with a view to providing guidelines for the work of the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly. At this meeting, 27 representatives of the Western, Communist and non-aligned countries endeavoured to achieve a common outlook and a common understanding on such topics as the threat or use of force, the peaceful settlement of disputes, the principle of non-intervention, and the sovereign equality of states. Although, not unexpectedly, a consensus could not be reached on most subjects, it is clear that the Mexico City conference showed signs of change or a moving away from three extreme conceptions of international law: that of some of the newer countries, demanding a change in the existing Charter provisions through the adopting of broad and generally political rather than strictly legal interpretations; that of the Soviet Union, pursuing an approach to international law more in keeping with the third rather than the first two roles I mentioned earlier, that is, using international law as an instrument of Soviet international revolutionary objectives; and, finally, that of some Western powers, advocating the development of Charter machinery but on the whole resisting the development of Charter principles.

Typical of the first approach was the view expressed by some developing countries that provisions of international law or treaties considered no longer to correspond to current requirements could not be invoked to restrict a nation's right to dispose of its natural wealth. Another example was the view that the concept of sovereign equality had come to encompass the concept of economic equality.

Such positions were, however, the exception. Even when put forward, they were usually complemented and tempered by a trust in the political and other organs of the United Nations and in the Specialized Agencies as the source of orderly change through international co-operation. In seeking change in the Charter system, these countries are equally anxious that they should not weaken the external structure, the United Nations system itself. They are showing an increased realization that institutions draw their strength from the principles under which they operate and that wholesale and arbitrary calling into question of the validity of these principles can only weaken the structure for maintaining the peace.

The Mexico City meeting also provided evidence that the Soviet Union may be moving toward acceptance, in some respects at least, of a unitary system of international law. For the Soviet Union, the meeting was, in part, a testing ground for the proposal, broached by Chairman Khrushchov in a letter of December 31, 1963, to heads of state and government, concerning border disputes and the means of settling them. This item, as you may know, is now on the provisional agenda for the forthcoming session of the General Assembly. Need I stress the "conservative" aspects of a proposal which aims at freezing existing borders? Is the Soviet Union at the point of groping toward a system of international law which may tend towards stability and not exclusively towards revolutionary change? To what extent will the former inhibit the latter?

In presenting the proposal on border disputes as a practical step towards disarmament, Soviet legal writers sharply reject any implication of supranational authority. Theirs is an inconsistent position because, while constantly advocating the need for change, especially radical change outside