

operations as UNTSO,¹ UNEF and UNMOGIP (UNIPOM was terminated early in 1966 after its mission was completed) have been indispensable in helping to maintain peace in their respective areas and their sudden withdrawal could have disastrous consequences. Yet, at the same time, in becoming a familiar part of the local scene, their presence may have, as the Secretary-General phrased it in the introduction to his Annual Report, "tended to reduce the sense of urgency which might stimulate a search by the parties concerned for a basic and peaceful solution of their conflicts". UNFICYP, while only two years old, is perhaps another case in point in the light of the repeated extension of its original three-month mandate because of the inability of the parties concerned to solve their problems. As the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Honourable Paul Martin, said in his address to the Assembly on September 24:

The time has come to ensure that peace keeping is intimately linked with peaceful settlement. The former, essential as it is, should not be permitted to obscure or divert the purpose of the latter. . . . The parties to a dispute should not expect to enjoy the benefits of United Nations intervention without accepting responsibility to settle their differences and thus facilitate the earliest possible termination of peace-keeping measures.

It was, therefore, a disappointment when the majority of members at the twentieth session received with relatively little enthusiasm a British proposal which sought a study of the subject of the peaceful settlement of disputes,² both from the legal and the political points of view, in order to improve procedures for fact-finding, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and judicial settlement.

On a separate, though related issue, the Assembly took action which recognized that international disputes and disturbances would be much reduced if nations did not intervene, directly or indirectly, in the affairs of other states. The original proposal for a declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention³ in the domestic affairs of states was initiated by the Soviet Union, apparently as a device to direct criticism towards United States action in the Dominican Republic and in Vietnam. The conception was transformed into a document embracing almost every conceivable type of intervention, including subversive activities designed to overthrow governments. The virtually unanimous approval accorded to the declaration can be taken as an expression of the political will of the Assembly, reflecting the fear of many of the new member states that violations of the principle of non-intervention pose a serious threat to their independence and freedom.

¹The United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization, which was established in 1948 to supervise the cease-fire between Israel and the Arab states.

²See Page 19.

³See Page 19.