

# THE LAW OF PEACE – MAIN COORDINATES

Professor **Dumitru MAZILU**, Phd

Member of the Central European Academy of Science, Letters and Art

The organization of peace, its preservation and consolidation requires a system of principles and norms that constitute - obligatorily - the *spinal column* of peace structure. Being the outcome of millennial experience, these norms and principles have become precise, enriched and developed especially in our contemporary age, enjoying a permanently wider recognition. The necessity of their observance has been often emphasized in earlier times, as well. Nowadays, mainly after World War II, the enactment of a system consisting in norms and principles to assure the enhancement of peaceful interstate relations has represented a priority concern of greatest importance in peace assurance.

**§ 1. The contents of the Law of Peace.** An efficient edifice of peace presupposes *durable* structures in order to be able to organize and orientate international relations on the path of peaceful co-operation. Such structures find their expression in the contents, the very substance of the Law of Peace, namely in the norms and principles it relies on. It is justified by the fact that their absence would make impossible the edification of peace and their violation would obstruct the achievement of the world forum's principal attributions and functions: the maintenance of peace and international security. The norms and principles of Law of Peace constitute a *spinal system*, they complete each other, contributing, in their totality, to the organization of a relational system within which peace and co-operation can be assured.

## **A. The importance of the norms and principles of the Law of Peace**

There is no doubt that the positive development of international relations in our contemporary age can be achieved only by observing the legitimate will and interests of peoples. The solid foundation on which there could be built new co-operation relations between States, the *principal factor* able to guarantee the recovery of international atmosphere, the liquidation of insecurity and tension existent between States, consists in the strict observance of each people's inalienable right to solve its own problems, to find its own way to development and the form of social organization with no interference from the outside.

The multilateral development of international co-operation, the assurance of peace and security in the world have as premise the possibility that each people assert freely its national being and personality, enjoy without any constraint all conditions necessary to its economic and social progress, on the grounds of generally acknowledged norms and principles of international law [1]. The statuting of normal interstate relations, the promotion of each nation's legitimate interests, the consolidation of progressive forces all over the world and the diversification of exchanges of material and spiritual values as a means of rising the

prosperity of each people are directly conditioned by setting international relations on the grounds of law principles. They are to do away with force and constraint methods, leading to the instauration of the reign of reason, spirit of justice and equity within international life - the only elements meant to govern relations between States. The peoples of the world assert, in a constant and firm manner, their sincere adhesion to the cause of understanding and co-operation between States, based on the principles of law and pacific coexistence. It has been seen in the observation and application of these principles a *sine qua non* condition for the enhancement of normal relations between countries, the avoidance of interstate conflicts and ridding the peril of a world war. Undoubtedly, international events prove the justice of the policy based on these principles which acquire a permanently larger recognition of States and peoples all over the world.

## **B. A complex and sustained codification process**

Due to their outstanding importance in the maintenance of peace and international security, the fundamental principles of international law have undergone a complex and sustained *codification* process [2]. It is known that ever since World War II, within conferences dedicated to the edification of an international organization efficient in the maintenance of world peace and security, it has been organized the most remarkable principles of law and justice in the life of the Planet. Over the years, these principles have seen a continuous enrichment and development. The most significant moments of this process are: the 1955 Conference of Bandung, dedicated to the support of general peace and co-operation; the 1957 Cairo Conference of solidarity between African and Asian countries; the 1958 Accra Conference of African countries; the 1961 Belgrade Conference and the 1964 Cairo Conference of non-aligned countries; the 1963 Addis-Abeba Conference of African countries, which adopted the Charter of the African Unity Organization; the Conference on security and co-operation in Europe which adopted in 1975 the Final Act, a document of greatest importance for the settlement of relations based on mutual respect between the countries on our continent; the negotiation and adoption of important documents by the UN General Assembly. We mention, for instance, Resolution no. 1236 (XII) regarding good neighbourly relations between European States belonging to different socio-political systems; Resolution no. 1495 (XV) concerning co-operation between UN member States; Resolution no. 1815 (XVII) on the examination of international law principles regarding friendly relations and co-operation among States, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

Obviously, an extremely significant moment in this codification process has constituted negotiation for a longer

period of time as well as the adoption, made in 1970 by the UN General Assembly, of the Declaration on international law principles regarding friendly relations and co-operation between States, according to the Charter of the United Nations. The text of the declaration said, has been elaborated during several years, starting in 1964, within the works of a special committee, made up of 31 States, among which Romania as well.

Lately, within the world organization, it is examined the enhancement and the codification of certain important principles of international law. Therefore, in a special UN Committee it has been approached the issue of increasing the *efficiency* of the principle of renouncing to force and threat by force within international relations. Moreover, the Special Committee for the UN Charter and the increasing role of the organization said, has elaborated the Declaration on regarding the pacific settlement of conflicts between States, as a result to the initiative made in 1979 by Romania. The Declaration has been finalized and adopted by the UN General Assembly within its XXXVII<sup>th</sup> session.

### **C. Analysis on the contents of fundamental principles and norms of the Law of Peace**

The analysis made on the contents of fundamental norms and principles and norms constituting the Law of Peace helps us understand their particular significance in organizing and developing peaceful relations. Such an analysis, furthermore, places emphasis on the role that each and every principle generally plays in the edification of peace, in the systematic and vertebrate structuring process as well as in the global vision of guaranteeing world peace.

#### **a. Renouncing to force and to threat by force within international relations**

Historical experience, millenniums of strain and armed confrontations, endless wars endured by mankind prove convincingly that renunciation to force and to threat by force, the obligation of States to refrain, within their international relations, from resort to threat by force or to use force either against territorial integrity and the political independence of any State or in any other way not in being in accordance with the aims of the United Nations [3] represent **1. the fundamental link** for building peace in the world; **2. the essential norm of the Law of Peace**; **3. the indispensable norm for guaranteeing the development of pacific relations between peoples.** Undoubtedly, world peace can be built only on the solid foundation of justice and truth and not on doubt, strain and insecurity. Renunciation to force and to threat by force, the sanctioning, application and generalization of international law principles within all States, constitute the durable indispensable foundation of new order. Nowadays [4], it is more and more insistently claimed the elementary need that within the relations between States, nations and peoples, the force of law should triumph and old practices based on the "right" of force should be abolished for good.

Renouncing to force and to threat by force represent the fundamental link for building peace in the world, as it is only this way that relations of *trust* can be built between nations. Thus, it can be achieved one of brightest aspirations of peoples: good understanding,

pacific development, safe from other peoples interference in one's domestic and foreign affairs. Assuring peace implies: the definitive abandonment of the concept of *theright of the strongest*; the recognition of the equal rights of all – regardless their size, economic or military power - to peace and security. Not resorting to force and threat by force - here including the prohibition to make recourse to armed forces, political, economic or other type of pressure, that is any act implying force - represents a condition for guaranteeing peace and international security, the development and progress of all nations.

The edification of a system of peaceful relations all around the world reflects the hope of peoples to do away with practices and methods based on force, the requirement to exclude the state of doubt and insecurity [5]. The use of force and threat by force within international relations represents the outcome of societies based on social exploitation and national oppression.

The development of humanity, steps taken forward for civilization, during the last decades, outlined more clearly, even in international documents, the imperative need to relinquish force [6] in interstate relations.

Following the tragic experience of World War II, the actions of States with regard to rid any manifestation of force policy and that of threat by force, acquired new valences; it became a constant concern. From the very constitution of the United Nations Organization it has been pointed out the need to abolish force in international relations [7] and settle a peaceful, trustful and secure climate for all nations. Even in the preamble of the *Charter* it is proclaimed the decision of peoples belonging to the United Nations of not to make recourse to force in interstate relations, by being consigned their will to act with regard to the achievement of this major desideratum. "Let us develop friendly relations among nations based on tolerance - is sanctioned in this fundamental document -, let us take effective collective measures to maintain international peace and security", statuting the obligation of all members of the Organization to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force (art. 2). Thus, from the very adoption of The Charter and the creation of the world organization said, it has been solemnly stipulated *the passage to a law of peace*, of good neighbourly relations, of understanding and coexistence of all nations. In last years' international debates, particularly in those made in the plenum of the UN General Assembly, it has been emphasized that interstate relations had to be based on new principles, by totally giving up the system grounded on *imposing the right of the strongest*. Moreover, it has been underlined that "increasing rivalry constitutes one of the major causes of the deterioration of interstate relations, *on force positions*, aiming at the extension of interest and influence areas" [8]. The assurance of worldwide peaceful relations is unconceivable provided an effective recognition of States' equal rights - regardless their size, economic or military power - to *peace and security*, as it is only this way that there are created conditions for the promotion of co-operation and common effort of States, nations and peoples in a climate of trust and mutual

esteem. Under a consistent scientific vision, there are also important the regulations of juridical nature; however, it is unchallengeable that only by means of changing the political contents of international relations it becomes efficient renunciation to force and threat by force. Nowadays, it becomes more and more frequent taking position as well as convictions declared within the world forum and other international organizations, according to which peace implies the participation of States with equal rights in the attainment of the great objectives to surpass underdevelopment and to achieve economic and social progress [9].

Within an international system founded on equity and justice, possible disputes and litigations cannot be solved by using force - it is only by pacific means that they are found solutions. "Supposing that there are two kind of fights - underlined Cicero -, one using words and the other force, and considering that one is proper to man while the other is proper to beasts, we are to resort to the latter one, provided that recourse to the first one is simply impossible [10]. This wise saw, that might have reflected a reality of ancient times, has been added correctives over the years, which brought as an imperative must, the requirement to avoid, regardless all given circumstances, resort to force within interstate relations and make recourse to negotiations, by using pacific political means. Making reference to such a new approach of international life issues, the former secretary-general of the United Nations, U. Thant showed that "no matter the great dangers threatening humankind, they will never be greater than the possibilities we are given in order to hinder them" [11].

In the new terms of the progress seen by human society, as tendencies to the democratisation of international relations appear more and more pregnan9tly in the innovation processes occurring on a world scale, the elimination of force and threat by force becomes the target of fight assumed by peoples with possibilities of effective completion.

In spite of the fact that the sources of strain are maintained, that mainly during the last years new tensional states and moments as well as serious cases of use of force have appeared as a consequence to changes occurred tomodifications concerning force balance on a world scale, there have been and there are still being improved the forms, procedures and means of their prevention and solution under the aegis of the United Nations Organization.

Renouncing to the threat and use of force as well as to all acts constituting factors of insecurity and permanent source of strain, represents a pressing need for the normal development of relations between States. It is a principle and, at the very same time, a fundamental norm [12] of the Law of Peace. Moreover, the *Charter of the United Nations* mentions this principle among its cardinal provisions: "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations" (art 2 p.4). This principle has been developed and materialized in a series of resolutions and declarations issued by the UN and

also other important international documents [13]. The peoples firmly sustain the principle of abolishing force within international relations, they actively militate for the translation of the norms compatible with international legality into the practical terms of interstate relations, as well as for the application of these norms by measures meant to promote a climate of peace and good understanding [14]. The principle of renunciation to threat or use of force - being in an indissoluble connection with the other principles of international law - represents a major premise for international good understanding.

In the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe - giving voice to these important desiderata - is adopted the obligation of all participating States to "refrain from the threat or use of force or any direct or indirect use of force against any other participating State. Moreover, they will refrain from any manifestation of force aiming to make another participating State to renounce to the unlimited exercitation of its sovereign rights [15].

The settlement and the enhancement of a climate of good understanding and worldwide co-operation presupposes recognition and respect for each people's right to freely choose the way of its independent and sovereign development; good international understanding imposes the pressing need to sanction and to translate into practical terms, within the current policy of all States, the imperatives generated by the application of the principle stipulating the abolishment of threat and use of force. The effective adoption of this Law of Peace principle meets the wide consensus in favour of abolishing the acts hostile to detente, generated by the intimidation policy and by all the attempts of deteriorating political atmosphere.

The time passed by since World War II also led to solutions given to further important litigious problems, repeatedly appearing on the international agenda. It is worldwide known that, in that period, significant armed forces and huge amounts of weapons have been concentrated, stirring the legitimate worry of peoples. That is the reason why, an important step towards the creation of a climate assuring to each State the possibility to sanction the energies of peaceful work, safe from the threat of aggression, of menaces and political, economic, military or other sort of pressure, should be taken by means of settling a system of guarantees, implying *solemn politico-juridical pledges*, and by undertaking concrete measures specifically designed to make effective non-resort to threat and use of force in turning this fundamental principle of law into an effective reality of international life. Renunciation to the threat and use of force constitutes not only a principle, along with the other relations existing among all the nations of the world, but also an *important political objective*.

This system of guarantees requires the adoption of concrete measures - accepted by the signatory States of the Final Act of the Conference on security and co-operation in Europe - to the end of applying the principle of non-resort to threat and use of force, by all States' firm commitment to render effective - by all ways and methods found appropriate - the obligation to refrain from recourse to threat or use of force within their reciprocal relations; to refrain from

using arms race, incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. They also engage themselves to abstain from any act of economic restraint meant to subordinate to its own interests another State's exercise of rights inherent to its sovereignty and, thus, assure for itself advantages of all kind; to undertake effective measures which, by their dissemination and by their own nature, constitute phases towards the ultimate objective of general disappointment under a strict and efficient international control; to promote, by ways and means found appropriate by each and every nation, a climate of confidence and mutual respect among peoples, in accordance with their obligation to refrain from any propaganda in favour of wars of aggression or any other threat or use of force against other States, incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations; to concert every effort to settle, exclusively by pacific means, all dispute existing between them, to refrain from actions which might adversely affect efforts in the peaceful settlement of interstate conflicts [16]. Including within the Final Act of the European Conference said, a distinct chapter foreseeing stated measures, confers, undoubtedly, a new dimension to every concern for the definitive removal of force policy from the life of Europe and of the entire world.

The radical way to the integral application, with all the consequences it implies, of the principle of non-resort to threat and use of force consists, without any doubt, in the adoption of effective measures, within a broad programme bringing the world closer to the goal of general and especially nuclear disarmament.

Within the system designed to make non-resort to force effective, the means of informing and influencing public opinion occupy a central role. In this respect, it is necessary that States as well - in assuming their responsibility to forbid any form of war propaganda - make use of the means of informing and influencing public opinion to *combat force policy*, acts of aggression and interference in other States' domestic affairs, to display and cherish the ideal of peace and brotherhood among peoples. It becomes obvious that for assuming such commitments and for undertaking such measures it is required the participation of each and every State, their concerted and determined action in promoting the system of concrete engagements and measures meant to ensure a peaceful future to the entire humankind.

Last years' debates on aggression - *the most brutal form of international violence* - have proved the real significance of specifying the meaning of this notion in order to make the effort to abolish threat and use of force. As well known, in 1974, the General Assembly fulfilled a difficult task, started in 1950 by adopting the definition of aggression and by recommending that this definition constitute the orientative criteria of the establishment of an act of aggression, namely making use of armed force by a State against the sovereignty, the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. It is also stated that all reason, should it be of

political, economic, military or of any other nature, could not justify an act of aggression.

Although the sense given by the world forum to this form of using force acquires new, significant elements, it does not contain an essential component with serious implications in the practice of international relations, namely, *economic aggression*. However, according to former experience, it could bring about serious consequences in the system of international life. Therefore, resuming discussions and completing the given definition in specifying the complex meaning of aggression, might contribute to the organization of the preventive activities of peoples and nations against all acts running counter to the principles of law and equity, actions based on threat and use of force.

The removal of aggression and all aggressive acts, renunciation to threat and use of force represent fundamental desiderata concerning worldwide peaceful relations, conferring it contents and substance by ensuring it guarantees of achievement. The very act of seizing correlations between the renunciation to aggression and the removal of force as well as their recognition as fundamental coordinates of a new system of international relations, outline the profound meanings of a peace edifice, based on democratic exigencies, on justice and equity.

Meeting the need to refrain from the threat or use of force and the abolishment of aggression from international life would mean a most significant pledge of States, which would act as an efficient political, legal and moral bridle on aggressive plans or intentions. It is unchallengeable that such engagement would contribute considerably to remove doubt, to limit the sphere of action of reactionary circles which are still counting on the threat and use of force within international relations. In this context, it clearly appears the incompatible character not only with operative international norms, but concerning the whole evolution of international political life, here including the options of the broadest social layers or political groups, of the acts running counter to real tendencies and chances that humanity could benefit of, with regard to the instauration of a genuine pacific order or a security system. Or, in this respect, the promotion of a *manu militari* - type policy, a policy using threat by force and all its derivatives, as proofs of force cannot but seriously harm recourse to force in interstate relations.

It has been believed for quite a long time that the notion of force implied only military actions, here including the acts of open aggression of a State towards another. However, history evinces a more complex nature of this concept, by mentioning economic, political, military and other sort of constraints and pressures. Under this aspect, there are of particular importance the norms set forth by the *Declaration on prohibiting military, political or economic constraint at treaty conclusions*, by which it is "solemnly condemned resort to threat or use of any form of pressure, either military, political or economic, by any State, with the purpose to constrain another State to complete a certain act related to the conclusion of a given treaty, by breaching the principles of sovereign equality of States and that of the freedom of consent" [17]. Lately, these interpretations become more and more known and acknowledged.

Experience showed that leaders of State, by giving up the language of menaces, the use and proofs of force, and by manifesting *realism, wisdom and patience*, could well find, by means of negotiations, solutions reciprocally accepted for the most complex and delicate issues of international relations. The interests of detente and security require active and consistent efforts for exploring and using all possibilities - political, economic, cultural, scientific, of co-operation and multilateral contacts - to settle the peaceful interstate relations that so many nations are longing for.

That is why, only calm political actions, constructive in guaranteeing the fertile ground of comprehension and trust between States, could become compatible with some authentic and genuine conditions of peace and security.

Setting interstate relations on the unanimously accepted grounds of law and justice - and, in this respect, the translation into practical terms of the principle of renunciation to force - would contribute to the creation of new premises with regard to the subsequent, gradual, step by step solution found for further problems. This would provide, at the same time, favourable conditions for the enhancement of fruitful and equitable interstate co-operation for the benefit of each country, strongly influencing relaxation in the relations existing between all the States of the world.

It is also to be noticed that renunciation to the threat and use of force is expressly sanctioned in numerous international documents. In occupying an ample space within the documents of the Conference on security and co-operation in Europe, it represents an eloquent illustration of the concrete concern and preoccupation of States for the promotion of a new system of international relations. This constitutes, without any doubt, an important step forward towards the settlement of long lasting peace all over the world. It is also to be emphasized that the mere enunciation of these exigencies is not sufficient. It is required, as well, the adoption of certain measures meant to exclude, for good, the threat and use of force from the sphere of international relations. From such a whole perspective, it could be inferred the particular significance of renunciation to threat and use of force with view to assure peace and to configure new international relations, which should be founded not on dictate, oppression and subordination, but on the democracy, equality in rights, equity, confidence and the security of all nations and peoples.

1. See *Principles of International Public Law*, Edit. Științifică, Bucharest, 1968; Grigore Geamănu, cit. work, vol. I, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., p. 177 and next; Edwin Glaser, *The right of States to participate in international life*, Ed. Politică, Bucharest, 1982; Victor Duculescu, *Continuity and Discontinuity in International Law*, Editura Academiei, Bucharest, 1982, p. 11 and next; M. Niciu, *International Public Law*, Course notes, t. I-II, Cluj, 1956; N. Tatomir, *Course of International Public Law*, Bucharest, 1961; Alexandru C. Aureliu, *Principles of interstate relations*, Bucharest, Edit. politică, 1966; Gheorghe Moca, *State sovereignty and Contemporary International Law*, Bucharest, Edit. Științifică, 1970; M. Virally, *Droit international et décolonisation devant les Nations Unies*, in A.F.D.I. Paris, 1963, 1964; G. I. Tunkin, *Coexistence and International Law*, in R. C., vol. 95, 1958; R. L.

Bobrov, *Sovremennoe mejdunarodnoe pravo*, Leningrad, 1962; D. B. Levin, *Mejdunarodnoe pravo*, Moscow, 1964; H. Waldock, *General Course on Public International Law*, in R. C., vol. 106, 1962; P. Reuther, *Principles of International Law*, vol. 103, 1961; M. Sørensen, *General Principles of International Law*, vol. 101, 1960 etc.

2. See *Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its forty-seventh session*, 2 May - 21 July 1995, General Assembly Official Records, Fiftieth Session Supplement No. 10 (A/50/10); Also see *Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its forty-ninth session*, A/O/6/52/L 15 of November 15, 1997.

3. See *Declaration on the principles of international law regarding friendly and co-operation relations between States*, according to the Charter of the United Nations, adopted in 1970 at the XXVth jubiliary session of the UN General Assembly.

4. See *Declaration on principles governing the relations existent between participating States*, chapter 1A of the Final Act, in the volume *Conference on security and co-operation in Europe*, Edit. politică, Bucharest, 1975, pp. 281-290; *The Charter on the economic rights and duties of States*, resolution no. 3281 (XXIX) of December 12, 1974.

5. This state of things is deeply rooted in the history of international relations. Numerous thinkers underlined unfairness and injustice caused by the acts of force carried on by the strongest (see Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights*, XX, 1, 15, Bucharest, Editura Academiei, 1965, p. 495 and next.; P.F. Girard, *La loi des XII Tables*, London, 1914; U. Brassiolo, *La repressione penale in diritto romano*, Napoli, 1937).

6. From the very beginning of this century it has been experienced a certain limitation to using force (the Drago doctrine, 1902-1903); later on, it is sanctioned „the prevention, as far as possible, of recourse to force in interstate relations” as necessity for the normal development of international life (*the conventions regarding the pacific settlement of international conflicts*, signed at Hague on the 18th of October 1907, in Martens, N.R.G., vol. III, p. 377); in 1917 it is solemnly declared that war of conquest is “a most serious crime against humanity” (*Decree on peace*, in Documents of the external policy of the U.S.S.R., vol. I, 1957, p. 12); *it is condemned the aggressor (Treaty of Versailles I*, in Martens, N.R.G. 3, vol. XI, p. 479); in the *Declaration of the Assembly of the Society of Nations held on the 24th of September 1927*, it is stipulated that “any war of aggression is and shall be forbidden” (*the Society of Nations, A Monthly Digest of Works*, vol. VII, 1927, p. 285). Furthermore, one year later, it is adopted at Paris The General Treaty for renunciation to war, known as the *Briand-Kellogg Pact*; on the 10<sup>th</sup> of October 1933, it has been concluded at Rio de Janeiro the Inter-American Treaty against war, a treaty of non- aggression and conciliation, also named the *Pact of Saavedra Lamas*, in which several European States took part, among which Romania, as well (*United Nations Systematic Survey of Treaties for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes*, 1928-1948, Lake-Success, New York, October, 1948, p. 1038 and next).

7. In the Declaration of the United Nations, adopted at Washington on the 1st of January 1942 as well as in the Charter project of Dumbarton Oaks, adopted in October 1944, it is formulated the principle of prohibiting the use and threat by force, reasserted in the Convention signed at London on the 8th of August 1945 by the U.S.S.R., U.S.A., Great Britain and France, in the statutes of the International military tribunals in Nürnberg and Tokio in 1945. This principle is also stated in the Pact of Bogota on the 30th of April 1948, in the Charter of the African Unity Organization, adopted at Addis-Abeba on the 26th of May 1963, in the Declaration regarding world peace and co-operation, adopted at Bandung on the 24th of April 1955, in the declarations made by the heads of State and the governments of non-aligned countries, at Belgrade on the 6th of October 1961, at Cairo in 1964 and in Alger in 1973.

8. Lazar Moïsov, *Speech made at the XXXVII<sup>th</sup> session of the UN General Assembly*, October 2, 1982.

9. See *resolution no. 3362 (S-VII)*, September 18, 1975; see *resolution 52/194*, adopted by the UN General Assembly, by consensus, on the 18th of December 1997, A/52/628/Add.6; also see *Global financial flows and their*

*impact on the developing countries*, Resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly, by consensus, on the 18th of December 1997, A/52/626/Add.1.

10. Cicero, *On Duties*, Scientific Publishing House, Bucharest, 1957, p. 165.

11. U. Thant, *Méssage à l'occasion de la journée des Nations Unies*, 1965, *Communiqué de press*, doc SG/SM/22, p. 2.

12. See H. Wehlberg, *L'interdiction de recours à la force, le principe et les problèmes qui se posent*, in R.C., 1951, I, 78, p. 45 and next; E. Glaser, *The Contribution of Romania to the Progressive Development of Contemporary International Legality*, in R.R.D., 1969, nr. 8, p. 59 and next.

13. See resolution no. 2160 (XXI) and 2230 (XXII).

14. See L.F. Damrosch & D.J. Scheffer, eds., *Law and force in the new international order*, Rev. by J. Manas, Harvard Intl. L.J., 36, '95, p. 245 and next.

15. *Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States*, within the *Conference on security and co-operation in Europe*, p. 283.

16. Ibidem

17. *The Final Act of the Conference of Vienna on the law of treaties*, § 1, Vienna, 1969.