthermore, 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.

When you, Mr. President, gave the floor to the representative of Israel I thought that the delegation of Israel had 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 invasion of Israel into Uganda. No reasons which might be 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....

A unilateral attack by one State on another without an appeal to the Security Council or to the United Nations is aggression; it cannot be denied. Official approval or justification of this Israeli act against Uganda may arouse regret, but the very people who approve such acts are encouraging organizations to undertake new actions inimical to the peoples of Africa — and not only of Africa.... The Soviet delegation therefore feels that the Security 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 connection: to compel Israel to recompense Uganda for the material damage done in connection with this attack. In addition, the Security Council must extend a serious warning to Israel that such acts of aggression will not go unpunished in the future....

With regard to the matter under discussion, 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 a given State. There is one standard international law and it is set out in documents and decisions of the United Nations. Sooner or later, this will be understood by those who planned the Israeli action against Uganda. I would be better if it were sooner rather than later.

**MR. KIKHIA, REPRESENTATIVE OF  
THE LIBYAN ARAB REPUBLIC TO THE UN  
ADDRESS TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL  
July 12, 1976**

I have listened, as have all the members of the Council, with great interest and attention to the statement of Governor Scranton, which in the view of my delegation, contains very serious and important elements and we cannot take it lightly.

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 of America contains some serious threats and pseudo-legal arguments in support of the Israeli aggression.

I said that it is very important to study these declarations because they come 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.

**CHAIM HERZOG, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE  
OF ISRAEL TO THE UN  
ADDRESS TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL,  
July 13, 1976**

I listened carefully to the long-drawn-out point of order made yesterday by the representative of Libya, and I must admit that I quite appreciate his concern — which he expressed again today. Who but the representative of Libya, a country which has been the paymaster and haven of international terrorism, would want to avoid a discussion in this Council on this evil: international terrorism? Libya's role in supporting international terrorism financially, militarily and politically and its involvement in attempts at the assassination of foreign leaders, including Arab heads of state, is known to all of us, and I need not repeat it here.

**MR. KIKHIA, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE  
LIBYAN ARAB REPUBLIC TO THE UN  
ADDRESS TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL,  
July 13, 1976**

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

Also, I want to point to another aspect of Mr. Herzog's statement. He is repeating again and again, that Libya is the paymaster of international terrorism and that Libya is promoting international terrorism. I do not know what is behind that. This whole question of international terrorism poses a big question mark: Who is perpetrating international terrorism? What is international terrorism? Who is responsible for international terrorism? There may be many groups known as international terrorists, and who have their national background or ideological background. But, many groups are penetrated. Maybe one day we shall know the truth.

Mr. Herzog was the head of the secret service in his country, in

his counterfeit State, Israel. Maybe one day he will write his memoirs, when he has retired to his green Ireland. At that time he will not be bound by the laws of secrecy of this counterfeit State, Israel.

## Mexican Gov't Statements To UN Security Council Debate

*United Nations, N.Y. July 17 (NSIPS) — The following is the text of the letter from the Mexican government presented to the United Nations Security Council on July 13 by Mexican Ambassador to the UN, Roberto Rosenzweig-Diaz.*

The government of Mexico wishes to reiterate its condemnation of all terrorist acts, and particularly those that endanger the lives of innocent people, as is the case of the recent Air France plane hijacking by a group of Palestinian extremists. The Palestine Liberation Organization, which according to resolution 3236 of the UN General Assembly is the representative of the Palestinian people, has dissociated itself from those acts.

True to its principles however, Mexico cannot fail to make equally known its firm rejection of the use of armed force by any state as a means to solve conflicts, given that such acts flagrantly violate the Charter of the United Nations and the universally accepted principles of International Law, while they create precedents of incalculable danger for all of civilized coexistence.

The lack of political will to comply with the fundamental precepts of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the pertinent resolutions adopted by that Organization, with respect to concrete cases, has, in the opinion of the Mexican government, produced a serious impasse in the Mideast, which affects all international activity.

We wish therefore to urge those countries directly involved in that conflict, and all members of the international community, to make urgent effort to find formulas which will allow a definite solution to the problem of the Middle East. These formulas must necessarily ensure the right of all states in the region to live in peace and security, as well as establish the right of the Palestinian people to form a state with their own territory, doubtless allowing major control by the leaders of the PLO, in order to avoid a recurrence of terrorist acts which are to be condemned from any standpoint.

---

How The  
**IDB** INTERNATIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT BANK  
Will Work \$100

by Lyndon H LaRouche Jr.  
U.S. Labor Party Presidential Candidate

Order Form  
Campaigner Publications, Inc. P.O. Box 1972, General Post Office, New York, New York 10001

---