

to the Commission. In fact, as I have already said, we can see no useful purpose to be served by pursuing this question further, at least for the time being. It has been suggested that the question of defining aggression might be referred to a Charter Review Conference. Since the term sought to be defined is a term used in the Charter, it would not seem inappropriate to consider the question of defining aggression in the context of the Charter, at such a Conference.

While my delegation can see no present prospect of reaching a general agreement on one definition, and while, as I have said, we have reservations concerning the effect of the definition on the functions of the competent organs of the United Nations, we should, out of consideration for those members who consider that a definition is desirable, be prepared to consider a suitable recommendation which would bring this matter forward for reconsideration at a Charter Review Conference.

LIBRARY E A / BIBLIOTHÈQUE A E



proposed. to the various definitions. aggression might be the most important. I think for the reasons mentioned that a definition of take quickly effective action aimed at restoring the peace. important first step is that the United Nations be able to would threaten the whole world with catastrophe, the all- peace and security. In this case, when a spread of hostilities not to impede the United Nations in maintaining international not to go unchastised, determining who is the aggressor ought tempers are still hot. While, of course, of course, of course.

of the Charter. be likely to do no more than duplicate existing provisions aggression. A general definition, on the other hand, would certainly encourage rather than discourage a state bent on within the four corners of the definition, and so could constitute justification where a particular act might not be comprehended capable, in some instances, of being used to support a plea of enumerated. In similar vein, such a definition would be the United Nations to place less significance on acts not there would always be a tendency for the competent organs of all cases in an enumerative or mixed type of definition. to be defined themselves. Since it is impossible to cover tions seem in their turn to use terms which would be required in varying degrees to the various definitions. Most defini-

My delegation can see no utility in referring the question back to yet another special committee. We also consider that we should not complicate the good work of the International Law Commission by again referring the question and money on a project which, given present circumstances, on the Organization by continuously spending effort, time years. I wonder if we are not more likely to bring discredit than postpone the consideration of the question for several delegations do consider that it would adversely affect the prestige of the Committee and the General Assembly to do no more at any rate -- should be set aside. I am mindful that some further discussion of this question -- for the time being. In the circumstances it seems to my delegation that organs of the United Nations in preserving or restoring the We submit also, for reasons already suggested, that a definition might well hamper rather than assist the competent aggression testifies to wide and seemingly irreconcilable of aggression testifies to wide and seemingly irreconcilable the record of the discussion of the question of the definition To sum up, Mr. Chairman, my delegation submits that