

The International Law Commission is primarily a group of experts and neither Article 8 nor any other article of the Statute should be interpreted in such a way as to destroy this all-important concept.

Many of my colleagues have discussed in one form or another the nature of the relationship existing between law and politics. Of course they are closely linked and yet the mistake must not be made of confusing one for the other.

Obviously the role of the International Law Commission is not to attempt to participate primarily in making political decisions or in dealing with political problems. However, bearing in mind the close relationship existing between law and politics the Commission will necessarily have to take political factors into account in its work. But the role of the Commission should be focused largely on the formulation of international rules through the use of well-developed legal techniques, having as its objective the promotion of the progressive development of international law and its codification and not directly the settlement of political issues.

I am unable to agree that the work of the International Law Commission consists of struggles involving one area against another and that the outcome is determined by the number of votes assigned to each area. Regional considerations and ideological differences must be given their proper weight, but the rule of law is, I would hope, something else and something more than the mathematical expression of a geographical allocation of votes or of political compromises.

Having regard to the essentially legal role which the International Law Commission must play, it will clearly be inappropriate and contrary to the spirit and