

their own borders, they cling to the most conservative notion of modern international law, sovereignty in as absolute a form as it is possible to advocate at the present day. They proclaim this principle in the disarmament field and in connection with the procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes. Their preoccupation with sovereignty is reflected in their emphasis on negotiations as the fundamental means of solving international disputes. Other modes of settlement are regarded as encroachments upon the sovereignty of states. This conservative doctrinal trend was also seen in the Soviet Union's proposal for the establishment of a list of illegal acts of intervention of a state in the affairs of another.

I could give other examples. It will, however, be clear from this account of Soviet attitudes at the Mexico City meeting that they may have reached a point where, increasingly, they have to choose between continuing to advocate an ideology of revolutionary change and a system of international law whose underlying philosophy is the achievement of stability and peaceful change.

Discussion of the topic of friendly relations is to be continued by the Sixth Committee at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly. While the Mexico City meeting did not, in most cases, reach the stage of formulation because of basic differences in approach, it would appear that certain ground rules are evolving for the development of Charter principles. These represent a compromise between the more extreme positions of East and West and non-aligned countries which I mentioned earlier.

I shall name four of these ground rules. First, notwithstanding the fact that the International Law Commission is the arm of the General Assembly charged with codification of international law, it is a proper task for the Sixth Committee to try to spell out what is the meaning of the Charter provisions or of what is implied in them. This is a proper sphere of lex lata. Second, by way of lex ferenda, the Sixth Committee might seek to recommend to governments additional legal rules supported by state practice in the interval since the Charter was written and which are consistent with the Charter. Third, there may be desirable principles of international conduct which are not necessarily ready for inclusion in the international legal system. These principles may as yet be norms of international morality which have not yet crystallized into legal obligations. Finally, in a world of sovereign states, resolutions adopted by United Nations bodies or general conferences represent an important element in the process of evolving international law. Such resolutions may not always be a reliable guide to international custom, but they actively indicate the way in which custom is evolving.

The present attempt to codify international law in bodies other than the International Law Commission may perhaps be indicative of a certain impatience and haste on the part of the Communists and some of the new countries in approaching the problem of change. Nevertheless there are portents to be drawn from the Mexico City meeting which suggest that recent attempts to alter significantly the course of development of international law may be subsiding into a more reasonable and critical approach.