

irregular forces, volunteer or mercenary forces or armed bands and to other acts of indirect aggression. Several Members, including the Central African Republic, Chile, the Congo (Brazzaville), Kenya and Mali, favoured the inclusion in the formulation of an express provision to the effect that States had an obligation to refrain from such acts and from inciting to civil war or fomenting acts of terrorism in other States.

Many Members, including Bolivia, Chile, Hungary, Iran, Madagascar, Malaysia, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Tunisia and Uruguay, maintained that the term "force" covered not only armed force but also any form of coercion, including political, economic or any other kind of pressure directed against the territorial integrity or political independence of a State. Wars of aggression were generally condemned, and some Members, including Chile, Mali and the United Arab Republic, stressed the necessity to incorporate in the formulation of the principle the idea of the responsibility of States which unleashed wars of aggression or committed other crimes against peace. In the opinion of Mali and Poland, this gave rise to political and material responsibility of States and to penal liability of the perpetrators of those crimes.

It was thought by some Members, in particular, the Byelorussian SSR, Chile, Finland and Poland, that a formulation of the principle should prohibit propaganda designed to encourage wars of aggression. Chile and Cuba expressly condemned armed reprisals. The United States considered that a reference to international lines of demarcation should be included in the formulation of the principle. A number of Members regarded the inviolability of State territory as an essential element of the principle. Some, including Chile and the Congo (Brazzaville), maintained that the territory of a State could not be subjected to military occupation or other measures involving the use of force by another State. Honduras also condemned the peaceful occupation of foreign territories. Several Members—among them, Chile, the Congo (Brazzaville), Hungary, India, Madagascar, Senegal, Tunisia and Yugoslavia—took the view that the formulation of the prin-

ciple should exclude the possibility of recognizing territorial acquisitions resulting from the threat or use of force. The Congo (Brazzaville), the United States and Uruguay favoured the inclusion of statements concerning, respectively, the desirability of making the United Nations security system more effective, and of securing general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

With regard to exceptions to the prohibition of the threat or use of force, some Members emphasized that the right of individual or collective self-defence should be limited strictly to the circumstances specified in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.<sup>5</sup> Several Members, in particular the Congo (Brazzaville), Hungary, Kenya, Somalia, Syria, Tunisia, the Ukrainian SSR and the United Republic of Tanzania, believed that self-defence against colonial domination should also be regarded as an exception to the general rule. However, others, such as the United Kingdom, considered it unacceptable to extend the doctrine of self-defence into the colonial field.

#### DUTY OF STATES TO CO-OPERATE

The consensus text on the principle concerning the duty of States to co-operate approved by the drafting committee of the 1967 Special Committee (see above), was considered by several Sixth Committee Members to be generally satisfactory. Some Members, however, considered that its content could be expanded or improved in the future. Romania, for instance, believed that reference should be made in the definition to the principles concerning the promotion of respect for national sovereignty and independence, equal rights of States, non-inter-

<sup>5</sup> Article 51 of the United Nations Charter reads:

"Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."