

be overcome through the application of the principles of the Charter and the provisions of the Assembly's resolutions. The representative of Uruguay, in particular, stated that what was necessary was for the Security Council to put an end to violence and for disputes to be submitted to arbitration or judicial procedure.

On the other hand, a large number of representatives took the view that a definition was possible, and was necessary or highly desirable from the legal and political standpoints. These included the representatives of Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, the Byelorussian SSR, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Iran, Indonesia, Lebanon, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Syria, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and Yugoslavia. In the opinion of these representatives, a definition would be a great step forward in international law and would also provide a useful guide for the United Nations organs called upon to determine whether aggression had been committed and assist in avoiding arbitrary decisions. It was emphasized particularly that, although a definition would not do away with aggression, it would act as a deterrent to potential aggressors and would also serve to mobilize public opinion against an aggressor. It was also stated that a definition would be a useful supplement to the system of collective security established by the Charter and would be a logical completion of the Charter's provisions. Even an imperfect definition, it was argued by the representatives of Burma, Chile, Egypt and Yugoslavia, among others, was better than none, and any imperfections could be remedied as they were discovered.

Some representatives, including those of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and USSR, were of the opinion that a definition should be formulated with a view to furnishing guidance to the Security Council and the General Assembly in their task of maintaining international peace and security. It was pointed out, for example by the representative of Mexico, that the adoption of a definition would not prevent the international organ applying it from taking into account the circumstances of each particular case.

Others, in particular the representative of France and also the representatives of Iraq, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden, thought that the primary purpose to be envisaged was the inclusion of a definition in a code of offences against the peace and security of mankind, which would be applied by an international criminal tribunal if

one were created. In this connexion, the representative of France drew a distinction between the police activity of the Security Council aimed at putting an end to an act of aggression, in which case a definition would be useful but not binding, and the judicial determination of an aggressor by an international court, on which it would be binding.

Some representatives, including those of Burma, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Iran and Lebanon, thought that a definition should both serve as guidance to the United Nations organs and be included in an international code.

As to the kind of definition to be drafted, the representatives of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the USSR thought it desirable to enumerate all the objective acts which constituted aggression, to specify the circumstances which could not be used to justify attacks, and to list the measures which might be taken by a State threatened with an attack. A satisfactory definition of this kind, these representatives held, could be worked out by the combined efforts of the Sixth Committee, and would have great advantages of clarity and ease of application. Reference was made, in particular, to the definition proposed by the USSR at the London Disarmament Conference of 1933 (known as the Litvinov definition), and to the so-called Litvinov-Politis definition which had been adopted on the basis of the USSR proposal by the Committee for Security Questions of that Conference comprising representatives of seventeen States and which was incorporated in bilateral agreements between the USSR and eleven States. Certain representatives, however, including, in particular, those of Belgium, the Netherlands and the United States, stated that these agreements had not in practice prevented aggression.

The representatives of Egypt, Iran and Mexico approved especially the proposal made in the USSR draft resolution (see below) that a list of circumstances not justifying attacks should be included. The USSR representative stated that the circumstances included in this list were those which had been used by aggressors to justify their acts. The United Kingdom representative expressed the fear that such a list would constitute an invitation to States that they could commit the illegal acts mentioned without fear of armed retaliation. The representatives of Egypt, Lebanon and Mexico considered that such illegal acts should call for United Nations action.

Varying views were expressed on whether particular circumstances gave rise to a right to use