

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1476th
MEETING

Wednesday, 7 December 1966,
at 4.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

<i>Agenda item 96:</i>	
<i>Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	305

Chairman: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 96

Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty (continued) (A/6397, A/C.1/938-940, A/C.1/L.367, A/C.1/L.388)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. SOURDIS (Colombia) said that after having carefully studied the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.367) and finding that it dealt exclusively with armed intervention in the domestic affairs of States, thus leaving aside indirect intervention, which was currently, as the Committee was aware, the form of intervention most commonly practised, most of the Latin American delegations had decided to submit amendments (A/C.1/L.388) to the draft resolution, which were in fact additions and which reproduced the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX).

2. The principle of non-intervention was of fundamental importance in the affairs of peoples, and Colombia had long supported it. Some delegations would doubtless recall the role which his delegation had played in the drafting of the text that had been adopted by the Committee at the previous session and which had become General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX). That resolution defined what might be called the "code of the free world" by reaffirming a number of principles, foremost among them the principle of non-intervention.

3. For Latin America, non-intervention was not confined to the theory of law. It was a way of life which the peoples had adopted almost at the same time as they had begun their struggle for independence. It was for that reason that in the American regional system non-intervention was so well guaranteed and so precisely defined. At a meeting at Bogotá in August 1966, the Presidents of Colombia, Chile and Venezuela and the personal representatives of the

Presidents of Ecuador and Peru had reiterated their support of the principle of non-intervention as a basis of international relations and they had declared totally unacceptable any direct or indirect intervention coming from within the continent or from without and any impediment to the self-determination of the Latin American peoples.

4. As the debate bore not only on the principle of non-intervention but on its implementation, the question at issue was how far that principle had been respected by other peoples. A number of speakers had referred to a recent international event, which could not be overlooked because of its impact on world peace, namely, the First Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America—known as the Tricontinental Conference—held at Havana in January 1966. At that Conference—which had been attended by all kinds of delegations, non-governmental for the most part, including a number of Communist Party members from different regions of the world and some delegations which, because of the persons heading them, probably had the support of the countries they claimed to represent—some resolutions had been adopted which directly concerned Colombia. In the resolution on colonialism and neo-colonialism, the Conference declared that armed liberation struggle was turning into a fundamental manner of struggle in Venezuela, Colombia, Guatemala, Peru, Oman and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In the resolution on the Organization of American States (OAS), the Conference proclaimed that the OAS had no juridical or moral authority to represent the Latin American continent and that the only organization able to represent Latin America would be the one created by the democratic and anti-imperialist Governments born from the free will of the peoples of Latin America. In another resolution on Latin America, the Conference resolved to lend the most determined assistance to the revolutionary movements in Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, Panama, Ecuador and other Caribbean and South American countries, to counteract with the most effective measures the effects of United States imperialism's all-out aggressive policy.

5. The Council of the Organization of American States had not let those declarations go unchallenged; on 2 February 1966 it had adopted a resolution^{1/} in which it declared that a State was responsible not only for the open use of force against another but also for giving support to any of the indirect forms of aggression. The majority of the members of the Latin American group in the United Nations had, for their part, addressed a letter to the President of the Security

^{1/} See Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-first Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1966, document S/7133.

Council on 7 February 1966^{2/} stressing that the objective of the Conference had been to promote the violent change of governments in different countries and that the establishment of permanent machinery to that end struck at the fundamental principles of international law as embodied in the United Nations Charter and represented the first deliberate violation of the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX).

6. The Colombians who had attended the Tricontinental Conference at Havana were the heads of various political groups which did not like the representative democracy prevailing in their country. They had left the country freely to participate in a conference which they had known to be aimed at the overthrow of legitimately constituted Governments and had returned to put into practice the instructions they had received at Havana. The case of certain other countries represented at the Conference was, however, very different.

7. In a statement made in the Supreme Soviet on 9 December 1965, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR had made it clear that his country would take part in the Havana Conference and would do all in its power to assist in consolidating the struggle against imperialist aggression. It could not therefore be claimed that the Tricontinental Conference had been composed of persons who had no connexion with their Governments.

8. The representative of the United Arab Republic at the Tricontinental Conference had confirmed that his country supported the revolutionary war against imperialism and neo-colonialism being waged in Colombia, Guatemala, Venezuela and other Latin American countries.

9. The Prime Minister of Cuba, for his part, had openly supported the Tricontinental Conference at Havana and had declared himself in agreement with all the conclusions it had arrived at. At the 1467th meeting of the First Committee, moreover, the Cuban representative had stated that his country had been confirmed in its belief that the decisions adopted by the Conference were effective and that his Government had been right in giving them its full support.

10. It might therefore be wondered, as the Colombian Minister for External Relations had observed in the Assembly's general debate (1416th plenary meeting), whether a conference whose objective had been to give moral and material support to seditious movements did not constitute a flagrant violation of the principle of non-intervention. Anyone studying the political report approved by the Havana Conference and the conclusions which had appeared in the Press was struck by the fact that for the first time in history a group of countries was openly preaching subversion and organizing intervention in the affairs of another group of countries.

11. Subversive groups existed everywhere. Whenever economic difficulties made it impossible to ensure some degree of tangible prosperity for all, the latent discontent could easily be channeled into a subversive movement, given expert means of the kind which the participants in the Havana Conference intended to employ.

^{2/} *Ibid.*, document S/7123.

12. It was true that there had been disaffected elements in Colombia before the Havana Conference, but the suppression of their guerrilla forces had been scarcely more than a matter of police action. Since the Tricontinental Conference, however, the guerrilla warfare had assumed an international character. It was financed from outside, supplied with arms and ammunition from outside, and supported by extremely efficient propaganda fostering dissension which had been raised almost to the level of a science. In short, it conformed exactly to the pattern laid down by Mao Tse-tung in his book on guerrilla warfare.

13. Chinese influence had thus been predominant at Havana. It was true that there had been some differences of opinion between the USSR representatives and those of Communist China. But as the matter under consideration had been intervention in the under-developed countries for the purpose of fomenting revolution, ideological differences had been relegated to the background and unanimity had eventually been achieved.

14. What had happened at Havana had certainly not been entirely extemporaneous. It might therefore be wondered whether the votes cast in the United Nations by certain States had any meaning. Certain States had, in the United Nations, preached non-intervention, the sovereign equality of States and refraining from the use of force in international relations, while organizing a conference which, a year later, had advocated totally different principles. As long as those States failed to make their actions consistent with their words, there was a threat to international peace.

15. The resolutions adopted at the Tricontinental Conference rejected the fundamental principles of established international order, tried to set the great nuclear Powers one against the other, aspired to establish a revolutionary pattern for the developing countries, advocated infiltration, subversion, guerrilla warfare and insurrection in the vulnerable regions of the world and proposed new forms of intervention, thereby trampling underfoot all the principles embodied in General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX). Although the United Nations was not a Government, the moral authority invested in one of its decisions by the endorsement of 100 Member States should at least be respected, if peace was to be safeguarded and the interventionist policies of certain Powers were not to endanger international security.

16. The perturbing question arose whether the decisions taken by the World Conference which was to meet to consider general and complete disarmament would suffer the same fate as the moral code contained in resolution 2131 (XX); in that case, the United Nations would have wasted much time. The proliferation of nuclear weapons and intervention in the affairs of other States were at present the two greatest threats to international peace; nuclear weapons threatened man's very existence on earth, while intervention provoked vigorous reactions from the victim countries.

17. Colombia had always respected the right of other peoples to self-determination and expected to be accorded the same right in return. The Latin American countries, which respected the rule of law and preferred democratic forms of government, would

not dream of organizing a continental conference in Latin America for the purpose of intervening in the domestic affairs of the Arab countries, for example. Every country must be free to choose its own Government and not have a Government imposed upon it over which it had no control. The Berlin wall was a good example of what was happening in the totalitarian régimes. It had not been built, like the great wall of China or the old wall of Cartagena de Indias in Colombia, to protect the people against outside attacks, but to prevent them from escaping. The whole nation thus became one vast prison. It was to be hoped that the free world would never, though cowardice or lack of foresight, find itself pent in by a wall behind which it would perish.

18. Mr. ATASSI (Syria) said that General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) was the result of the efforts of the newly emancipated peoples and countries which wanted the right of self-determination to triumph in international practice. The question of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States was of the highest importance for the newly independent States. For years, that question had been discussed at length at every conference of non-aligned countries and countries of the "third world", particularly at the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, at the various conferences of the Organization of African Unity, at the Belgrade and Cairo Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries and in the Organization of American States.

19. His delegation believed that the General Assembly had the duty to formulate explicitly the aspirations of all peoples, expressed at those conferences and demanding the cessation of all forms of intervention in the domestic affairs of States. Syria had taken part in most of the conferences and believed that any step to eliminate intervention would strengthen peace and security.

20. Acts of direct and indirect intervention by the colonialist and imperialist Powers in the domestic affairs of Asian and African States increased tension and were designed either to bring the newly independent States into the strategic spheres of influence of the imperialist Powers or to perpetuate the economic exploitation of those States at the expense of their development. Far from diminishing since the adoption of resolution 2131 (XX), imperialist intervention in the affairs of Asian and African countries continued unabated. The discussion of the implementation of that resolution would enable the General Assembly to adopt a text suited to the present situation, one marked by renewed imperialist threats and armed United States intervention in Viet-Nam. The war waged by the United States in South Viet-Nam, the bombing of North Viet-Nam and the overflight of the territory of the People's Republic of China by United States aircraft were facts which testified to the gravity of that intervention. Any attempt to becloud them by alleging some sort of subversive activity or people's war would divert attention from the central question, which was imperialist intervention in the domestic affairs of the newly independent States, whether in Viet-Nam or elsewhere in Asia and in Africa.

21. Syria appreciated the Latin American countries' efforts to consolidate their independence and economic

development. The Arab people could not but remain faithful to the principle of the inadmissibility of all forms of intervention in the domestic affairs of States. In that connexion, it should be noted that the United States Central Intelligence Agency was playing a role in the uprisings and changes of régime in most countries of the third world. The consolidation of the imperialist bases in Asia and Africa had been going on for several years. Southern Rhodesia and Israel constituted bastions of racial discrimination used to secure imperialist interests in Africa and the Middle East. Israel was and would remain, by definition, a foreign body in the Middle East and would always constitute an imperialist base for armed intervention and pressure in that region. Maintained and armed by the imperialist Powers, particularly the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel harboured expansionist designs, as had been demonstrated by the explicit statements of its leaders and by the pressure of world Zionism to make Jews emigrate to Israel. The tiny territory of occupied Palestine could not hold another million Jews, and it was obvious that any new flow of immigrants constituted a threat of aggression and expansion by Israel.

22. For all those reasons, his delegation attached great importance to the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty and it was prepared to associate itself with any measure taken to eliminate all forms of intervention in the domestic affairs of States.

23. Mr. TOMOROWICZ (Poland) said that it was the duty of the General Assembly to see that the principles it had proclaimed in the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty were strictly observed and implemented. Violation of those principles was a serious threat to the maintenance of peace. Therefore the USSR Government's proposal to discuss the status of the implementation of that Declaration was timely, particularly because a number of its provisions had been completely disregarded in 1966.

24. The General Assembly had solemnly declared that no State had the right to intervene for any reason whatever in the internal affairs of other States. Events showed that that provision had been constantly violated. A flagrant example was the United States armed intervention in Viet-Nam. The number of United States troops in Viet-Nam had more than doubled in 1966, military operations against the civilian population of South Viet-Nam had been intensified and the attacks against the sovereign State of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam had become fiercer.

25. The Declaration reaffirmed the inalienable right of every State to choose its political, economic, social and cultural systems, without interference in any form by another State. But the Viet-Nameese people had been deprived of that right: it had been denied the opportunity to hold free and democratic elections, and a series of Governments had been imposed upon it in order to prevent reforms. Thus, what had been an internal struggle to institute those reforms had become a United States military expedition in South-East

Asia. Under the Declaration, armed intervention must be regarded as aggression. The United States war in Viet-Nam therefore constituted aggression and should be condemned under paragraph 1 of the Declaration.

26. The Declaration prohibited intervention in the external affairs of other States. Interference in any form in the foreign trade of a sovereign State was nothing but flagrant intervention in its external affairs. The United States Government was continuing to exert pressure on a number of States in order to impede their trade with the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of Cuba. The attempts of the Federal Republic of Germany to prevent other States, by threats and blackmail, from establishing diplomatic relations with the German Democratic Republic constituted another example of intervention in the external affairs of other States.

27. The Declaration proclaimed that no State had the right to organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed against the régime of another State. Yet groups of Cuban terrorists were being organized and equipped in the territory of a number of neighbouring States for the purpose of overthrowing the Republican Government of Cuba. Moreover, the very existence of a United States military base on Cuban soil was contrary to the Cuban people's right to exercise sovereignty over all Cuban territory.

28. The Declaration made it mandatory on States to contribute to the complete elimination of racial discrimination and colonialism. While some progress had been made in that direction in 1966, there had been no change in the status of the peoples of the largest colonies still in existence, such as the African territories under Portuguese domination. There had been no improvement in the status of the peoples oppressed and discriminated against by a white minority in South Africa, South West Africa and Southern Rhodesia.

29. The conclusion to be drawn from all those facts was that a number of States had not observed the essential provisions of the Declaration. There was no need to alter or redraft that document; the value of the Declaration lay in the degree to which it was observed by all the parties concerned. The Committee's duty was rather to reaffirm the validity of the Declaration, to call on all States to implement its provisions strictly and to warn them of the consequences of violating those provisions. For that reason, his delegation supported the USSR draft resolution and commended it to the Committee for approval.

30. Mr. ESCOBAR SERRANO (El Salvador) said he was convinced that the historic value of resolution 2131 (XX) could only increase as the principles which had inspired it became established and as the independence and sovereignty of all States—particularly those most exposed to interference and aggression because they were small, poor and defenceless—came to be more effectively protected. His country had proposed the adoption of the principle of non-intervention

as early as 1928 at the Sixth International Conference of American States at Havana. The issue before the Committee was the logical corollary of that principle and should be discussed independently of any political or propagandistic considerations, however difficult that might be for those countries which had suffered interference in their domestic affairs and whose duty it was to express vigorous condemnation of such interference in order to ensure respect for the sovereignty and self-determination of peoples. The Latin American countries were among those concerned with the matter, since they had suffered interference only too often. That was why they had done so much to ensure that the principle of non-intervention won legal recognition and why they reacted so strongly whenever the sovereignty of States and the self-determination of peoples were violated.

31. There could be no constructive international co-operation unless the principle of non-intervention was recognized in practice. It was disturbing to note the increasing frequency of acts of aggression in the world. They were often indirect, manifesting themselves in the incitement and financing of subversive or terrorist activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the régime of another State, in the interests of the aggressors, in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and with disregard for General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX). Friendly relations between States could be sincere only if they were based on mutual respect and an absolute determination to refrain from any intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries. Nothing could justify a powerful country in taking advantage of its privileged position to impose its policies on weaker countries, as though it had a messianic sense of being called upon to impose its will on the world. History was not lacking in examples of that type of intervention. Fortunately, such behaviour was forthrightly condemned in today's world. It must be vigorously denounced whenever it occurred, so that it would finally be universally understood that peaceful coexistence required respect for moral and legal norms and the abandonment of all action which might be considered as unjustified intervention in the domestic affairs of States.

32. A particularly strong stand should be taken against the new forms of indirect intervention and against the insidious propaganda which fostered violations of law and order and the overthrow of legally constituted Governments, thus promoting the interests of irresponsible groups which claimed to represent popular opinion. It was regrettable that some countries allowed themselves to be deceived by such groups and gave moral and material support to the so-called national liberation movements in violation of resolution 2131 (XX). In his speech in the Assembly's general debate (1442nd plenary meeting), he had already voiced condemnation of the Tricontinental Conference at Havana, which had been attended by representatives of States Members of the United Nations. He would not dwell on the reprehensible aims of that Conference, since the representatives of other Latin American countries who had preceded him in the discussion had already spoken of them, and the Special Committee set up by the Organization of American States

had issued a report^{3/} on the Conference. It was impossible to ignore the moral support which the communist countries had given the Tricontinental Conference, which, however, had not had the results its organizers had hoped for. It had had little effect on the American countries, which, with good reason, had taken the view that its aims were contrary to General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) and threatened their peace and security. His country, whose people lived in conditions of law and order under the protection of their democratic institutions, was not at present the victim of direct intervention. That was not, however, true of other countries such as Colombia, Guatemala, Peru and Venezuela, and his Government was compelled to protest strongly against that situation and to join those Latin American countries which had called for the condemnation of such flagrant violations of the principles of resolution 2131 (XX). His Government condemned any intervention which was contrary to the United Nations Charter, whatever its form or origin, and held that the principle of non-intervention should be not only an ideal proclaimed by all countries but a practical reality of international life.

33. His delegation was in general agreement with the Soviet draft resolution to the extent that it condemned armed intervention. However, the draft was less comprehensive than resolution 2131 (XX), and it was to remedy its shortcomings that El Salvador had joined other countries in submitting the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.388. The purpose of the amendments was to strengthen the principle of non-intervention, to emphasize that all improper actions must be abandoned and to enhance the prestige of the United Nations, whose principles all countries were bound to respect. There should therefore be no difficulty in adopting them unanimously.

34. Mr. BUŠNIAK (Czechoslovakia) said that although the world had welcomed the adoption of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, the situation had not subsequently improved. That was largely due to systematic violation of the principle of non-intervention, which derived from the sovereignty of States and, together with the other principles embodied in the Charter, was the basis on which international relations and peaceful coexistence between countries must rest. Those principles must therefore be constantly strengthened, for their violation made progress in the maintenance of international peace and security impossible. Blatant disregard of them by some States was the main obstacle to the development of normal relations between States and prevented the solution of such international problems as disarmament, the elimination of colonialism and economic assistance to the developing countries. It was therefore essential for the General Assembly to consider carefully how the Declaration was being implemented. An important factor to be borne in mind in that connexion was the

resolution adopted by the 1966 Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, by which the Special Committee, bearing in mind the fact that the Declaration reflected a universal legal conviction which qualified it to be regarded as an authentic and definite principle of international law, had decided that, with regard to the principle of non-intervention, it would abide by General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX).^{4/} All States were therefore bound to implement its provisions, and any violation of them must be regarded as illegal.

35. The Declaration could have a favourable effect on the international situation, provided that certain Western Powers, especially the United States, responded without delay to the General Assembly's appeal. Unfortunately, however, those Powers, in clear violation of the Declaration's provisions, were constantly intensifying their operations against peoples struggling for freedom and national independence. That policy was exemplified, in particular, by the United States intervention in South Viet-Nam and aggression against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. The intensification of that war threatened peace and security not only in South-East Asia but throughout the world. That fact could not be altered by theories about so-called "local wars" which were nothing but the expression of a policy of intervention and use of force against other States. No one could be deceived by the attempts of the United States to justify its aggression in Viet-Nam in terms of alleged obligations towards the South Viet-Nameese régime which the United States had itself created. The Czechoslovak people and Government, together with the other socialist countries, stood firmly by the heroic Viet-Nameese people. Czechoslovakia supported the demands of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam, which were based on the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and provided a reasonable basis for solving the Viet-Nameese problem. The interests of peace required the United States to halt unconditionally its bombings and military operations against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and end its armed intervention in South Viet-Nam. It must also end its intervention in Laos and Cambodia and the extension of the conflict to the territory of those countries.

36. In order to justify its policy of force, the United States often used the word "doctrine". In fact, the various United States doctrines were nothing but an attempt to justify the policeman's role which the United States presumed to play in world politics. In order to achieve its ends, United States imperialism thus made its own "laws", which it placed above the obligations and principles of international law. The common denominator of all those doctrines was the desire to block any revolutionary, progressive change in the world. The United States also spoke of its "world responsibilities", which were nothing but attempts to intervene wherever people had decided to live in a way that was not in keeping with United States interests and views—a fact confirmed, *inter alia*, by United States actions against the Republic of Cuba. The

^{3/} "Report of the Special Committee to study resolutions II.1 and VIII of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs on the First Afro-Asian-Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Conference and its Projections ('Tricontinental Conference of Havana')", Council of the Organization of American States, Pan American Union, Washington, D.C., document OEA/Ser.G/IV, C-i-769-A Rev., vols. 1 and II, 28 November 1966.

^{4/} See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes*, agenda item 88, document A/6230, para. 341.

retention of the Guantánamo base against the wishes of the Cuban people could have no other purpose than that of using the base for purposes of provocation against the Republic of Cuba. The base was also a source of tension and a constant threat to peace in the Caribbean. Other examples which could be cited included United States intervention in Korea, Guatemala, Lebanon, the Congo and the Dominican Republic.

37. Intervention in the affairs of other States was primarily directed against popular liberation movements. Where the old methods were no longer adequate, the colonialists resorted to the most varied forms of neo-colonialist intervention and intimidation, thus preventing many newly independent States from attaining complete freedom. The policy of interference in the affairs of other States was currently one of the main sources of conflict and a serious threat to peace throughout the world. It was therefore essential for the General Assembly to reaffirm the provisions of the Declaration and vigorously condemn any form of intervention in the domestic affairs of States. For those reasons, his delegation fully supported the Soviet draft resolution, whose adoption would greatly contribute to the lasting implementation in international relations of the principle of non-intervention.

38. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that while the Syrian representative was speaking in the Committee in the cause of non-intervention, the Syrian Government was openly boasting of its interventionist policies, and was not only promoting subversive activities in the Middle East but extending its support to the organization and financing of terrorist and insurgent activities in far-away countries, as the representatives of certain Latin American States had pointed out. It was an established fact that Syrian interventionist activities in the Middle East were not confined to Israel. Nevertheless, the Committee was asked to believe that all those activities were being carried on in the name of non-intervention, in implementation of paragraph 2 of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty.

39. Mr. ATASSI (Syria) speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he would merely recall that the head of his delegation had already refuted, at the 1466th meeting, the falsehoods uttered by the representative of the Zionist authorities.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.