United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
EIGHTEENTH SESSION
Official Records

SIXTH COMMITTEE, 809th MEETING

Tuesday, 12 November 1963, at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 71:
Consideration of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (continued) 151

Chairman: Mr. José María RUDA (Argentina).

AGENDA ITEM 71

Consideration of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (A/5470 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.6/L.528, A/C.6/L.530, A/C.6/L.531 and Corr.1, A/C.6/L.535, A/C.6/L.537) (continued)

1. Miss LAURENS (Indonesia), recalling the circumstances which had led the Sixth Committee to consider the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States, expressed satisfaction that the obstacles which threatened to block consideration of the question, in particular the procedural difficulties, had been overcome by the conciliatory spirit shown by the members of the Committee and the efforts of its Chairman. In pursuance of General Assembly resolution 1815 (XVII), the Committee would endeavour to develop generally-acceptable rules of international law by studying the Charter principles which should govern the conduct of States so as to enable them to coexist in peace. The resolution, which had been adopted unanimously, had represented a compromise among a number of draft resolutions, one of which had been submitted by Indonesia and fourteen other non-aligned countries. However, there were still differences of opinion about the scope and objectives of the task entrusted to the Committee. Indeed, some representatives questioned the timeliness of a general declaration of the principles under discussion.

2. Nevertheless, under the provisions of operative paragraph 2 of resolution 1815 (XVII), the Committee was to work towards the progressive development and codification of the principles of international law as those terms had been defined in article 15 of the Statute of the International Law Commission: towards the preparation of draft conventions on subjects which were not yet regulated by international law and on the systematization of rules of international law in those fields in which there already was extensive State practice. Of course, it might be argued that the definition did not include the notion of a declaration; but there was no clear reason for excluding it. Moreover, in its resolution 178 (II) the General Assembly had instructed the International Law Commission to prepare a draft declaration on the rights and duties of States, taking as a basis of discussion a draft presented by Panama. None of the fifteen members of the Commission who had met in 1949 to consider the draft had adduced the slightest legal argument against the idea of a declaration as such. Of course, some of those jurists and a number of Governments had expressed a preference for a convention. In support of a declaration, however, she cited the opinion of Mr. Yepes who, at the first session of the International Law Commission (8th meeting) had advocated a multilateral convention or a collective declaration and had stated that a declaration, though not legally binding, would have the advantage of simplicity and might create a juridical conscience (Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 1949, p. 64). Similarly the Mexican jurist, Mr. Roberto Cordova, while conceding that a declaration would not have great value as an instrument for securing rights which were continually being violated, had said that it would represent a substantial advance if it established a standard of conduct recognized by States (ibid., p. 65). In the opinion of Judge Manley Hudson, Chairman of the Commission in 1949, the value of a declaration subject to ratification would be diminished if it failed to obtain many ratifications, but a declaration adopted by the General Assembly, even if it did not create legal obligations upon Member States, would be comparable in value to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (ibid., pp. 65 and 66). Moreover, Mr. Amado, while he had favoured the drafting of a convention, had suggested that the General Assembly should also adopt a resolution on the rights and duties of States (ibid., p. 63). Besides the views of some of the members of the International Law Commission, she could cite in particular that of the United States jurist, Mr. Philip C. Jessup who advocated the method, adopted in inter-American conferences, of declarations containing the conclusions reached by the representatives, which, though they had not the force of treaties, constituted evidence that the rules of law they proclaimed actually existed.

3. Her delegation, basing itself on the opinions of those distinguished jurists, had reached the conclusion that a declaration was entirely suitable, not as a substitute for a convention, but as an instrument preliminary to one. Furthermore, the target date of the twentieth session of the General Assembly, proposed by the Czechoslovak representative for the attainment of that objective, seemed appropriate to her delegation and could perhaps coincide with the proclamation of the United Nations Decade of International Law, contemplated in resolution 1816 (XVII). The meaning of the phrase in paragraph 2 of resolution 1815 (XVII) "to secure their more effective application" was explained in the third preambular paragraph, which spoke of "their application to present-day conditions". Those conditions and the main objectives

were stated in the fourth, sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs.

4. Some delegations considered that the principles formulated in the Charter, in particular the four principles under discussion, could only be studied in relation to the Charter as a whole, and that to do so might lead to a complete reformulation of the basic rules stated in the Charter, which they considered inadvisable. In that connexion she cited the opinion of Justice Stone, Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, who had stated in 1936 that the problem for jurists was the reconciliation of the demands that law should at once have continuity with the past and adaptability to the present and future (The Common Law in the United States).[1] The Charter was not an immutable instrument. It could of course be read in terms of the international law which had existed when it had been drafted and of its historical background, but the Committee should go further and look at more recent developments and present conditions and should look ahead. As President Kennedy had said at the 1209th meeting of the General Assembly, the United Nations could not survive as a static organization and, as its obligations were increasing as well as its size, its Charter must be changed as well as its customs. It was therefore to be hoped that circumstances would soon be propitious for the holding of a general conference on the revision of the Charter. In the meantime it was to be hoped that present circumstances were propitious enough to take the Charter as a basis and, guided by its spirit, to elaborate the meaning of its words so as to secure their more effective application to present conditions.

5. But it was of the greatest importance that the Sixth Committee should be guided in its study by the spirit of the Charter, which had impelled its draftsmen to proclaim their determination to practice tolerance and to live together in peace with one another. It should not be forgotten that the principles under discussion were precisely those principles concerning friendly relations and co-operation between States. Moreover, as several representatives had pointed out, the Committee might also be guided by the Declaration contained in the final communiqué of the Bandung Conference of African and Asian States, the Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of the Non-aligned Countries, issued on the occasion of the Belgrade Conference, and the Charter of Addis Ababa establishing the Organization for African Unity. All those instruments concluded that, to promote world peace and co-operation, nations should rid themselves of fear and mistrust and show tolerance and goodwill towards one another. Similarly, the Committee might usefully consult the 1933 Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States, the Charter of the Organization of American States,[2] and other documents drafted by inter-American conferences.

6. The four principles which the Committee was to consider at its current session could not be studied separately; as the representative of Chile had pointed out, they were closely interrelated. The first principle, prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations, had been dealt with at length in particular by the United Kingdom representative (805th meeting). However, the Indonesian delegation, in considering how that principle could be applied more effectively to present-day conditions in order to maintain and strengthen international peace based on freedom, equality and social justice and to develop peaceful relations among States, could not fail to reach somewhat different conclusions from those of the United Kingdom representative. It recognized that the principle could be examined in the context of Chapter VII, which dealt with the legal uses of force, but it concluded that the only text which supported legitimate recourse to force by any State was Article 51. In order to ensure more effective application of the first principle in order to establish peaceful relations among States, Article 2, paragraph 4 should not be interpreted too narrowly, and the scope and meaning of Article 51 should not be widened. In that connexion she pointed out that the article by Rosalyn Higgins (The British Year Book of International Law, 1961),[3] quoted by the United Kingdom representative at the 805th meeting, misquoted Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. That might compromise the validity of the conclusions based by the United Kingdom representative on that text, for the punctuation and the words omitted, namely the comma after the word "state", the word "or" before the words "in any" and the word "other" after those words, indicated the broad scope intended by Article 2, paragraph 4, through the very choice of its wording.

7. It had been said that peace was founded on law; but was not law founded on justice? The term "threat or use of force" could therefore not be limited to the direct or indirect use of physical force in any form. It should also be recognized that the coercion of a State by another State by means of economic or other methods was contrary to or inconsistent with one or more declared purposes of the United Nations.

8. The United Kingdom representative had warned the Committee against any attempt to restate the principles or purposes of the Charter or to extend or supplement them. The delegation of Indonesia fully shared that opinion especially in regard to Articles which were already restrictive, such as Article 51, which limited the use of force in the exercise of the right of self-defence to the case of a State which was the victim of an armed attack, and laid down that even then the use of force should be temporary only, pending action by the Security Council. Construing the expression "armed attack", Mr. Jessup considered that under the terms of the Charter alarming military preparations by a neighbouring State justified an appeal to the Security Council, but the threatened State was not entitled to use force in anticipation of an attack.

9. The principle of non-intervention was most closely related to the principle of prohibition of the threat or use of force and even overlapped it inasmuch as intervention through or accompanied by the use or threat of force by a State constituted an illegal use of force. Moreover, both those principles derived directly from the principle of the sovereign equality of States. Intervention, however, did not necessarily imply the use of physical force. Thus a State could intervene in the affairs of another State by refusing to recognize its new government and subjecting the latter to economic or financial pressure until it was obliged to resign or was overthrown. A large State could easily intervene in the affairs of a small State even without the direct use of military, economic or political force, by such means as giving moral and financial support to revolutionary elements. If the revolutionary in-

[1] Harvard Law Review, 1936-1937, vol. 50, p. 11.

[2] United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 119 (1952), No. 1609.

[3] London, Oxford University Press, 1962.

trigues against the national government failed, it could not only shelter the revolutionaries but could also encourage them to continue their activities against such government. Those examples were regrettably taken from everyday international life. The delegation of Indonesia profoundly hoped that the Sixth Committee would draw inspiration from such instruments as the Bandung Declaration, the Belgrade Declaration, and especially the Charter of the Organization of American States, and conclude the study of the principle of non-intervention with the formulation of a definition which would be truly effective and contribute to the practice of peaceful coexistence and co-operation.

10. The principle of the pacific settlement of disputes stated in Article 2, paragraph 3, of the Charter embodied the idea that there could be no true peace or security without justice. Article 33 of the Charter listed the various forms of pacific settlement. It placed negotiation at the head of the list, and judicial settlement only last but one. It recognized the right of the parties to a dispute to select the means of settlement of their own choice, according to the nature of the dispute and the circumstances of the case. It was indeed preferable to leave the choice to the parties, except where they had expressly undertaken by special agreement to adopt a particular means of settlement. Generally speaking, the disputes whose continuance was likely to endanger international peace and security were not those which could be settled by purely legal means. The representative of Ceylon had very clearly indicated at the 805th meeting of the Committee the reasons why many States hesitated to bring their disputes before the International Court of Justice. Moreover, the Court was bound by its Statute to apply the law of the "civilized" nations. The delegation of Indonesia, for its part, approved the order in which the means of settlement were listed in Article 33 of the Charter. Its own preference was for negotiation, pursued in a spirit of understanding, without coercion or pressure and in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States. Those considerations were valid for all means of settlement, and it was in that way that the words in Article 2, paragraph 3 of the Charter, "in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered", should be interpreted. Those were the essential requirements of justice, particularly in disputes between a strong and a weak State.

11. While the United Nations Charter proclaimed the principle of the sovereign equality of its Members, which was the fourth of the principles under consideration, it also condoned certain privileges and inequalities. It was generally the small and medium-sized Powers which defended the principle of equality, in which they saw a sure guarantee of their rights. Thus the Bandung Declaration, the Charter of the Organization for African Unity and the Charter of the Organization of American States all solemnly proclaimed the principle of sovereign equality. She hoped that the Sixth Committee, too, would formulate a statement of that principle which would promote more effective enforcement of respect for it.

12. In conclusion, she supported the suggestions made by the representatives of Afghanistan, Chile and Colombia, at the 804th meeting and by the representative of Iraq (808th meeting) that one or more working groups be set up within the Sixth Committee. The best solution might perhaps be to set up a main group and divide it into several sub-groups each of which would study one or two principles, as the representative of Chile had suggested. She did not, however, think that the setting-up of an international fact-finding centre, suggested by the representative of the Netherlands (803rd meeting) came within the scope of the question. Special fact-finding missions would be in a better position than an international fact-finding centre to carry out the enquiry mentioned in Article 33 of the Charter. She agreed with other speakers that the Committee should decide to give further consideration to the principles mentioned in operative paragraph 1 (d), (e) and (g) of General Assembly resolution 1815 (XVII) at subsequent sessions.

13. Mr. SINCLAIR (United Kingdom) exercising the right of reply, said that the misquotation mentioned by the representative of Indonesia, which had slipped into the statement made by the United Kingdom representative at the 805th meeting was an involuntary typing error and did not in any way detract from his delegation's argument.

14. Miss LAURENS (Indonesia) replied that she had not meant to accuse the United Kingdom delegation, but the author on whose work its argument was based, and she hoped that the situation had become clearer after the United Kingdom delegation's clarification.

15. Mrs. ZGURSKAYA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) referred to the great satisfaction with which the peoples of the world had welcomed the conclusion of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, signed at Moscow on 5 August 1963. As, however, Mr. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, had pointed out when the treaty was concluded, it was only an initial success. On 7 October 1963, the day on which the treaty had been ratified by the United States Congress, President Kennedy had stated that the treaty should be followed by other measures along the same lines. Also on 7 October 1963, the representative of the Ukraine had stated in the General Assembly (1231st plenary meeting) that the treaty widened the field of international understanding and opened the way to other more comprehensive agreements. The international climate was therefore propitious for the consideration of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States.

16. Four principles had been selected for study at the present session, and further principles were to be selected for study at later sessions. The law of peaceful coexistence had now reached a stage of development at which it could be codified.

17. For nearly two centuries voices—at first timid and few, but later more and more numerous and determined—had been raised against war. The revolution of October 1917 had marked a turning-point in progress towards an era of peace. In its Decree on Peace of 26 October 1917, the Soviet Government had stated that wars of aggression were "the most heinous of all crimes against humanity". The peoples of the world now demanded that wars of aggression should be banned forever, and jurists had at their disposal sufficient instruments and texts to state the great principles of peaceful coexistence. The principle of renunciation of war had been embodied for the first time in the Briand-Kellogg Pact of 1928.[4] Wars of

[4] General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy, signed at Paris, 27 August 1928 (League of Nations, Treaty Series, vol. XCIV, No. 2137).

aggression had subsequently been condemned by the Statutes of the Nürnberg and Tokyo military tribunals. The United Nations Charter had prohibited the threat or use of force by Members. In its resolution 1653 (XVI) the General Assembly had adopted a Declaration on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. The recognition of the principle that States must refrain from the threat or use of force should culminate in general and complete disarmament and the prohibition of war propaganda. That principle was very well formulated in the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Czechoslovakia at the seventeenth session.[5]

18. The principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes was the logical consequence of the principle that States should refrain from the threat or the use of force. That principle had been stated for the first time in The Hague Conventions for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, of 29 July 1899 and 18 October 1907. Under the term of those Conventions, however, States had done no more than undertake to settle their disputes by peaceful means if circumstances permitted. Nevertheless those Conventions had made it possible to institute such means of peaceful settlement as good offices, mediation and arbitration. The Briand-Kellogg Pact and the Charter of the United Nations had carried that principle to its logical conclusion by requiring States to have recourse to peaceful means in every case. However, the means of settlement provided in Article 33 of the Charter were frequently diverted from their proper aim by certain actions likely to give rise to conflicts. The principles of peaceful settlement of disputes should therefore be laid down in terms that would guarantee due respect for it; such terms were provided in the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

19. Several delegations had already given an account of the main stages in the evolution of the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of States. That principle had been embodied in a number of international instruments such as the Declarations of Bandung, Belgrade and Addis Ababa, in which it was laid down as the basis for peaceful coexistence between States with different social and political systems. It was to be regretted that certain States had acted in defiance of that principle so as to prevent the newly independent States from proclaiming their sovereignty over their natural resources. It was unthinkable that contemporary international law should contain provisions that authorized interference of that kind. It was necessary to affirm forthwith, and in a text, the principle forbidding all direct or indirect interference in the domestic affairs of States. The Czechoslovak draft declaration was an excellent model from that point of view.

20. The principle of the sovereign equality of States was laid down in Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Charter. The tenor of that principle was clearly explained in the Czechoslovak draft declaration. The State was sovereign over its own territory and each people therefore had the right to choose its social, economic and political system. Unfortunately international practice furnished many examples of negative principles, for example, the principle of capitulations. That relic of the past was sometimes replaced by more subtle forms of domination when certain States desired to secure for themselves economic or political sovereignty with respect to other States, as shown in leonine treaties. Her delegation had already declared that leonine treaties were the legal expression of unequal political and economic relations. They were opposed to the Charter and impeded the development of friendly relations among States. It was therefore essential that the principle of sovereign equality should be further developed with due regard for the changes that had taken place in the world. Efforts made to that end would serve the cause of peaceful coexistence.

21. Under resolution 1815 (XVII) the Sixth Committee had to decide what other principles were to be given further consideration at subsequent sessions. Her delegation thought that they should include the principle of economic and social co-operation. That principle was a consequence of the obligation incumbent upon States to co-operate with one another. There was a close connexion between the progressive development of international law and co-operation in economic, social and other matters. As the Brazilian Government had pointed out in its comments (see A/5470) that principle had taken form sufficiently and had advanced beyond the point of being a principle of political and economic convenience or a moral principle to become a truly general principle of international law, in the light of which both customary and conventional rules on international economic issues must be interpreted or even reviewed. Therefore it should now be given the character of a rule of law. The principles of law should correspond to the spirit of the times, which inclined towards coexistence. Law should be purged of all commercial notions and discriminatory policies which erected obstacles to the progress of the under-developed countries. Co-operation in social and cultural matters was also most important. The United Nations had already accumulated much experience in that respect. Resolution 1677 (XVI) on co-operation for the eradication of illiteracy throughout the world was an example. A study of economic, social and cultural experience was a fundamental necessity of the contemporary era. The Charter contained the essence of the principles of international law, but a declaration of the principles of peaceful coexistence was necessary for account must be taken of the march of events since the adoption of the Charter. Her delegation wholeheartedly supported the Czechoslovak draft Declaration. Contrary to what certain delegations contended, it was not merely a repetition of the principles of the Charter. The General Assembly had on previous occasions resorted to declarations when it desired to stress certain particularly important principles. At the fifteenth session, for example, it had adopted the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (resolution 1514 (XV), and there was no doubt that it would follow that example at the current session by adopting the draft declaration on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, on which the Third Committee was engaged. A declaration on the principles of peaceful coexistence would strengthen confidence among peoples. It would be most suitable for the Sixth Committee to arrange for the adoption of an instrument containing the principles of international law concerning friendly relations among States to coincide with International Co-operation Year.

22. Mr. KHELLADI (Algeria) recalled that, in resolution 1815 (XVII), the General Assembly had resolved to undertake a study of the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter, with a

[5] Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 75, document A/C.6/L.505.

view to their progressive development and codification. The object of that study was not to reformulate the basic rules stated in the Charter, nor to lead to a revision of the Charter, but to determine, creatively and alertly, the legal, political, economic and social obligations imposed by the Charter. The Committee should take care not to lose its way in purely theoretical discussions; it should isolate the practical aspects of the principles under consideration, taking due account of international conditions and of the prerequisites for the application of those principles. The Committee should base the study called for in resolution 1815 (XVII), on United Nations practice and the practice of States. That study would not give the principles in question a real and increased role and effectiveness in international relations unless it took into account the international realities of the present day, such as the problems of the coexistence of countries with different economic and social systems and the problems arising between developed and developing countries, and expressed the common will of nations. The Committee could be guided by a document which the Secretary-General was to prepare on United Nations and State practice regarding the four principles on the agenda, and by the statements made during the general debate illustrating national or regional practice in the matter. Such a study of national and international practice would enable the Committee to determine, for each principle, on what points there were still doubts, differences of opinion or difficulties of interpretation, and how far all States were already in agreement or could reach agreement. Agreement among all States was important, for no efforts at codification and improvement would serve any purpose if States were unwilling to accept their results. As the representative of Iraq had indicated (808th meeting) the principles formulated must be accompanied by legal sanctions in order to ensure that they were respected and properly applied. The Algerian delegation considered that the sanctions of nullity provided for by the International Law Commission in its draft articles on the law of treaties would be extremely useful in that connexion.

23. His delegation's aim was to evolve from the practice of the United Nations and of its Members a set of binding rules, derived from the Charter, which would govern friendly relations and co-operation among States and which would also dictate the decisions of the International Court of Justice. Such a set of rules could take the form of a declaration which, circumstances permitting, could be worked out in time for International Co-operation Year as the Czechoslovak representative had proposed (802nd meeting). The Algerian delegation, like other delegations, considered that it would be useful to set up a working group.

24. Algeria had demonstrated its wholehearted approval of the four principles under consideration by taking an active part in drafting the Bandung and Belgrade Declarations on coexistence and the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, which embodied those principles. As to the first principle—the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations—Article 2 of the Charter had taken on a new dimension in the nuclear age. The use of armed force in international relations was now prohibited more firmly than ever as a means of settling international disputes or as an instrument of national policy. His delegation considered that the term "force" covered every form of economic coercion brought to bear against a country's independence or integrity, such as economic blockade or incitement by a foreign country to civil war. In the modern world economic weapons were a frequent substitute for weapons of war. Article 2, paragraph 4, obviously did not extend to all illegal forms of political or economic pressure covered by the principle of non-intervention, and the prohibition it laid down did not apply to the specific cases provided for in Article 51 and Chapter VII of the Charter. On the other hand his delegation considered that Article 2, paragraph 4, necessarily imposed upon States the obligation not to worsen tension and not to increase the risk of war, for example, by failing to comply with United Nations resolutions or by increasing disproportionately their military power. States were under a duty to help improve international relations by decolonizing, upholding the law, dismantling bases abroad, denuclearizing particular zones and strengthening the means for the peaceful settlement of international disputes specified in Article 33.

25. With regard to the principles of peaceful settlement of disputes, his delegation considered that, except where States were already bound by special arrangements for that purpose, they should be entirely free to select one of the means specified in Article 33 of the Charter. Moreover, negotiations must always be conducted on the basis of the sovereign equality of States if lasting solutions were to be found.

26. The importance of the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of a State had been stressed by many representatives, and, in particular, by the representatives of Chile (804th meeting) and Mexico (802nd meeting). Its significance as a means of promoting coexistence, peaceful relations and co-operation among States with different social, political and economic systems and between developed and developing countries could not be over-emphasized. The Charter of the Organization of African Unity laid on States the duty not to intervene in the internal affairs of other States and to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each State and its inalienable right to independent existence; it unreservedly condemned political assassination and subversive activities on the part of neighbouring States or any other State. On the basis of the Charter of the Organization of American States, the Charter of the Organization of African Unity and other multilateral and bilateral treaties, the Committee might work out the principle of non-intervention in the light of international practice over a long period. It should also anticipate the cases in which the meaning of the principle had been distorted by States into a pretext for opposing the implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

27. Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Charter, which stated the principle of the sovereign equality of States, was undoubtedly the basis of the international order envisaged in the Charter. The principle meant that States, as subjects of international law, enjoyed equality in their relations and that they were equal before the law and equally protected by it. In virtue of that principle, States were equal in rights as in duties. No reasons of an economic or political nature should destroy that principle. It was an obvious fact, as the representative of Ceylon had recalled, that in practice States were not all equally able to enforce their rights. Furthermore, like other newly independent and small countries, Algeria had been the victim of traditional international law. It was because

of that fact that Algeria attached great importance to the progressive development and codification of international law and especially to the task of codification entrusted to the Sixth Committee. It feared that the reservations made by certain States, which considered that everything had already been said in the Charter and that the topic was impracticable because of its complexity, might jeopardize the implementation of resolution 1815 (XVII) and frustrate the hopes that resolution had stirred. The Algerian delegation considered that the question of the establishment of a centre for international fact-finding, as proposed by the Netherlands representative, might be studied in conjunction with the general problem of strengthening the means of peaceful settlement of disputes between States and might include the question of more frequent recourse to the International Court of Justice and that of conventions which had remained without effect. That general problem might be included as a separate item in the agenda of the General Assembly's nineteenth session.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

Litho in U.N. 77601—May 1964—2,075