

ference and mutual advantage. Honduras hoped that it would be possible at some future date to establish the obligation of the wealthier countries to come to the aid of the poorer. Thailand considered that mention should be made of the duty of States to refrain from hindering other States which were co-operating among themselves in accordance with the Charter. Kenya thought that the consensus text would have derived greater strength from an open acknowledgement of the fact that non-discrimination was an essential part of the duty to co-operate. The Byelorussian SSR was of the view that all discrimination between States must be prohibited. Guinea mentioned the eradication of colonialism as being among the aims listed in paragraph 1 of the consensus text. Ceylon stated that paragraph 2 (a) of the consensus text, concerning the duty to co-operate in the maintenance of international peace and security, simply reproduced what had been said in paragraph 1, adding nothing to the content of the principle. China favoured the addition of the words "and the elimination of discrimination against women" at the end of paragraph 2 (b) of the consensus text. Thailand considered that the reference in paragraph 2 (c) of the consensus text to the principles of sovereign equality of States and non-intervention was not clear. Finally, Ceylon and Cyprus regretted that paragraph 3 of the consensus text, concerning co-operation in economic, social, cultural and other fields, was only in the form of an exhortation and did not impose a legal obligation.

#### EQUAL RIGHTS AND SELF-DETERMINATION OF PEOPLES

A number of Members regretted that the points on which agreement had been reached by the working group concerned with the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples had been considered insufficient by the drafting committee to justify their reference to the 1967 Special Committee. The hope was expressed that further discussion in the Special Committee would prove more fruitful.

Several Members, including Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, Mongolia, Senegal, the Ukrainian SSR, and the United Arab Re-

public, stated that the principle could not be regarded as a mere moral or political postulate but constituted an established rule of contemporary international law.

With regard to the content of the principle, the Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba and Mongolia, among others, referred to the freedom of any State to choose, without foreign interference, the political, economic and social system which it considered desirable, to the exercise of full sovereignty, and to the right of any State to dispose freely of its wealth and natural resources. Guatemala expressed the view that any formulation of the principle must be based particularly on the letter and spirit of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.<sup>6</sup> Attention was drawn by some Members to the differences of opinion regarding the definition of "people." For some, "people" meant primarily independent States, while for others it referred essentially to peoples living under colonial domination. A number of Members, including Canada, the Central African Republic, Guatemala, Kenya and Spain, agreed that the principle should not be used in such a way as to affect the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. Ecuador considered that the principle could not be invoked by minorities living in the territory of a State to bring about the dismemberment of that State. Ecuador and Bolivia thought that self-determination could not be exercised by the populations of territories which were the subject of a legal dispute between States.

Various Members, including Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, Cuba, Kenya, Poland and the USSR, considered that people deprived of their freedom and their right to self-determination were entitled to exercise their right of self-defence by every means and to receive assistance from other States by virtue of that right.

For others, however, in particular the United Kingdom, the affirmation of the colonial peoples' so-called right of self-defence raised a serious obstacle to agreement on the formulation of the principle.

<sup>6</sup> See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, text of resolution 1514(XV).