

ited Nations

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

FORTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records*



SIXTH COMMITTEE
63rd meeting
held on
Monday, 5 December 1977
at 3 p.m.
New York

UN LIBRARY

DEC 21 1977

UN/SA COLLECTION

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 63rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GAVIRIA (Colombia)

later: Mr. BOJILOV (Bulgaria)

CONTENTS

NDA ITEM 119: DRAFTING OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST THE TAKING OF
HOSTAGES: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DRAFTING OF AN INTERNATIONAL
CONVENTION AGAINST THE TAKING OF HOSTAGES (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of
the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief,
Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for
the Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.6/32/SR.63
8 December 1977
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 119: DRAFTING OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST THE TAKING OF HOSTAGES: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DRAFTING OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST THE TAKING OF HOSTAGES (continued) (A/32/39; A/C.6/32/L.10 and L.15)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that Mexico had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.10.
2. Mr. GAWLEY (Ireland) said that the only effective means, if not of eliminating the taking of hostages, at least of resolving the problems to which it gave rise was the drafting of an international convention against the taking of hostages, as the Ad Hoc Committee was in the process of doing.
3. His delegation, which was concerned over the increasing frequency of acts of terrorism, therefore hoped that the Ad Hoc Committee would be able to continue its work and complete the task entrusted to it as soon as possible. Accordingly, it recommended that the Sixth Committee should adopt draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.10, of which Ireland was a sponsor, by consensus.
4. Mr. KAPETANOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that, in view of the extremely delicate problems raised by the question of the taking of hostages, the drafting of a convention on that subject which was acceptable to all States required time. He therefore fully supported draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.10, which provided for the extension of the Ad Hoc Committee's mandate.
5. If the work of the Ad Hoc Committee was to be successfully completed, it would be necessary for its members to continue the practice of constructive exchanges of views and endeavour to reach compromise solutions.
6. While he did not wish to review all the problems with which the Ad Hoc Committee had to deal, he felt that he must stress the need to include in the draft convention provisions regarding the adoption of preventive measures against the taking of hostages and the banning of terrorist organizations. Without such provisions, the effectiveness of the convention would be considerably reduced since it would permit the international community to act only post factum, in other words after an offence had been committed.
7. The draft convention prepared by the Federal Republic of Germany was a well-arranged legal text which could be of great help during the drafting of the final text.
8. Algeria's proposal that some of the fundamental principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations should be included in the preamble to the convention also deserved attention.
9. His delegation shared the view of many other delegations that every effort should be made to avoid any risk of confusion between the struggle waged by the

/...

(Mr. Kapetanovic, Yugoslavia)

liberation movements against colonialism and racism and terrorist acts perpetrated by anarchist and Fascist organizations. In that connexion, the clarifications which the United Republic of Tanzania (A/AC.188/L.5) and Mexico (A/AC.188/L.6) proposed to introduce into the definition of the taking of hostages might lead to a generally acceptable compromise solution.

10. His delegation also supported the proposals that the draft convention should include provisions designed to protect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States in the event of any foreign intervention for the purpose of liberating hostages.

11. While he believed that the Ad Hoc Committee would soon be in a position to submit a draft convention, it would be several years before a convention entered into force. It would therefore be very useful if in the meantime States Members of the United Nations concluded bilateral agreements and took action to combat the taking of hostages and all other forms of terrorism.

12. Mr. YACOUBA (Niger) said that his Government, which had always condemned the taking of hostages, recognized the merits of the draft convention prepared by the Federal Republic of Germany, but that he doubted whether a convention which took no account of the motives of those who committed such acts could gain the support of all States.

13. His delegation believed that the principle whereby any State was obliged to prosecute or extradite those who took hostages should be made more flexible in order to distinguish clearly between criminals who were pursuing their own personal ends and freedom fighters who were waging a legitimate struggle against colonial and racist régimes. He therefore proposed that the Ad Hoc Committee should define clearly what was meant by "an act of taking hostages" in order to avoid any risk of confusion between criminal acts falling within the scope of common law and acts committed in the exercise of the inalienable right of peoples to free themselves from any form of oppression.

14. Niger attached paramount importance to respect for the principle of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and could in no case agree to any derogation from that principle on the pretext of liberating hostages. Any international convention against the taking of hostages should therefore include provisions guaranteeing respect for those principles, which were embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

15. Mr. SHEQUEM (Jordan) observed that, while the members of the Ad Hoc Committee held divergent views on many points, they were unanimous in condemning acts of taking hostages, particularly when the victims of such acts were outside the conflict to which the acts were linked. Moreover, they all recognized that, given the special nature of the process of codifying international law, the drafting of a convention against the taking of hostages would take a great deal of time.

16. He was particularly gratified to note the spirit of compromise which had characterized the last few meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee and which had enabled it to adopt by consensus the draft resolution submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany (A/AC.188/L.17).

/...

(Mr. Shequem, Jordan)

17. In that connexion, he wished to emphasize that Jordan was prepared to accept a compromise solution provided that it took account of the interest of all States; such a compromise was, in fact, essential if a convention acceptable to all was to be drafted. It was important, however, to ensure that it did not run counter to legal doctrine and practice.

18. A more general consideration was that it was essential, in order to preserve the dignity and relevance of international penal law, that international legal conventions dealing with the taking of hostages and related questions should adopt a corrective rather than a punitive approach. Moreover, if they were to be applicable and not remain a dead letter, they must take cognizance of political realities.

19. Mr. TAIBI (Algeria) said that unlike some delegations which were concerned at the considerable divergence of views regarding the field of application of the future convention, and the definitions in the draft convention submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany, his delegation regarded such differences as inevitable in view of the diversity of ideologies and legal systems in the countries constituting the Ad Hoc Committee; the Committee's first session, which had adopted by consensus a recommendation for the extension of its mandate, had on the whole produced fairly considerable results.

20. He readily admitted that there were still many problems to solve and in particular, care must be taken to ensure that the adoption of an international legal instrument against the taking of hostages did not encroach directly or indirectly on the right of peoples to fight for their national liberation.

21. The Geneva Conventions of 1949 and the additional Protocols thereto which prohibited the taking of hostages by parties to an armed conflict were not of themselves sufficient to dispel the anxiety of all those who, like the Algerian people, had had to suffer a merciless war to liberate their country from a long period of colonialist occupation, particularly since certain circles, denying the right of self-determination of peoples, were spreading confusion regarding the significance of certain proposals made in a constructive spirit in the Ad Hoc Committee, and were giving currency to the thesis that only those national liberation struggles conducted by liberation movements recognized by regional organizations and the United Nations could be assimilated to the status of international armed conflicts.

22. The Ad Hoc Committee must therefore devise a legal instrument which condemned the taking of hostages both by individuals and, what was even more reprehensible because of its collective and long-lasting nature, the taking of hostages by foreign colonialist racist régimes with the sole object of preserving an inequitable order in a territory which was not theirs.

23. If the future convention did not cover acts of that nature, all that would have been achieved would be the preparation of an additional instrument of oppression. It was in the light of such considerations that his delegation had drafted the text proposed in document A/AC.188/L.4 and had co-sponsored the draft resolution in document A/C.6/32/L.10.

(Mr. Taibi, Algeria)

24. He considered moreover that the draft convention against the taking of hostages should expressly prohibit the threat or use of force against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States on the pretext of liberating hostages, and he associated himself with the Syrian proposal in document A/AC.188/Add.11. He also supported the proposal relating to the right of asylum contained in paragraph 2 of the working paper submitted by Mexico (A/AC.188/L.6).
25. He added that his delegation, which supported the extension of the Ad Hoc Committee's mandate, hoped that Governments would continue to transmit their observations to the Committee. His delegation was ready to make its full contribution to a draft convention which would be acceptable to all.
26. Mr. HARRIMAN (Nigeria) recalled that the taking of hostages was, like the hijacking of aircraft, an aspect of international terrorism and he noted with appreciation the efforts of Member States in trying to work out a consensus in the drafting of an international convention against such crimes. The taking of hostages was not limited to any one continent or any one group of peoples, or any one race, culture, religion, or level of social and economic development. It was therefore an appropriate matter for international action. It was prohibited in time of war, which was all the more reason why it should be prohibited in time of peace. It was for those reasons that his delegation supported the initiative of the Federal Republic of Germany.
27. Progress, actual or potential, in the matters of aircraft hijacking and the taking of hostages must not be allowed to divert attention from the general concept of international terrorism. As General Assembly resolution 31/102 implied, terrorism could not be separated from its underlying causes which were connected with the social, political and economic structures of Member States and the denial of basic rights to certain peoples, and there was no hope of progress unless that fact was recognized.
28. A number of working papers concerning an international convention on the taking of hostages had been submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee. His delegation had co-sponsored two working drafts, the first of which (A/AC.188/L.5) was intended to serve as a reminder that in southern Africa for example, it was the racist régimes which were constant perpetrators of that crime on the territory of neighbouring States; the other draft (A/AC.188/L.7) was designed to prevent States claiming the right, as had happened recently, to use force against other States to free hostages. The Ad Hoc Committee's mandate should be extended so that all those documents could be studied. His delegation would therefore associate itself with any consensus on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.10, a resolution which, in any case, was concerned only with procedure.
29. Mr. SIRCAR (Bangladesh) said that the taking of hostages was an act which endangered human lives and violated human dignity, rights inherent in the Charter which were proclaimed by the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The taking of hostages was in any case prohibited by various international agreements in particular cases.

(Mr. Sircar, Bangladesh)

30. Many delegations were therefore concerned with the matter and had submitted documents to the Ad Hoc Committee; among them, special mention should be made of the draft convention submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany (A/AC.188/L.3).

31. The taking of hostages involved a number of criminal elements and one of them, the motive, was an essential element in jurisprudence. National legislation, as well as international instruments relating to certain specific aspects, clearly defined the crime and its punishment. It was within that framework that the problem should be viewed and its causes carefully studied. In that connexion many delegations including his own considered that, as in the case of hijacking, the general definition of the crime of taking hostages should make provision for an exception which would take into account certain legitimate political motivations and situations such as those in South Africa or Palestine, where people were struggling to achieve recognition of their inalienable rights.

32. His delegation thought that article 11 of the draft convention should be more carefully scrutinized and its implications spelt out more fully in practical terms.

33. Mr. WU Hsaio-ta (China) said his country had consistently opposed terrorist acts by individuals or groups of individuals who were isolated in their political struggle, for such acts could not win the sympathy of the people and in addition were bound to have damaging effects on the cause of national liberation and the people's revolution. Furthermore, imperialism, colonialism, racism and zionism often used such acts as a pretext to seek to attack the revolutionary struggle of oppressed peoples for their freedom, a scheme which China firmly opposed.

34. It was in that light that his delegation considered the international convention against the taking of hostages which, in its opinion, should differentiate clearly between right and wrong and embody certain basic principles. First, while the convention should take into account the views of the various sides, it should not harm the just struggle of peoples for their liberation. It was absolutely inadmissible to associate the terrorist acts perpetrated by a handful of adventurers with the revolutionary struggle of the broad masses of the oppressed. Second, in the interest of effectiveness, it would be unwise to include in the convention provisions which violated national sovereignty, for example by demanding that the accused must be severely punished or extradited irrespective of the circumstances in which they had committed their acts. Lastly, the countries concerned should engage in consultations and co-operation on the basis of mutual respect for their sovereignty, for it was inadmissible for any country to resort to the threat or use of force against another on the pretext of rescuing hostages.

35. Many countries, especially African and Arab countries, had submitted working papers on the aforementioned aspects of the question to the Ad Hoc Committee. His delegation felt that the Ad Hoc Committee should give those views serious attention when drafting the convention, for otherwise it would find it difficult to prepare a draft acceptable to all States.

36. Mr. NJENGA (Kenya) said his delegation, which had participated in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, did not think that it was feasible for the latter to discharge its mandate in a single session. The Ad Hoc Committee had nevertheless proceeded with its task in a business-like manner, its work having been greatly facilitated by the substantive proposals submitted, especially that of the Federal Republic of Germany. However, the Ad Hoc Committee must be given the necessary time to elaborate a balanced draft convention. The international community must solve the problem of hostage-taking, which constituted a serious breach of international peace and became even more abhorrent when the victims were in no way connected with the plight of the perpetrators.

37. His delegation was one of those which attached great importance to the activities of recognized liberation movements, but while acknowledging that those movements should be able to use all means at their disposal in their struggle, it did not think that anyone advocated giving them the right to take innocent hostages and did not even believe that any responsible movement would wish to resort to such acts. However, it was important not to lose sight of the dynamics of the liberation struggle between oppressed and oppressors and to acknowledge that many civilians participated actively in the oppression and were therefore not innocent targets.

38. His delegation was glad that a number of proposals had been submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee with a view to including in the draft convention an exception clause in favour of the liberation movements. In that regard he singled out the proposal by Lesotho and the United Republic of Tanzania (A/AC.188/L.5) and the proposal of Mexico (A/AC.188/L.6), which sought to exclude from the sphere of application of the draft acts committed by freedom fighters which were covered by the rules of international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflicts.

39. The draft convention should also cover the taking of hostages purely for purposes of extortion and the provision concerning the right of asylum should be rephrased so as to specify that asylum would be granted only for legitimate political reasons.

40. In the light of recent events, his delegation supported the proposal prohibiting recourse to the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or independence of other States as a means of rescuing hostages (A/AC.188/L.7).

41. He believed that it would be possible to make considerable progress on those points and many others. His delegation hoped that the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee would be extended and would support draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.10.

42. Mr. GILCHRIST (Australia) recalled that, as his delegation had already stated the previous year in the Sixth Committee, his Government considered that hostage-taking violated fundamental human rights. A hostage was an innocent person who had the right to life and freedom, regardless of his nationality, race or religion. However, where the taking of hostages involved more than one country it posed problems of jurisdiction and other problems arising from a lack of international co-operation, for there was as yet no general obligation upon States to prosecute or extradite the offender.

(Mr. Gilchrist, Australia)

43. There were numerous international instruments which touched on parts of the general problem of hostage-taking. Those instruments, to which his country was a party, had been supplemented in 1977 by the two Additional Protocols to the 1949 Geneva Conventions. However, those instruments did not cover all possible situations and the existing gaps should be filled by appropriate provisions of international law which would command general support.

44. The provisions of the two Protocols to the Geneva Conventions relating to hostages were strikingly imperative and far-reaching in their ambit, examples being the preamble and articles 1 and 75 of Protocol I and article 4 of Protocol II. The Protocols were the fruit of four years of international discussion and compromise, and although they were applicable only to armed conflicts their principles should be borne in mind in the framing of measures against the taking of hostages in time of peace.

45. The report of the Ad Hoc Committee showed that that body had succeeded in identifying and clarifying many of the problems inherent in the preparation of a convention which would attract universal support. His delegation welcomed the positive contributions made by various members of the Ad Hoc Committee and especially by the Federal Republic of Germany.

46. The question arose, however, why the Ad Hoc Committee had been unable to complete its task, despite the increasing urgency of the problem of hostage-taking. First, some members of that Committee had requested precise definitions of the concept of a hostage, of various kinds of hostage situations and of the crime of hostage-taking. The need for legal precision must be respected, but that had not prevented the drafting, in the other international instruments in force, of generally acceptable provisions regarding hostages.

47. There had also been suggestions that the drafting of a convention could not be properly considered except in the wider context of a study of the causes of terrorism. It should be noted in that regard that if the various conventions on international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflicts had had to wait until there was a consensus about the causes of war, the international community would still be without those humanitarian provisions.

48. Some members of the Ad Hoc Committee had been of the opinion that the application of a convention along the lines indicated in working paper A/AC.188/L.3 could operate to the disadvantage of groups or peoples struggling against colonialism or alien or racial oppression. The principle of the right of peoples to self-determination was indisputable; it was a corner-stone of the Charter, which Australia was determined to uphold. However, it was a matter for serious doubt whether the cause of any oppressed group or people could be enhanced by conferring on anyone the right to commit an act which was recognized in all countries as a crime against humanity. In that connexion, his delegation welcomed the statement made the previous week on the subject by the representative of Morocco. It was in the interest of all countries and all peoples to avoid using in a convention language which could be construed as granting anyone a licence to take hostages.

. /...

(Mr. Gilchrist, Australia)

49. The drafting of the proposed convention indeed presented some real difficulties. The traditionally recognized right of asylum, for example, had to be taken into account, as did the need to ensure protection for the lives of hostages and obtain their early release. Some useful proposals in that context had been put before the Ad Hoc Committee, and in an earlier statement the representative of Trinidad and Tobago had likewise made a useful suggestion by drawing attention to the 1976 European Convention, which could be profitably studied by the Ad Hoc Committee.

50. Provisions for punishment of the hostage-taker could be an alternative to extradition and thus help to solve some of the problems. His delegation believed that the proposed convention should, however, contain provisions pertaining to jurisdiction and extradition comparable to those of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents. It should in any case provide firstly, that the taking of hostages, wherever it was committed, was an offence which every party was entitled and bound to treat as a crime, and secondly, that if a prosecution was not initiated within an appropriate period, the State detaining the wrongdoer should extradite him to the State within whose territory the crime had been committed. In fact, the political character of such a universally reprehensible offence as hostage-taking should not justify any exception to the principle of punishment and extradition.

51. His delegation supported draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.10, which was essentially a procedural resolution and in no way prejudged the outcome of the Ad Hoc Committee's work, and hoped that it would be adopted by consensus. The Ad Hoc Committee would then be able to resume its task early in 1978, and it should be allowed adequate time. His delegation hoped that the Ad Hoc Committee would prepare a full and detailed report, so that the Sixth Committee would be able to make a thorough and well-informed study of the expected draft convention at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

52. The CHAIRMAN announced that Indonesia had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.10.

53. Mr. SIAGE (Syrian Arab Republic) observed that the Charter of the United Nations accorded the right of peoples to self-determination priority over the rights and freedoms of individuals. Similarly, in the international convention against the taking of hostages, the rights of peoples should take priority over individual rights, or should at least be placed on a par with them. That was the reason why his delegation, whose views were recorded on pages 36 and 84 of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee (A/32/39), had put forward a definition of the term "taking of hostages", which in its view should not apply to acts carried out by liberation movements in the process of national liberation or resistance against colonial rule, racist régimes and foreign occupation. Moreover, the convention could not win general support or constitute the basis of effective collective action without prohibiting any infringement of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State under the pretext of freeing hostages.

(Mr. Siage, Syrian Arab Republic)

54. The taking of hostages was only one form of international terrorism, whose underlying causes must be determined to enable a global solution to be found to the problem. It was impossible to condemn the taking of hostages by individuals while pretending to be unaware of the fact that entire peoples were deprived of their freedom and sovereignty, held prisoner by occupation forces and treated as hostages by racist régimes. His country would continue to co-operate with the whole international community to put an end to all the forms of terrorism of which peoples and innocent individuals were victims.

55. His delegation was in favour of renewing the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee, and supported draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.10, since it applied only to procedural matters.

56. Mr. Bojilov (Bulgaria) took the Chair.

57. Mr. MONTENEGRO (Nicaragua) said he was surprised that the taking of hostages still excited controversy, when it had been defined as a serious offence by the 1949 Geneva Convention and other international instruments. His delegation considered that the crime should always be condemned with the same vigour, regardless of the identity and motives of the perpetrator. The international community could not apply a double standard by tolerating the taking of hostages on the part of some and condemning it on the part of others.

58. During its session the Ad Hoc Committee had had before it a number of interesting working papers, particularly that prepared by the Federal Republic of Germany, whose draft articles were very comprehensive and possessed all the qualities required to obtain a consensus both in the Ad Hoc Committee and in the General Assembly. His delegation therefore considered it necessary to extend the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee, so that it could discharge the extremely important and urgent task entrusted to it. In that spirit it had co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.10.

59. Mr. BAVAND (Iran) said that the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee reflected the firm desire of the international community to fill the legal gaps in international law in that regard.

60. With regard to the legal aspects of the question, the Ad Hoc Committee had made valuable progress. The majority of the members had regarded the working paper submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany as an acceptable legal basis for consideration of the problem, and some 23 proposals had been submitted with a view to improving the basic provisions of that text.

61. With regard to the political aspects of the question, the procedure followed by the Ad Hoc Committee had been more of a probing nature than an attempt at negotiation. It should, however, be noted that with regard to the two sets of proposals concerning non-use of force against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and the right of asylum, there seemed to be certain grounds for accommodation. In fact, the question of the applicability of the term

(Mr. Bavand, Iran)

"taking of hostages" to the acts of national liberation movements had been the focal point of the discussions. Some members had been of the opinion that the two 1977 Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions had opened a new vista which was to be utilized for future accommodation. They had maintained that the "taking of hostages" should not include any acts covered by the rules of international law applicable to armed conflicts, including conflicts in which peoples were fighting for self-determination and independence. Others had held the view that additional safeguard measures in favour of national liberation movements were required, which were to be the subject of special negotiations.

62. His delegation believed that the future work of the Ad Hoc Committee depended on the political will of the parties concerned. Genuine accommodation required the recognition and reaffirmation of the fundamental principles of vital interest for each party. As it had stated during the general debate in the Ad Hoc Committee, his delegation considered that an effective and generally acceptable convention against the taking of hostages should take into account the following factors.

63. Firstly, the convention should be drafted in such a manner as to avoid undesirable side effects in other areas of human rights. In the light of the absence of an international penal code and international criminal court, the basic provisions of the convention should be in accord with the well-established principles of international humanitarian law and with the principle of fair treatment. In that connexion, it could be noted that in penal codes, an offence, an attempt to commit an offence and complicity were not treated uniformly. Moreover, the severity of the penalty varied according to the different legal systems, and for that reason, his delegation had suggested in the Ad Hoc Committee that in article 4 of working paper A/AC.188/L.3 the words "severe penalties" should be replaced by the term "appropriate penalties" and supported the French and Nicaraguan proposals concerning the addition of a new paragraph to that article.

64. His delegation considered that the convention should in no way impair the exercise of the legitimate right to self-determination and independence of all peoples struggling against colonialism, alien domination, racial discrimination and apartheid. Human rights and the right of peoples to self-determination were directly connected because the latter was concerned with the attainment of socio-political conditions favourable to the realization of the former. It was to be noted that although the two Geneva Additional Protocols had introduced a new element into the legal status of national liberation movements, additional safeguard measures similar to those provided for in the 1973 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, should be laid down.

65. Thirdly, his delegation had no objection to reaffirming in the text of the convention the fundamental principle of sovereignty and territorial integrity.

66. His delegation shared the view that the Committee should avoid excessive curtailment of the scope of the institution of political asylum.

(Mr. Bavand, Iran)

67. His delegation was convinced that, if it showed political realism, the Ad Hoc Committee would undoubtedly achieve remarkable success at its next session and hoped that draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.10, which related solely to procedure, would receive unanimous support of the members of the Sixth Committee and would be adopted by consensus.

68. Mr. Gavaria (Colombia) resumed the Chair.

69. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said he considered that the taking of hostages was a crime against humanity and that he supported all measures to curtail it. He also supported the renewal of the Ad Hoc Committee's mandate. Although several categories of the taking of hostages could be distinguished, any convention on the subject must absolutely condemn such acts in a general way and deal with the problem from a purely humanitarian viewpoint.

70. However, that was only one of the many symptoms of a much deeper evil, which was undermining the international community and to which, inter alia, the proliferation of items on the agenda of the General Assembly could be ascribed. If the world was prey to anarchy and insecurity, that was basically because the international legal order was less and less respected and the United Nations was failing to fulfil its primary task of establishing truly universal peace and security. The reason was that the resolutions adopted by the Security Council, which bore primary responsibility for that task, remained a dead letter, as the measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter were not being applied. In order to prevent individuals or groups of individuals from resorting to terrorism, acts of aggression perpetrated by certain States must be curtailed by the application of the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.