

war against its own people that was unlikely to end until it stopped blaming outside forces for the domestic opposition to their rule. He called for accepting the proposal of the Nicaraguan democratic resistance for a church-mediated dialogue, a ceasefire and a suspension of the state of emergency.²²

The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, exercising his right to reply, strongly condemned the United States reference to his country's internal affairs. He reminded the Council of the facts he addressed in his statement, namely, the refusal of the United States to recognize the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. As to the refugee problems, he stated that Iran was hosting 2 million Afghan refugees, half a million Iraqi refugees and 2.5 million war-stricken people of his own country. He also mentioned certain individuals hosted by the United States, most of whom had stolen a great amount of Iranian property. As for Nicaragua, he held the United States responsible for many problems and the suffering of the people.²³

The representative of Nicaragua, exercising his right to reply, said that his delegation felt compelled to come to the Security Council to denounce United States aggression

and noted that it had become the practice for the United States delegation to distort the genuine motives of Nicaragua's approach to the Council. He stated that the United States constantly repeated in that important body, which should be respected because of the functions entrusted to it, that it had no intention to undermine the Government of Nicaragua. He considered those assertions to be either products of ignorance or rather terroristic attempts to overthrow the legitimately constituted Government.

He believed that it was of the highest importance for the Council to have discussed the complaint of Nicaragua to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security, in a preventive fashion and to consider the situation that might arise in the future. He thanked the delegations that had expressed their firm defence of the rule of law. He reiterated the peace-loving nature of his country's policy and its readiness to transform Central America into a zone free of any military presence. At the same time, he repeated that Nicaragua would not agree to disarm itself until the cessation of United States aggression.²⁴

The President declared that the Security Council had thus reached the end of the current state of consideration of the item on the agenda.

²²Ibid., pp. 52-55.

²³Ibid., pp. 56-58.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 58-64.

16. LETTER DATED 16 DECEMBER 1985 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

[HOSTAGE-TAKING AND ABDUCTION]

Decision of 18 December 1985 (2637th meeting): resolution 579 (1985)

By a letter dated 16 December 1985 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹ the representative of the United States of America requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the serious situation created by acts of hostage-taking and abduction.

At the 2637th meeting, on 18 December 1985, the Council included the item in its agenda without objection.

The President of the Security Council drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Australia, Denmark, Egypt, France, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America,² which he proposed to put to the vote; it was adopted unanimously as resolution 579 (1985). It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Deeply disturbed at the prevalence of incidents of hostage-taking and abduction, several of which are of protracted duration and have included loss of life,

Considering that the taking of hostages and abductions are offences of grave concern to the international community, having severe adverse consequences for the rights of the victims and for the promotion of friendly relations and cooperation among States,

Recalling the statement of 9 October 1985 by the President of the Security Council, resolutely condemning all acts of terrorism, including hostage-taking,³

Recalling also resolution 40/61 of 9 December 1985 of the General Assembly,

Bearing in mind the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted on 17 December 1979, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted on 14 December 1973, the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed on 23 September 1971, the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed on 16 December 1970, and other relevant conventions,

- 1. Condemns unequivocally all acts of hostage-taking and abduction;*
- 2. Calls for the immediate safe release of all hostages and abducted persons wherever and by whomever they are being held;*
- 3. Affirms the obligation of all States in whose territory hostages or abducted persons are held urgently to take all appropriate measures to secure their safe release and to prevent the commission of acts of hostage-taking and abduction in the future;*
- 4. Appeals to all States that have not yet done so to consider the possibility of becoming parties to the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and other relevant conventions;*

¹S/17685.

²S/17686.

³S/17554.

5. *Urges* the further development of international cooperation among States in devising and adopting effective measures which are in accordance with the rules of international law to facilitate the pre-

vention, prosecution and punishment of all acts of hostage-taking and abduction as manifestations of international terrorism.

17. COMPLAINT BY LESOTHO AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

Decision of 30 December 1985 (2639th meeting): resolution 580 (1985)

By a letter dated 23 December 1985 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹ the representative of Lesotho requested a meeting of the Security Council to deal with the grave situation created by an unprovoked armed aggression against Lesotho by South Africa.

At its 2638th meeting, on 30 December 1985, the Security Council included the item in the agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited the following, at their request, to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote: the representatives of Burundi, Lesotho, Senegal and South Africa. At their request contained in a letter dated 30 December 1985 from the representatives of Burkina Faso, Egypt and Madagascar,² an invitation, under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, was extended to Mr. Neo Mnumzana, representative of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC). The Council considered the item at its 2638th and 2639th meetings, on 30 December 1985.

At the 2638th meeting, on 30 December 1985, the representative of Lesotho recalled that the first complaint against South Africa was brought to the Council in December 1982 after the invasion and brutal murder of 42 people in the capital, Maseru. That aggressive act was condemned by the Security Council in its resolution 527 (1982) of 15 December 1982, in which it called upon South Africa to bind itself not to repeat similar attacks and to pay full and adequate compensation. South Africa had arrogantly refused to implement any of the provisions of the resolution and had continued a systematic campaign of destabilization of Lesotho through the so-called Lesotho Liberation Army based and trained on its territory.

The speaker described the recent attack, which had taken place in the early hours of 20 December 1985. According to independent witnesses, commandos of the South African Army shot in cold blood seven people, of whom six were South Africans, in a house located in a suburb of the capital, Maseru. The witnesses saw white soldiers cordoning off the house and remarked that, judging from the mute sound, the guns were fitted with silencers. Two other victims were followed by the assassins to their houses and shot. There was also testimony that a group of white soldiers had been seen heading towards South African territory. The representative announced that sworn statements by witnesses and photographs were available for examination. He also referred to the exchange of telex messages between South Africa and Lesotho,³ which, according to the speaker, showed the premeditated nature of the latest attack on the basis of unsubstantiated allegations that

members of the ANC had been planning attacks against South Africa from Lesotho during the Christmas period. At the same time, the exchange of messages had shown that Lesotho had demonstrated readiness to resolve any differences through discussions and negotiations. The representative stated that his country had received refugees belonging to various South African organizations on condition of non-use of its territory for attacks against South Africa. Arrangements for their transportation to second countries of asylum were made by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. He called for the international community to make arrangements for the safe conduct of the refugees from Lesotho. He also drew the attention of the Council to the fact that South Africa had threatened to impose restrictions on normal traffic in and out of Lesotho and had asked the Council to take note that South Africa was creating special transit problems for Lesotho, placing that country's security and economic development in jeopardy. He went on by stating that the wings of apartheid had spread over the entire southern African region, bringing destabilization to Lesotho, Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe. In conclusion, the speaker appealed to the Security Council to condemn once again the aggressive action of South Africa as well as the system of apartheid, which was incompatible with peace and security. He welcomed any mission of the Security Council that could help preserve the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lesotho.⁴

At the 2639th meeting, on 30 December 1985, the representative of Senegal stated that the Pretoria regime defied the international community by its policies of tyranny and lawlessness. He referred to the refusal of the racist regime to recognize the right of the people of South Africa to establish a democratic, multiracial society. He also referred to the illegal occupation of Namibia, contrary to all relevant resolutions of the Security Council, and to Pretoria's aggression against neighbouring African States. He condemned the most recent cynical acts of aggression against the sovereign State of Lesotho and called for a mission of inquiry to be sent in order to assess the damage and evaluate human casualties. He declared that compensation to Lesotho and to the victims would constitute the very minimum that the Security Council could determine in order to renew the confidence placed by the founders of the Organization and its Member States in the primary organ for the maintenance of international peace and security. In his view the only response of the Security Council consistent with the efforts to eradicate totally the system of apartheid would be application of comprehensive and mandatory economic—and even political—sanctions. He referred to the proposal of the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to convene a world conference on sanc-

¹S/17692.

²S/17700.

³A/17689.

⁴S/PV.2638, pp. 3-11.