

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1401st
MEETING

Wednesday, 8 December 1965,
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 107:

The inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty (continued)

General debate (continued) 283

Chairman: Mr. Károly CSATORDAY (Hungary).

AGENDA ITEM 107

The inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty (continued) (A/5977, A/C.1/L.343/Rev.1, L.349/Rev.1 and Add.1, L.350 and Corr.1, L.351, L.352, L.353 and Add.1)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. SEATON (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the ideal of a universal international society based on freedom and justice and bound together by ties of co-operation and concern for the general welfare had gradually brought about the elimination from international life of such practices as piracy, slavery, capitulations, the forcible collection of debts, and colonialism. None of them had been eliminated without a struggle, and some had subsequently returned in different guises. Nevertheless, progress had been made, particularly after the emergence into international life of the Latin American nations, which had joined in the struggle with vigour and dedication.

2. The Asian-African Conference, held at Bandung in 1955, had provided an opportunity for concerted action against some of the grosser evils still persisting in international life. As a result of that conference, the world had recognized colonialism to be a cruel and selfish form of exploitation, a fact reflected in the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 1514 (XV). Intervention was a constant threat to the newly independent countries. It had been defined as "forcible action of some type taken in the interference with the affairs of a State by another State, by several States, or by a collectivity of States", and as such was a violation of international law and of the United Nations Charter. In recent years such violations had occurred with increasing frequency, and the international community was having difficulty in dealing collectively with them.

3. At the present time two areas of the world were the subject of grave concern. In Viet-Nam, the arrangements agreed on at the 1954 Geneva Con-

ference^{1/} had been ignored, and the welfare of the local population and their right to choose their own form of government were more and more being disregarded. In the Dominican Republic, armed forces had, occupied the country, and were still present, causing widespread alarm in Latin America and the rest of the world. In both those areas the international community had to face a situation in which increasing disrespect was being shown for law.

4. It was the duty of the First Committee to examine the principles of international law from the viewpoint of international morality. He therefore welcomed the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.343/Rev.1), and the additional texts and amendments which had been submitted. In view of the Security Council's inability to play its appropriate role, it was vitally important to reaffirm the rights and duties of every sovereign State. The artificial basis for membership of the Security Council had led to paralysis, with the result that important discussions and negotiations were held outside the United Nations. Although ample evidence could be found to show that there was an increased sense of international responsibility for the difficulties of other nations, vigilance was needed to ensure that the major Powers did not yield to the temptation of assuming roles that had no justification either in the Charter or in international law.

5. The Tanzanian delegation had reservations with regard to certain of the drafts before the Committee which did not conform to internationally accepted principles. In particular, it did not consider assistance offered to oppressed peoples struggling against colonialism and apartheid to be a form of intervention, either direct or indirect. That view had been upheld at the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in October 1964. A consensus of the views of the participating countries could be found in the declaration of that conference entitled "Programme for Peace and International Co-operation". The draft resolution submitted by the United Arab Republic (A/C.1/L.353) faithfully reflected those views, and the delegation of Tanzania had therefore agreed to become a sponsor (A/C.1/L.353/Add.1). He hoped that all delegations would be able to support it.

6. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that by proposing the inclusion in the agenda of the item under discussion the Soviet Union had demonstrated once again its sincere desire for peace. The Byelorussian delegation considered that a threat to the peace arose whenever one State

^{1/} Geneva Conference on the problem of restoring peace in Indo-China, held from 16 June to 21 July 1954.

interfered in the internal affairs of others, particularly when armed force was used. Military interference, however, was not the only form of imperialist intervention, which was sometimes masked as economic assistance or help in the settlement of disputes surviving as a legacy of colonialism.

7. In recent years the imperialists had carried out aggressive activities against the Congo, activities which had caused bloodshed and plunged the United Nations into serious difficulties. In addition, the United States had intervened in Cuba. Much had been said at the Assembly's current session on the subject of imperialist activities in Viet-Nam, and the United States had been criticized for assuming the role of an international gendarme. The statements on that subject made before the General Assembly amounted to a collective condemnation of the United States by the majority of mankind.

8. Nevertheless, the United States was persisting in its criminal policy in Viet-Nam, showing no willingness to negotiate on the just terms proposed by the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam and the Government of the Democratic Republic of North Viet-Nam. Representatives of the United States had tried to whitewash their activities and to shift the blame; but they would not succeed, for the facts were there for all to see. The war against the people of Viet-Nam was doomed to failure. The puppet régime of Saigon had no popular support and relied solely upon United States armed force. South Viet-Nam had been dotted with prisons, concentration camps and strategic hamlets in an effort to suppress opposition to the policies of the puppet government. Nevertheless, the struggle by the National Liberation Front went on, and already it controlled three-quarters of the territory of South Viet-Nam.

9. The war in Viet-Nam was rapidly becoming a United States war against Asians. There could be no justification for the bombing raids carried out on North Viet-Nam; the support for the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam came from the people of South Viet-Nam and not from outside. A distorted version of the causes of the war had been repeated in the Committee by the allies of the United States; in that connexion, he referred to the statement by the representative of Australia, whose Government had sent troops to Viet-Nam and was training further battalions for the same purpose.

10. The escalation of the war was a threat to the whole world. The only solution was for the United States to carry out the terms of the 1954 Geneva Agreements, to cease raids on North Viet-Nam, to withdraw all foreign troops from South Viet-Nam, to end all outside interference and to allow the people to decide their own affairs. Instead, it appeared that the war effort was to be intensified, making Viet-Nam into another Korea. The Byelorussian delegation believed that all aggressive acts should halt, not only in Viet-Nam but in other regions where interference was still taking place.

11. In April 1965 the people of the Dominican Republic had taken arms against the United States puppet régime in order to restore the 1963 Constitution. In defiance of the Charter, the United States had sent

troops to crush the uprising and to preserve the military régime which protected United States interests in the Dominican Republic. All progressive peoples were united behind the Dominican people, which must ultimately triumph. The House of Representatives had subsequently approved a resolution authorizing the United States to intervene unilaterally in any Latin American country, which had aroused a storm of protest and had been condemned both by the Mexican and the Colombian Senates. The facts showed clearly who was the guilty party in the recent increase in tension.

12. The policy of interference was particularly dangerous to the newly independent countries which were attempting to develop their economies and to liquidate the vestiges of colonialism. But for interference by certain Western Powers, Angola, Mozambique and other colonized territories would not still be enslaved. Without outside support, apartheid and the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia could not survive. For that reason the Byelorussian delegation supported the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.343/Rev.1); the draft declaration embodies the principles contained in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. The Bandung, Belgrade and Cairo Conferences had all decided that it was essential to reaffirm the importance of the principle of non-intervention. The adoption of the draft declaration would provide all peoples with a further means of defending their freedom and independence. Representatives who had attempted to minimize its importance had done so because they feared that the General Assembly would condemn their acts of intervention. He fully agreed with the representatives of Afghanistan and the United Republic of Tanzania that support given to a people struggling for freedom and independence could not be regarded as interference.

13. The representative of the United Kingdom had protested against any approach to the problem that recognized the existence of two kinds of States. Unfortunately, it was a fact that two kinds of States existed: those which obeyed the principle of non-intervention, and those which did not. The Soviet draft was a realistic document, dealing with an urgent question of the day. The doubts expressed by the representative of Thailand as to its value were regrettable; but fortunately they were not shared by the majority. It was the Committee's duty to take action to prevent intervention in the domestic affairs of States and to protect their independence and sovereignty. He therefore called upon all delegations to support the Soviet draft resolution.

14. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) said that the Soviet Union deserved thanks for raising the question of the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States, for the matter was an important one which had a significant bearing on the current serious international situation.

15. The principle of non-intervention had long been recognized as essential to world stability, and it was the key-stone of the Charters of the Organization of American States, the League of Arab States, the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations. It was surprising, therefore, that it should have been so often violated; and the result had been

untold suffering. Ironically, the principle of non-intervention had been most frequently violated by the very Powers which had done most to legitimize it; whenever it was a question of protecting their selfish interests, they formed an alliance against those who were legitimately defending their sovereignty. The systematic violation of the principle of non-intervention by certain Powers had not left the victims indifferent; it had been condemned by the African, Asian, Latin American and non-aligned States at the Bandung, Belgrade and Cairo Conferences, thus focusing world attention on the need to prevent further violations.

16. The principle of non-intervention implied the unequivocal condemnation of all intervention, whether overt or covert, military, political or economic. Military intervention was, of course, the easiest to define: it included wars of conquest and reconquest and direct intervention such as had taken place at Stanleyville and in the Dominican Republic.

17. Political intervention, although more subtle, was equally dangerous. Many States had concluded that it was more advantageous to control another country indirectly than to occupy it physically, for by that means they procured the benefits of colonialism without its attendant expenses and responsibilities. That policy led to the creation of spheres of influence composed of States which were legally independent but politically dependent.

18. Political intervention often took the form of economic assistance designed to ensure control of the essential sectors of the national economy. The political authorities of the country thus controlled became the prisoners of foreign interests. The developing countries, by reason of their economic under-development, were particularly vulnerable to that type of intervention by economically stronger States. Neo-colonialism, which thus combined indirect political control with economic exploitation, was the most heinous form of colonialism. Yet there were a few cases in which a just relationship had been established between an industrial country and a developing country, to their mutual benefit.

19. It was not enough, however, to define and condemn intervention. Attempts had recently been made to justify acts of intervention on the pretext that they were a response to previous intervention. That was related to a crucial aspect of the current international situation, namely, the opposition of certain imperialist Powers to wars of national liberation. Such wars were just and constructive and deserved the support of the international community, for they enable peoples to win their freedom. As, however, they often threatened powerful foreign interests, the Powers affected intervened to crush the national liberation movements, which they accused of being based on subversive external support. Such intervention, and the false political doctrine on which it was based, should be condemned. A people could not be accused of subversive activity because it wished to exercise its natural right to independence. Those who opposed wars of national liberation were in fact rejecting all the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and condoning the continuance of colonial and neo-colonial domination.

20. An analysis of the conflicts resulting from foreign intervention showed that they were always caused by the desire of an imperialist Power to maintain its influence in the country concerned. The conflict in Viet-Nam was the most characteristic example of that process. Instead of being helped to recover their national unity, as the 1954 Geneva Agreements had provided, the Viet-Nameese people had witnessed increasing intervention in their internal affairs, culminating in a direct confrontation between them and the armed forces of the United States.

21. Respect for the principle of non-intervention was essential to international peace and security. The United Nations should therefore set itself the task of eliminating colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism, which created the conditions that gave rise to intervention and constituted an obstacle to peaceful coexistence and international understanding and co-operation.

22. Mr. SHALLOUF (Libya) said that the question of the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States was one which should have been considered by the United Nations long ago, and the Soviet Union was to be congratulated for having proposed its inclusion in the agenda of the current session.

23. Throughout history, the law of the jungle had prevailed in international affairs, and his country had itself been a victim of colonialism. Libya believed that the freedom of individuals and States should be respected. Since it had won its independence it had supported and carried out the principles of the Charter and the basic principles of international law; it was thus morally committed to non-intervention. His delegation therefore supported the Afghan representative's proposal that the sponsors of the various draft resolutions and amendments before the Committee should meet and try to agree on a single text, and would give its views on any conclusions reached in that respect at the proper time.

24. Mr. ASTROM (Sweden) said his delegation believed that the Assembly's twentieth session, which was taking place during International Co-operation Year, would be an appropriate occasion for Member States to reaffirm their faith in the principles of the Charter and their willingness to observe them in their international relations. It therefore welcomed the Soviet Union's proposal that the Assembly should adopt a declaration on non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States, which was one of the most important principles of the Charter. The Soviet initiative was indeed a timely one, for almost all the major problems discussed in the United Nations in recent years had been related to some aspect of that principle, and a clearer definition of the concept of intervention was needed, as had been pointed out by the Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs in his statement to the General Assembly at the nineteenth session (1319th plenary meeting).

25. Sweden attached great importance to the principle of non-intervention, as was proved by its statements in the Sixth Committee and the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, and believed

that it should be accorded a prominent place in any general declaration of rededication to the Charter. It should not, however, form the subject of a separate declaration, for the principle of non-intervention was supplemented and supported by other principles of the Charter which gave it meaning and substance—for example, those relating to the prohibition of the threat or use of force, the right to self-determination, and the obligation to abide by international treaties. It was also related to the Charter pledge of international co-operation in the economic and social fields with a view to raising levels of living in developing countries. A well-balanced declaration would take all those considerations into account; it would not alter or abridge the obligations contracted under the Charter, and would make it clear that the Charter still constituted a valid code of behaviour in international relations.

26. The declaration might begin by recalling that twenty years had passed since the establishment of the United Nations and that during those years the emergence of many new States and their admission to the Organization had brought that body closer to the desired goal of representing all mankind. It could state that international developments during those years had further emphasized the need for international co-operation in the preservation of peace and for understanding between the permanent members of the Security Council so that the United Nations might indeed serve as an effective peace-keeping instrument. The declaration might record some of the Organization's achievements and state that disregard for the principles of the Charter had caused friction between States, world tension, misery and bloodshed. It could reaffirm the right to self-determination, independence and equality and point out that every State was under an obligation to respect those rights and to facilitate their exercise. It could confirm that colonialism in all its forms must be brought to a speedy end, and support that principle by stating that the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or independence of another State constituted a serious violation of the Charter. It could continue by affirming that it was the duty of all States to refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of other States, either directly or indirectly, either overtly by the use of force or covertly by fostering civil strife. Intervention was particularly dangerous to newly independent States seeking to shape their future, and should be categorically condemned. The declaration could add that all countries were under an obligation to settle their disputes by peaceful means and to co-operate with a view to promoting respect for human rights and fostering social, economic and cultural progress in all parts of the world. Lastly, the declaration might stress the need to meet international obligations in good faith and to make the United Nations a centre for harmonizing the action of all nations.

27. If the General Assembly was to adopt such a declaration, he hoped that it would be one that would win wide support and, if possible, be adopted unanimously. His delegation had no intention of submitting specific proposals at the present stage; it would follow the debate to ascertain whether there was support for a general declaration of the type he had

described. It believed that it had detected some interest in such a declaration in previous statements, and if that impression was confirmed it would be prepared to co-operate with other delegations in drafting a text that would obtain general support.

28. Mr. PAYSSE REYES (Uruguay) said that his delegation welcomed the debate on the item before the Committee as an important contribution to the cause of peace and to the implementation of the precepts enshrined in the Charter. Uruguay, which for a hundred years had been neither a victim nor a perpetrator of intervention, was unalterably opposed to interventionist policies of any kind, and it had contributed, in co-operation with other American States, to the formulation of the most explicit anti-interventionist provisions in international law.

29. The purpose of the present debate should not be to pass judgement on the question of responsibility for past events but to adopt constructive measures which would prevent any repetition of the kind of acts which the Committee was unanimous in condemning. If certain Members wished to point an accusing finger at others, their own qualifications for sitting in judgement would have to be examined and it would become apparent that there were few among them, not even the smaller States, who were wholly blameless.

30. His delegation had decided to join in sponsoring the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.349/Rev.1 and Add.1 for a number of reasons. Firstly, it was based on the Latin American concept of non-intervention. It was in Latin America that the principle of opposition to any intervention in the affairs of States, individual or collective, had first been enunciated. That principle was laid down in article 15 of the Charter of the Organization of American States. Secondly, the Latin American draft resolution was the broadest and most complete of the drafts submitted. Thirdly, it had the best prospects of adoption, since no additions, deletions or changes had been proposed. Finally, its adoption would constitute a positive response to the hopes of peoples throughout the world.

31. Uruguay's anti-interventionist policy followed from its conviction that peoples should have the right of self-determination, a right which would be nullified if any State was allowed to try to impose its philosophy, institutions and customs on another. Uruguay was in favour of peaceful coexistence, but that meant that no nation should try to make others conform to its ideas. If representative democracy tried to convert the adherents of Marxism and the Marxists thought they had the right to try to sovietize the democratic camp, coexistence would cease and the world would be plunged into war. Today even religions, without abandoning their positions on matters of dogma, were proclaiming their desire to abide by the principles of peaceful coexistence in their relations with each other; the more reason to apply the same principle to political relations, which in their essence excluded considerations of dogma.

32. Uruguay was profoundly concerned over the various forms of intervention currently being practised. Armed intervention, while perhaps the harshest, was not the most serious, for its very openness and

violence provoked a defensive reaction and mobilized the nations of the world in support of the victim and in condemnation of the aggressor. There was another form of intervention which was much more dangerous because it was hidden and corrosive. He was referring to economic intervention and to the practice of financing political parties and the Press, radio and television in foreign countries and infiltrating their educational systems. His delegation would have liked to see those means of intervention specifically referred to in whatever draft declaration might be adopted. It was, of course, in the nature of democracy that within democratic countries some citizens should be able, provided that they did not violate the national laws, to try to mould the thinking of others even in ways foreign to national tradition. Intervention from abroad, however, was entirely inadmissible, if nations were to live at peace with each other. Why should the democracies have to endure what no other type of régime would accept? Why should they have to allow their own resources to be used to finance political forces or other movements within their territory? His delegation hoped that with further study of the question a more complete formulation could be evolved.

33. Mr. LEKIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation welcomed the decision of the Soviet Government to request the inclusion in the agenda of the item before the Committee, for its consideration was of particular significance at a time when the international situation was characterized by increasingly frequent resort to the use of force and the infringement of the independence and sovereignty of States. The Committee's objective should be to adopt a document reaffirming the basic principles of the Charter and calling on States to carry them out. The establishment of the United Nations had reflected not only mankind's aspiration for peace but also its awareness of the interdependence of nations; the Charter provided an ideal instrument for the co-operation among all peoples without which none of them could progress. The majority of Member States had consistently advocated the strict application of the Charter's principles, as had the countries participating in such major international conferences as those held at Bandung, Belgrade, Addis Ababa and Cairo.

34. The post-war period had been characterized by a constant struggle between the forces that were striving by political, military, economic and other measures to prevent the development of international relations on the basis of respect for the Charter, and the constantly growing forces of peace, which were opposed to the arms race, the cold war and the remnants of colonialism and neo-colonialism—in other words, to all forms of inequality and to violations of the principles of self-determination and the independence and territorial integrity of all countries. The roots of many post-war crises lay not in the absence of clearly defined principles but in the rejection of all that was new and progressive, in the failure of some States to understand that a new international pattern had emerged as a result of the emancipation of many former colonies and to realize that the existence of nuclear weapons made it imperative to reject war and the use of force as an instrument of policy. War and the policy of force were

indeed unacceptable even to the peoples of countries whose Governments were resorting to them.

35. Among the major political problems which had plagued the post-war period was the survival of colonialism in various territories. Another problem was the constantly widening difference in levels of economic development between the developed and the developing countries, a situation which was being used by certain States for the purpose of exerting economic pressure and intervening in the internal affairs of other countries. Certain Powers were trying to ascribe to national liberation movements features and characteristics that would provide a basis for their suppression. Attempts were also being made to interfere in the affairs of other countries precisely on the pretext of upholding the principles of the Charter. There were some who were arrogating to themselves the right forcibly to prevent other peoples from choosing their own social and political systems and to obstruct their struggle for liberation. Yet experience proved that neither the threat or use of force nor intervention of any kind in the affairs of other States had solved major international problems; on the contrary, they had only aggravated them and created new problems.

36. Armed forces and economic pressure had also been used in various parts of the world to prevent peoples from exercising their right to political and economic emancipation. Moreover, attempts had been made to give those activities an international semblance and represent them as measures of collective defence against subversion. However, nuclear weapons and the present interdependence of countries had created a situation in which armed intervention could have catastrophic consequences. At the present time the world's attention was concentrated on Viet-Nam, where approximately 200,000 foreign soldiers equipped with the most modern weapons were engaged in constantly expanding military operations. The territory of an independent sovereign State—the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam—was being bombed and certain circles were demanding that the war should be intensified and extended even beyond the borders of Viet-Nam. That war, which was in the interests of neither the Viet-Nameese people nor those who were responsible for it, was imperilling peace throughout the world and at the same time hampering the solution of other international problems.

37. The people of Yugoslavia, who had won their independence in a struggle which had cost nearly 2 million human lives, understood the significance of the struggle of the people of Viet-Nam and other countries for their emancipation. Yugoslavia was convinced that that struggle could not be stifled whatever the means used against it, for it involved broad national movements, the readiness of peoples to make the greatest sacrifices and the inexorable march of history. Only the peoples fighting for their independence had the right to choose the ways and means of waging their struggle, and it was incumbent upon freedom-loving peoples everywhere to give them moral and material assistance. No country could arrogate to itself the right to assess what was in the best interests of another people and decide whether subversive activities were being

carried on in a particular country, so that it could intervene unilaterally, on the basis of its own interpretation of the Charter and against the will of the people involved. The method of "solving disputes" practised in Viet-Nam today must be firmly resisted by all mankind. A solution to the Viet-Name conflict could be found only through negotiations on the basis of the 1954 Geneva Agreements and in harmony with the legitimate aspirations of the Viet-Name people, which were expressed exclusively by the National Liberation Front.

38. The struggle for peace, freedom, progress and the implementation of the Charter knew no geographical, ideological or other frontiers; the Charter was in fact an expression of awareness of the realities of the modern world. For that reason, intervention could not be justified on ideological or any other grounds, and a policy based on intervention was the direct product of obsolete conceptions about the necessity of maintaining previously acquired positions. The retrogressive policy of intervention was doomed to failure, for it was in direct opposition to the legitimate aspirations of peoples and their right to lead an independent life and determine the course of their internal development. Intervention in a country's internal affairs could bring only tragedy to the peoples against whom it was directed, while to those whose Governments were pursuing such a policy it could bring only isolation from the other peoples of the world. The experience of the past twenty years showed that existing differences and problems could be settled only by strengthening peace, by encouraging co-operation among all States and peoples on the basis of equality of rights, and by applying the principles of the Charter.

39. Mr. BARNES (Liberia) said that the importance of the question of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States was demonstrated by the fact that both the Sixth and the First Committee were discussing it at the current session. Thus there was already a consensus, both juridical and political, that the principle of non-intervention in the internal or external affairs of States was the foundation of harmonious relations among States and the corner-stone of the structure of world peace. International law prohibited intervention in the affairs of States because it affected the independence and territorial integrity of the victims and thus posed a clear threat to their political and economic development. The inadmissibility of intervention and the obligation of all States to respect one another's sovereign equality were key features of the United Nations Charter. One of the sources of conflict at the present time was the attempt of certain States to coerce others, by political and economic pressure, into adopting their political or ideological systems. Each State had the inherent right to choose its own national way of life free from external pressures, intrigues, infiltration and subversion, and to judge for itself what kind of society would best serve the needs and interests of its people. It was therefore intolerable that any State should intervene in the internal affairs of another State to impose an alien way of life.

40. The three draft resolutions before the Committee and the amendments to them covered much common

ground and reaffirmed one of the oldest principles known to international law. Such a reaffirmation was necessary, because failure to respect the political integrity and sovereign equality of States continued to be a major cause of friction. At the regional level, the Organization of American States, the Bandung, Belgrade and Cairo conferences, and the Organization of African Unity had all denounced intervention in the affairs of States; and the principle of non-intervention was indeed one of the corner-stones of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity. Thus the Committee's task was to clarify already established principles; and he thought it could be greatly assisted in that task by a working group, as had been suggested by the representative of Afghanistan.

41. It was important to bear in mind that intervention was not a secondary but a primary cause of war. The events that had set off both world wars had resulted from intervention. The First World War had broken out when Serbia had refused to agree to the demand that an Austrian judge should try the assassin of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand on Serbian territory—which would have been a gross violation of its national sovereignty. The prelude to the Second World War had been Hitler's intervention in the Sudetenland and Austria. Today the world was witnessing Indonesia's threats against the territorial integrity of Malaysia. It was thus clear that intervention was a form of aggression which led inexorably to war. In the two world wars, however, no attempt had been made by the aggressors to justify their intervention, whereas today high principles were being invoked as a pretext for that form of aggression.

42. The most complete manifestation of intervention was colonialism, which was an intrusion into the most vital aspects of the lives of other peoples. He used the word "peoples" advisedly, because there was a tendency to think of intervention chiefly in terms of interference by one State in the internal affairs of another. Actually, it was the impact of intervention on the lives of peoples which made it not only a juridical issue but a political and moral issue of the highest order. Intervention was thus more than a violation of the rules governing the relations of States; what it amounted to was the domination of one people by another, and it therefore constituted a challenge to the most fundamental principles of human rights.

43. There was a tendency on the part of some Powers to think of the world as a stage on which they were acting out a drama of the struggle between good and evil. Yet it was not those Powers but usually the smaller Powers which were the victims of the resulting acts of aggression. Thus the whole question of intervention became a confrontation between the great and the small Powers. It was in terms of that division rather than exclusively in terms of ideological divisions that the whole problem should be approached. The truth of that assertion could be seen from the fact that within each ideological camp the strong were encroaching on their weaker and smaller allies; that was perhaps one of the reasons why the military alliances founded in the post-war period on the basis of ideological kinship were now weakening.

44. For all those reasons he believed that a declaration which would reaffirm the relevant principles of the Charter was of the highest importance. The problem was immediate and pressing, and by approving

such a declaration the Committee would have made a vital and far-reaching contribution to peace.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.