United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SEVENTEENTH SESSION
Official Records

SIXTH COMMITTEE, 763rd MEETING

Tuesday, 20 November 1962, at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Chairman: Mr. Constantine EUSTATHIADES (Greece).

AGENDA ITEM 75

Consideration of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (A/5192, A/C.6/L.505, A/C.6/L.507 and Add.1-3, A/C.6/L.509) (continued)

1. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) said that, as the very wording of the agenda item before the Sixth Committee indicated, the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States must be considered in the light of the United Nations Charter; and under General Assembly resolution 1686 (XVI) it was the duty of the Sixth Committee to extract those principles from the texts in which they had already been stated, to formulate them and to study them. There were other General Assembly resolutions dealing with peaceful and good-neighbourly relations among States, which stressed that the best basis for ensuring the conditions essential to allow the nations and peoples of the world to live and to assist each other in mutual tolerance and understanding for the benefit of all was the observance of the purposes and principles of the United Nations; he referred to resolutions 1236 (XII), 1301 (XIII), 1495 (XV) and 1505 (XV), which last resolution was the origin of the present discussion in the Sixth Committee. The preamble of that resolution clearly showed that the General Assembly was concerned not only with the consideration of the seven subjects now on the programme of work of the International Law Commission, but more especially with the need for promoting friendly relations and co-operation among States.

2. At the sixteenth session of the General Assembly, the question of future work on the codification and progressive development of international law, which had been placed on the agenda in pursuance of resolution 1505 (XV), had provoked a keen discussion on the question of the peaceful coexistence of States. Some considered that that was only a political slogan outside the realm of international law, that the subject concerned the totality of relations between States and not relations in any particular field, and that it therefore did not lend itself to codification. Others believed, on the contrary, that there was at present a general set of rules governing international relations, embodied in the United Nations Charter and the numerous declarations of the United Nations, which were binding on Member States, which had tacitly agreed to respect them by becoming members of the Organization, and in covenants, declarations and agreements to which nations were parties; all those documents constituted a body of material which could be reduced and codified into a system of law that would govern the conduct of nations towards one another on the basis of peaceful coexistence. At the same time, those who held that view recognized that the scope of the subject was so vast that its codification would be a formidable task. Part of the problem had been solved by the decision adopted, as a compromise solution, to undertake a codification in various spheres of international relations, which would ultimately have the cumulative effect of strengthening international co-operation, and part had been solved by resolution 1686 (XVI), by which it had been decided to place on the current agenda the question at present before the Sixth Committee, the words "peaceful coexistence" having been changed to "friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations". The problem now was to determine precisely what the Sixth Committee's task was in that connexion, and if it was considered, as was his delegation's view, that in adopting resolution 1686 (XVI) the General Assembly had implicitly recognized the desirability of having a general code of conduct designed to promote friendly relations and co-operation among States, to determine how the Sixth Committee should proceed to give effect to that objective in legal terms. As the resolution used the words "in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations" the Committee should take the Charter as its starting point.

3. In his delegation's opinion, the Charter consisted of five distinct classes of concepts: the Preamble, the purposes, the principles, the substantive rules derived from the principles and the procedural rules to give effect to the principles and the substantive rules. The Preamble had no law-making effect; it consisted of a statement of motives and laid down no rules. The purposes and the principles of the United Nations were set out in Articles 1 and 2, and his delegation drew a sharp distinction between purposes and principles on the one hand, and between principles and rules on the other. The purposes of the United Nations were the objects for which the Organization had been set up. In pursuit of those purposes, the Organization and its Members were enjoined to act in accordance with the principles laid down in Article 2. Therefore, it was through respect for the principles that the purposes were to be achieved consequently, the only positive law laid down by the

purposes was the statement of the Organization's objectives. On the other hand, the principles and rules set out norms of conduct for the Members of the United Nations. However, a distinction had to be made between principles and rules, since the principles laid down in broad terms the course of conduct to be followed, while rules of substance were derived from the principles to fit certain specific facts, and rules of procedure were laid down for the purpose of giving effect to such principles and rules.

4. To illustrate that point he read aloud Article 2 of the Charter, which laid down five principles for observance by Member States, and cited the various other Articles which, without laying down new principles, contained rules for the implementation of the principles. On careful consideration of those Articles the question arose whether the principles and rules contained in the Charter were adequate for the achievement of its purposes, whether they were adapted to the new developments which had taken place since 1946 and whether the purposes themselves met the requirements of modern conditions. Having considered all those questions, his delegation believed that the time had come to revise and supplement the Charter and to give full effect to its purposes by laying down more comprehensive principles and rules and by formulating more declarations like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In that connexion he cited the statements made by the Argentine representative at the 720th meeting of the Sixth Committee, by the Yugoslav representative at the 714th and 753rd meetings, by the USSR representative at the 717th meeting, by the Peruvian representative at the 726th meeting, and by the Ukrainian representative at the 723rd meeting; all of them had pointed to shortcomings or lacunae in the Charter which made it inadequate in the light of recent developments. The United Nations should not allow the Charter to become its master but should regard the Charter as its servant in the implementation of its purposes. As the Polish representative had aptly stated at the 656th meeting of the Committee, the Charter was a tool of international law and international law was a tool of the United Nations. In that connexion the question had arisen whether the United Nations could make new laws or merely record existing international customary law. Contrary to the view expressed in the 758th meeting by the Australian representative, he believed that it was Article 10 of the Charter rather than Article 13, paragraph 1, which defined the powers of the General Assembly in that respect, and that General Assembly resolutions of a declaratory nature, giving fresh vitality to the Charter, were a source of international law. The rules thus established were backed by the sanctions placed by the Charter at the disposal of the Security Council.

5. With regard to the question whether there should be such a declaration of principles by the General Assembly on the item now under discussion in the Sixth Committee, his delegation cited the precedent of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which had been adopted and proclaimed by the General Assembly on 10 December 1948 and which sought to establish justice in human relations. There was no reason why the General Assembly should not adopt a similar declaration applicable to relations between States. In that connexion, he also cited resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, which gave practical effect to the provisions of Chapters XI and XII of the Charter relating to Non-Self-Governing Territories and the International Trusteeship System. A declaration on the present item would fulfil the same role in relation to the Charter. It remained to be determined whether that declaration should be drafted by the Sixth Committee or by the International Law Commission. As everyone knew, the International Law Commission was already overburdened, and his delegation saw no reason why the Sixth Committee, which represented the cream of the legal talent of the world, should not undertake the task itself—a step which would also help to bring it out of the background, where it had remained for some years. That was also the view of many other delegations. With regard to the content of the declaration, it would be useful to consider some of the earlier declarations which had formulated principles of international conduct. He had in mind the Declaration contained in the final communiqué of the Bandung Conference,[1] that of the Accra Conference,[2] the resolutions of the Addis Ababa Conference[3] and the Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries made at the Belgrade Conference.[4] The principles contained in the Declaration issued by the Bandung Conference comprehensively covered all fields of international relations and represented modern thinking on the subject. If the African and Asian Powers had been able to produce such a Declaration, he did not see what made some members of the Sixth Committee so reluctant to embody at least some of those principles in a declaration. Perhaps the answer to that question had been given by the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Mrs. Bandaranaike, when she said at the tenth plenary meeting of the Belgrade Conference that peaceful coexistence was hardly possible among countries which maintained a battery of intercontinental ballistic missiles aimed prominently at one another, and that the whole basis of peaceful coexistence depended on the premise that in the modern world inconsistent ideologies did not require an armoury for their survival.

6. Some representatives had criticized draft resolution A/C.6/L.505 for not making the necessary distinction between law and politics. The Ceylonese delegation did not believe the line could be drawn easily. In many fields law and politics were inextricably mixed. One of the motives that had prompted the authors of the Charter was the wish "to live together in peace with one another as good neighbours", which could only mean peaceful coexistence. Principles that sought to give effect to that motive could not be branded as political considerations. The Sixth Committee was not concerned merely with legal problems but also with the political aspects of legal problems and with the legal aspects of political problems. The Committee must be realistic and recognize that many new trends in international relations had an impact on the development of international law. The Ceylonese delegation submitted that the principles on the subject under discussion should be so formulated as to take into account the changes and new conditions in the present-day world. Fundamental

---

[1] Conference of African and Asian States, held 18-24 April 1955.

[2] Conference of Independent African States, held 15-22 April 1958.

[3] Conference of Independent African States, held 14-26 June 1960.

[4] Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-aligned Countries, held 1-6 September 1961.

changes had taken place since the Charter had been signed sixteen years ago. As Mr. Friedmann had pointed out in his Law in a Changing Society, contemporary international law was more like a collection of scattered fragments than an integrated body of rules governing the conduct of States in their relations with one another. It was time the Sixth Committee took steps to produce such an integrated body of principles and rules.

7. Turning to the three draft resolutions before the Committee, he said that his delegation regretted that it could not support draft resolution A/C.6/L.507 and Add.1-3, because it was too narrow in scope. In the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.6/L.505), the preamble was generally acceptable, but some of the principles postulated were not legal principles. Even when they were, the formulation was not always satisfactory: paragraph 1, for example, established no precise legal obligation capable of being enforced. In paragraph 7, the words "peace is indivisible" were ambiguous. Although the great majority of the principles stated in the draft resolution reproduced the terms of certain Articles of the Charter or of General Assembly resolutions, while others repeated the gist of the final communiqué of Bandung and of the Belgrade Declaration, and the Ceylonese delegation could accordingly accept them, a careful study was necessary before all the principles could be incorporated in a declaration. He nevertheless congratulated the Czechoslovak delegation on the excellent work it had done.

8. Draft resolution A/C.6/L.509 was based on provisions of the Charter, which it sought to amplify. The Ceylonese delegation intended to become a sponsor of that draft, but wished to suggest two amendments: first, the insertion of the words "and justice" after the words "peace and security" in paragraph 2, which would accord with Article 2, paragraph 3, of the Charter; and, second, the addition of the following new paragraph at the end of the operative part: "Decides to place on the provisional agenda of its eighteenth session the question entitled 'Consideration of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations' for further consideration".

9. He might wish to speak again on draft resolution A/C.6/L.509. He concluded by appealing to all members of the Committee not to allow the debate to be haunted by the spectre of the cold war.

10. Mr. SUCHARITKUL (Thailand) recalled that the Sixth Committee's contribution to the codification and progressive development of international law had consisted mainly in considering the work of the International Law Commission. By resolution 1686 (XVI), the General Assembly had assigned to the Sixth Committee the task of considering the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, without reference to the International Law Commission. In the present climate of world public opinion the Sixth Committee had a very important part to play in the codification and progressive development of international law on that topical subject.

11. The Sixth Committee would be taking a regrettable retrograde step if, after it had decided to consider the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States, it reverted to the discussion of the question of "peaceful coexistence". That expression, even as understood at the Conferences of Bandung and Belgrade, had a political and social character which made it hardly susceptible of codification in the form of principles of international law. Although peaceful coexistence, an instrument of socialist world revolution, was admittedly better than war, its sole aim was to permit political and social systems to exist together until the final victory of one social system over the rest of the world. But, as the Brazilian representative had commented, modern societies were much more complex and required for survival something more positive and constructive than peaceful coexistence. He himself did not believe that it was enough for States to live side by side: they must maintain friendly relations and co-operate with one another whatever their social, cultural and political structures. Nor must it be forgotten that the agenda item included the phrase "in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations". The expression "peaceful coexistence" was nowhere to be found in the Charter, the Preamble of which spoke only of the determination of the peoples of the United Nations to "practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours". The phrase could thus be interpreted as meaning that the provisions of the Charter concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States must be examined with the purpose of deriving from them the principles of international law applicable to the subject. In doing so it was necessary also to appreciate the realities of international life and the current state of international law.

12. Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter provided that "friendly relations" among nations were to be "based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples". That principle, despite the efforts made by the Organization, was still a long way from having become a principle of international law. It deserved the Sixth Committee's further consideration with a view to its formulation as a principle of positive international law. Care must be exercised, of course, lest its application impair the very notion of statehood.

13. Put in positive form, the idea contained in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter could be said to impose an obligation to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of States; and the corollary of that obligation was that every State had a right to territorial integrity and political independence. He recalled the words spoken by the Thai Minister of Foreign Affairs before a plenary meeting of the General Assembly: "What is required of the nations of the world is not simply a declaration, but also the willingness to accept and uphold the four freedoms for nations—namely, freedoms from pressure, propaganda, provocation and prejudices" (1135th meeting, para. 147). Those four freedoms were implied in the Charter: the first in Article 1, paragraph 2, and the other three in Article 2, paragraph 4. They were clearly a sine qua non for the establishment of friendly relations and co-operation among nations, great and small.

14. The existing international law on the subject would unfortunately be found to consist of a body of principles adopted in the past by European nations to regulate their mutual relations and to settle their

differences, notably with regard to their overseas possessions. For instance, the principle of non-intervention—which was actually more of a doctrine than an established principle of international law—suffered from many exceptions. International law had recognized and still recognized many forms of lawful intervention, such as diplomatic intervention, and even in some cases armed intervention to protect the lives and property of nationals living in a foreign country. The absence of a central higher authority to lay down the rules governing relations among States had given rise to a form of "lawful" intervention which had enabled the stronger nations to impose their will on the weaker nations. Thanks to the Charter, and particularly to Article 2, paragraph 5, the situation had been somewhat modified: the distinction between lawful and unlawful intervention had been reaffirmed and the opportunities for unlawful intervention restricted. In the past the right of a nation to protect the lives and property of its nationals abroad had been exercised principally by European Powers on Asian, African and Latin American soil. The Latin American continent had now evolved a system of regional customary law of its own to remedy that state of affairs. The African and Asian countries could no longer tolerate application of the rules of traditional international law regarding State responsibility and the treatment of aliens. In the present age of decolonization there could no longer be any question of according preferential treatment to aliens or quasi-aliens on the pretext that they were nationals of a European Power. The notion of subjection and domination of Asian and African peoples by superior races must once and for all be eliminated from its place in international law.

15. The rules of international law on interference in the internal affairs of another State were not entirely clear. In practice States had often intervened in affairs exclusively within the jurisdiction of a sovereign State by such means as pressure, propaganda and infiltration. Intervention of that type was clearly ruled out by the Charter. The resolve expressed by the various nations in the Preamble to the Charter showed their desire to establish the rule of law in human society and consequently to ensure the primacy of international law in inter-State relations. That was why it was essential to adopt a single set of rules of international law governing relations between States; and those rules must necessarily be independent of any domestic law theories concerning the nature and application of international law—in other words, must be of universal application. The existence of such a body of principles would imply that all States were bound to respect and fulfil their obligations arising out of treaties and other sources of international law. It should not be forgotten that in Article 2, paragraph 2, the Charter provided that "all Members ... shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter". "Good faith" therefore seemed to be one of the general principles of law universally recognized, and as such constituted a prerequisite for the promotion of friendly relations among nations.

16. Referring to the problem of relaxing international tensions, he pointed out that Article 33 of the Charter laid down the obligation to settle disputes by peaceful means. The need was now to improve existing machinery for that purpose, both the principles of international law and the procedural and administrative mechanisms for implementing them. In his delegation's view, the solution lay in strict equality between States, and in the consequent absence of any form of discrimination. It was true that the Charter specified that the United Nations was based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members; but it must be admitted that in practice that equality was not always observed. The judicial organ of the United Nations was only competent to the extent that its jurisdiction was accepted by States; and admittedly the optional clause of the Statute of the International Court of Justice was a very poor substitute for compulsory jurisdiction. Furthermore, the execution of the Court's decisions and the implementation of its opinions were far from satisfactory.

17. Article 2, paragraph 3, emphasized that in the settlement of disputes, justice should not be endangered. The fact remained, however, that in practice the means provided in Article 33 of the Charter were not always used in that spirit, particularly when the dispute was between a great Power or a colonial Power and a small African or Asian State. The settlement usually favoured the great Power while the small State was subjected to pressure of all kinds, including the threat or use of force and economic reprisals. That was why a peaceful settlement could only be said to have achieved its purpose if it was guided by justice, harmony and respect for the sovereign equality of States.

18. Co-operation among States had certainly not been overlooked in the Charter, and was in fact mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 3. The kinds of co-operation referred to in that Article were not, strictly speaking, legal. Nevertheless, even when international problems fell rather within the competence of the Second or Third Committee or the Commission on Human Rights, their solution did not on that account lack legal interest. Indeed, the means that might be used to settle them were based on procedures which had to conform to certain principles of international law. For example, the solution of social and cultural problems in order to achieve international co-operation had to take account of such principles as equality of rights, self-determination and good faith.

19. Similarly, the right of asylum had, apart from its political and social aspects, also a legal aspect when viewed as the right of a State to grant asylum or to refuse extradition in particular circumstances. That was one of the reasons why it appeared on the programme of future work of the International Law Commission.

20. Of all relations among States governed by international law, economic and commercial relations were perhaps the most important. Co-operation between the industrialized and the developing countries was a matter not simply of mutual assistance but of the very survival of mankind. Recent surveys and statistics showed that the population of the "have-nots" was steadily increasing while the "have" minority was diminishing daily. The same phenomenon was to be observed among States. That raised innumerable and complex problems, which sometimes transcended the boundaries of traditional disciplines. The principles of international law applicable to such problems were still in their initial stage of development. At the 760th meeting, the representative of

Panama had pointed out that the economic prosperity of the world was indivisible. Hitherto international law had been concerned primarily with protecting foreign interests—property and investments—in certain countries. With the emergence of new States, the trend was now towards economic assistance to the developing countries and concern for their interests. The progressive development of international law should make it possible to reconcile the divergent but not necessarily conflicting interests of the rich and poor nations. All countries stood to gain by the free flow of development capital. Profits should be shared equitably without undue protection for the interests of private investors. Nor did arrangements between two or more industrialized countries seem relevant to international economic co-operation, which raised a serious problem, in view of the present economic situation and the need to restore confidence in international relations.

21. The same considerations applied to international trade, which also should be governed by international law. The general rule should be non-discrimination in trade. Subject to a number of exceptions, such as customs unions, associations of States and common markets, that principle seemed to have gained acceptance and was expressed in such international instruments as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. In the past, various practices had countenanced inequalities among international traders. Private foreign companies doing business in underdeveloped countries had been invested with certain attributes of sovereignty. They had been able, for instance, to declare war on local potentates, to conclude treaties with them and even to perform administrative functions on behalf of the metropolitan State. Those instances fortunately belonged to bygone days when trade was a pretext for colonial expansion. At present it was tending to assume its proper role. Nevertheless, private overseas corporations not infrequently exercised a large measure of control over the economy of less developed countries and could thus interfere in their internal affairs. That element of distrust could be removed if the industrialized countries and the corporations displayed good faith. Another source of distrust in international trade relations was the rudimentary character of the rules of international law which governed them. Thus in the previous century the doctrine of State immunity from jurisdiction had been generally accepted. At present the existence of a number of socialist States which had nationalized their foreign trade made it dangerous to apply that doctrine, for private traders were afraid of being remediless against the foreign State trading organs. The risk was further intensified by the practice in United Kingdom and United States courts, which declined jurisdiction against foreign public corporations. European and Asian courts were more predisposed to exercise jurisdiction over foreign State trading agencies, because they held that in trade there should be no favour. Certain States engaging in international trade had rightly disclaimed any attribute of sovereignty which might hinder the development of trade. That was another field in which progressive development of international law was much needed.

22. The Sixth Committee, in considering the present agenda item, should study only principles of international law. Draft resolutions A/C.6/L.505 and A/C.6/L.509, however, contained other principles. The Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.6/L.505) apparently failed to distinguish law from morality, politics, economics or the social and humanitarian sciences. Most of the principles it enumerated were not yet ready to be formulated into principles of international law. Many of them, furthermore, were being studied by other organs of the United Nations: that was true, for instance, of disarmament, the elimination of colonialism, State responsibility and respect of human rights. When the Sixth Committee had adopted the resolution which subsequently became resolution 1686 (XVI), it had not intended to consider questions already being examined elsewhere.

23. Draft resolution A/C.6/L.509 was open to similar criticism, although the principles enunciated in it were not presented as recognized principles of international law. It was not for the Committee to produce a declaration of principles containing principles alien to international law. The reproduction, however emphatic, of the provisions of the Charter could not in itself be regarded as progress. The Committee's duty was to study principles of international law thoroughly. As the representative of Poland had pointed out at the 760th meeting, the progressive development of international law should make the provisions of the law correspond more closely to the realities and complexities of international life. Before representatives committed themselves to any proposed principle of international law, they should explore the sources of the law. Once the principle was established, they could then consider whether it should be reaffirmed or not. They could even decide to modify certain principles in a manner more compatible with the demands of current international life. None of those things had, however, been done. The Committee was not, of course, bound to make a declaration of principles of international law at the present session. For over ten years it had been considering the publication of a juridical yearbook, and the question of extended participation in general multilateral conventions had not yet been settled. If it had exercised care in dealing with those less significant matters, it should be still more careful not to deal superficially with the vital matter of the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States. That matter must be approached systematically, with due regard both to the provisions of the Charter and to State practice, on which point Governments should be consulted.

24. His delegation was prepared to support draft resolution A/C.6/L.507 and Add.1-3. The examination of the two questions proposed in paragraph 4 would enable the Committee to examine a number of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States, such as the distinction between lawful and unlawful intervention, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, the unlawfulness of subversion, equal rights, self-determination and good faith, and the improvement of the machinery, methods and enforcement measures for the pacific settlement of disputes. Further questions, such as international economic co-operation, might be studied later. Meanwhile the two areas selected by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.507 and Add.1-3 were ripe and calling urgently for codification. His delegation concurred with the representative of Burma that that draft would serve as a satisfactory starting point.

25. Mr. HSU (China) recalled that it was largely due to his delegation that the provision relating to the progressive development of international law and its codification had been introduced into Article 13 of the Charter. International law had in fact been making rapid strides since the end of the nineteenth century, and ought to be clarified. Moreover, since it now concerned a great number of new States, it needed progressive development. Those reasons were much more compelling now than they had been in 1945.

26. He was glad to see that the progressive development of international law and its codification were being studied in connexion with friendly relations and co-operation among States. He wondered why certain representatives had spoken of "peaceful coexistence" as if the term was synonymous with "friendly relations and co-operation". That could, of course, be true; but unfortunately the way in which the term "coexistence" was applied excluded that possibility, as China had found out.

27. Draft resolution A/C.6/L.507 and Add.1-3 contained some valuable proposals. It provided that the work of the Sixth Committee should be based on the United Nations Charter and on customary international law. It stressed the need not only for formulating certain principles, but also for devising procedures to put them into effect. Two principles were proposed for inclusion in the agenda of the eighteenth session of the General Assembly, but other subjects meriting examination were not thereby excluded. His delegation hoped that other principles equally important for the establishment of friendly relations and co-operation among States might be studied later. International law had in fact evolved. It now concerned the individual and not only the State. It no longer outlawed only inhumanity, but also aggression and subversion. Formerly it had been mainly confined to the principle of the sovereign equality of States and the execution in good faith of obligations incurred under treaties. It now also covered self-determination, human rights and international economic, social and cultural co-operation. The international community wished to know the scope of the accepted principles and what limitations should be applied to the principles now in process of recognition in order to ensure their full acceptance. If friendly relations and co-operation among States were to be established, all the relevant principles and the procedures for applying them must be considered. Draft resolutions A/C.6/L.505 and A/C.6/L.509 would make the Sixth Committee adopt, in the form of a declaration, principles that it had not been able to consider. One of those two draft resolutions failed to mention subversion, and the other mentioned neither subversion, nor inhumanity, nor the suppression of human rights, although those three factors were among the most serious of hindrances to the establishment of friendly relations and co-operation among States at the present time. His delegation would therefore support draft resolution A/C.6/L.507 and Add.1-3.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

Litho in U.N. 77601—May 1963—2,075