

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1530TH  
MEETING

Friday, 3 December 1965,  
at 5.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

<i>Agenda item 107:</i>	Page
<i>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>	251

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, A/C.1/L.349)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. YOST (United States of America) regretted that at the 1395th meeting the representative of the USSR had introduced a discordant note into a successful and constructive session by making a unilateral and tendentious attack against a number of Members of the United Nations, in particular the United States. It was clear that the real purpose of the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.343/Rev.1) was not to promote adherence to the principle of non-intervention, understood in a broad and impartial sense, but to serve as a pretext for a violent attack on the Western States. That was no doubt partly explained by the Soviet Union's competition with Peiping for primacy in communist orthodoxy and militancy; but it was a pity that the United Nations should be involved in that dreary competition.

2. So far as Viet-Nam was concerned, if North Viet-Nam had fulfilled its commitment under the Geneva Agreements of 1954 to leave South Viet-Nam alone, there would be no war and no United States troops in that part of the world; aggression had come from the North, not the South. Viet-Nam was a classic case of the current Chinese Communist doctrine of intervention—the doctrine of "wars of national liberation". Such a war had been unleashed against South Viet-Nam and Laos, and wars of the same kind were planned against Thailand and even against non-communist Governments in Africa. The United States had always been prepared to stand up against such interventions, as it had done in Greece and Korea, in support of peoples who cherished their liberty and wished to determine their own destiny. It was also prepared for unconditional negotiations at any time—which others, despite repeated appeals from many quarters, apparently were not.

3. The Soviet charges about United States policies in the Dominican Republic had been discussed and rejected in a long series of meetings of the Security Council. The United States troops, and after them the Inter-American Peace Force, had gone to that country in order to preserve the people's right to choose their own destiny freely and independently; they were not there to prevent the exercise of freedom, as had been the case wherever Soviet troops had gone in the twentieth century. Had communist plans to install a minority Government by force been successful, the Dominican people, like the Cuban people, would today be ruled by an iron dictatorship and indefinitely denied the opportunity of choosing its own Government and its own destiny.

4. With regard to the Soviet representative's remarks on the Congo, the fact was that the first request for outside assistance had come to the United States from Mr. Lumumba, and that the United States had promptly suggested that the right source of aid was the United Nations. Moreover, in 1960 the Soviet Union had made a misguided and abortive attempt to interfere directly in the Congo, in flagrant disregard of the agreement reached in the Security Council that the problem should be dealt with through the United Nations. And on 16 September 1960, at the 906th meeting of the Security Council, the Soviet Union had vetoed a draft resolution calling for an end to intervention.<sup>1/</sup>

5. The most serious source of intervention in the domestic affairs of other States in the twentieth century had been the Soviet Union, until recently, when Communist China had become the source of the greatest danger. In 1940, Soviet armed forces had entered and occupied the independent sovereign States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and, except for a brief interruption during the Second World War, they had been there ever since. The Soviet Union today included in its vast dominion parts of Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Japan; and East Germany was still little more than a Soviet military occupation zone. In none of those areas had the people been allowed to exercise their right to self-determination.

6. The replacement of the doctrine of the inevitability of war by the doctrine of peaceful coexistence had been a welcome reversal; if Communist China was ever to become a peace-loving member of the world community, a similar reversal of its incendiary and aggressive policy would be necessary. It was also encouraging that the Soviet Union, which in the past had voted against certain General Assembly resolutions opposing intervention and the promotion of civil strife, now seemed willing to subscribe to the

<sup>1/</sup> See Official Records of the Security Council, Fifteenth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1960, document S/4523.

principles underlying such resolutions. The United States hoped that that willingness would be reflected in the acceptance by the USSR delegation of certain changes in its draft declaration designed to make it more impartial, just and generally acceptable. The United States delegation had prepared a number of amendments, which would shortly be circulated.<sup>2/</sup> Some were designed simply to bring the language and form of the declaration into line with customary United Nations style; others were designed to make clear the inadmissibility of intervention by all States, wherever it occurred, not just by "some States" in "various areas", as the existing text stated.

7. His delegation was proposing the insertion of two new preambular paragraphs emphasizing an idea which it had been pleased to find included in the Soviet draft—the idea that intervention could not be justified for any reason, whether economic, political or ideological. The greatest danger to the sovereignty and independence of newly independent countries lay in outside intervention for ideological reasons. It was known, for example, that young people from many independent African States were being trained in Communist China for the purpose of mounting subversive movements against their own Governments, and that young Latin Americans were being trained in Cuba for the same purpose.

8. The other main change proposed by the United States was designed to bring out clearly the inadmissibility of all intervention, whether it was overt or covert. Unlawful intervention meant more than simply armed attacks across international frontiers. Just as real, and perhaps even more dangerous, was intervention by the insidious encouragement of guerrilla warfare, the secret training of armed bands, and the infiltration of agents whose goal was to terrorize and murder innocent people and impose the will of another Government and another ideology. In order to bring out that point, the United States had proposed several small amendments to various paragraphs and the addition of a new preambular paragraph recalling General Assembly resolution 290 (IV). Lastly, it had introduced a few amendments designed to stress the necessity of allowing all peoples, whether or not they were independent, to determine their own destinies through the exercise of the right of self-determination, in whatever manner they chose.

9. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal) said that his delegation strongly supported the basic principles of non-intervention as set forth in the USSR draft declaration. The United Nations should adopt a declaration on non-intervention, as it had adopted a declaration on human rights.

10. There had recently been a number of unsolicited interventions in the domestic affairs of States, endangering the sovereignty of smaller nations and threatening international peace. If the peaceful co-existence of States was to be secured, it was essential to establish a code of international behaviour based primarily on the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States.

aligned countries which adhered strictly to the principle of coexistence had explained their position in that respect in various international forums. In that connexion, he reminded the Committee of the proposal submitted by Ghana, India and Yugoslavia at the session of the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States held at Mexico City in 1964.<sup>3/</sup> If all States followed the spirit of that proposal many of the ills now besetting international relations would be cured.

12. Smaller States in regional organizations were also very conscious of the problem of intervention. It was at the insistence of such States that the principle of non-intervention had been proclaimed in article 15 of the Charter of the Organization of American States. The same principle had also been proclaimed at the Asian-African Conference, held at Bandung in 1955, and at the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in October 1964. Its strict observance would guarantee the sovereignty and independence of the countries which had recently emerged from colonial domination.

13. Activities directed against the political, economic and social systems of States were as serious a problem as armed intervention. Coercive measures infringing the right of a sovereign State to choose its own way of life were tantamount to intervention, as were subversive or terrorist activities against other States. The concept of the sphere of influence was a legacy of the days of imperialism and colonialism, and smacked of racist policy.

14. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said that the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States had at all times been undeniable, and that the United Nations, in view of its expressed determination to establish conditions under which justice could be maintained, and in the light of the obligations assumed by Member States under Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, had a special responsibility to ensure that that principle was observed. Accordingly, what the Committee had to consider at the present stage was not the principle of non-intervention itself—which was absolutely beyond dispute—but the desirability, in the interests of preserving peace and justice, of adopting a declaration reaffirming it and calling upon all Member States to observe it scrupulously. Since the principle had been violated in the past and might still be violated in the future, his delegation had welcomed the inclusion of item 107 in the Assembly's agenda for the current session, and thought that the adoption of a declaration was the least that the United Nations could do in discharging its responsibilities in that field. The declaration should not be confined merely to stating the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States, as such, but should also contain a clear affirmation of the closely related principles of non-aggression, coexistence and international co-operation. Further, it should refer not only to the political sovereignty of States, but to their economic, social and cultural independence as well.

based on the Charter, on conclusions drawn from certain historical facts, on sources of international law and on international understandings reached at conferences in which his country had participated. But he would like to offer for the consideration of the Soviet delegation a number of informal suggestions on the wording of certain paragraphs. In the first place, the declaration should be worded in such a manner as to apply to intervention in the domestic affairs of States in any form and at any time, and not merely to specific cases or forms of intervention. Accordingly, in the first preambular paragraph everything after the words "the increased threat to world peace" should be deleted; in the second preambular paragraph, the words "the armed intervention by some States in the domestic affairs of other States in various areas is creating" should be replaced by the words "intervention in any form in the domestic affairs of other States creates"; and in the third preambular paragraph the words "are creating" should be replaced by the word "create". Paragraphs 1 and 2 were acceptable as they stood; and the Afghan delegation was in agreement with the substance of paragraph 3, but thought that the words "should be halted forthwith and should not be permitted in the future" should be replaced merely by the words "should not be permitted". He could support paragraph 4 as it stood, but did not feel that the final paragraph was really necessary. His delegation might subsequently express its views on the latter paragraph in the light of the comments made by other delegations and of the Committee's decision on the form which the declaration was eventually to take.

16. Finally, it was his delegation's clear understanding that the declaration should apply only to relations between States, and that it had no relevance to disputed territories. In certain cases the demands of the inhabitants of disputed territories, based on their legitimate and undeniable right to self-determination, had been ignored; and support for those legitimate demands, based on the will of the people, had been wrongly interpreted as intervention in the domestic affairs of another country. Cases involving disputed territories should be examined objectively on their merits and in full accordance with the principles of international law.

17. Mr. KLUSAK (Czechoslovakia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that if the representative of the United States had intended in his statement to refer to the union of Transcarpathian Ukraine with the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, he had overlooked or deliberately ignored the elementary facts. The Transcarpathian Ukraine, which before the Second World War had formed part of the Czechoslovak Republic, had been reunited with the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic by the express and unanimous will of the people. The agreement to that effect between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia had been welcomed by the people both of Transcarpathian Ukraine and of the whole of Czechoslovakia, and had served to strengthen the friendly relations between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

publics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, reaffirmed the facts and arguments which had been presented in his statement at the previous meeting. A number of representatives had made serious and useful comments, which would be carefully studied, but some unfounded statements had also been made. The United States representative, in particular, had attempted to justify the policy of his country; but the undeniable facts showed that Washington was following a policy involving the gross violation of the sovereignty of other States and intervention in their internal affairs. The United States representative had failed to explain by what right United States armed forces had invaded the Dominican Republic and continued to violate its sovereignty and independence, by what right the United States had flagrantly violated the Geneva Agreements and unleashed unprecedented bloodshed in Viet-Nam, or by what right it had brutally suppressed the uprising of the Panamanian people.

19. The United States delegation's attempts to whitewash flagrant violations of the United Nations Charter and the universal principles of international law were doomed to failure; no falsification or distortion could delude the freedom-loving peoples as to the clear facts of United States actions in Viet-Nam, the Congo and the Dominican Republic. Nor would historical excursions or references to the Far East or Eastern Europe divert attention from the flagrant United States interference in the internal affairs of other countries which was taking place in various parts of the world.

20. Many facts could be adduced to show that the aggressor in Viet-Nam, against the whole of the Viet-Nameese people, was the United States, and that the only foreign interventionist in that country was the United States, with some of its satellites. For all the propaganda directed against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, protest against United States aggression in Viet-Nam was growing even in the United States itself, and in South Viet-Nam the struggle for national liberation against the interventionists and the shameful puppet camarilla in Saigon was spreading. The real representative of the South Viet-Nameese people was the National Liberation Front, which stood for independence, democracy, peace, an end to imperialist intervention, and the establishment of a democratic coalition Government pursuing a policy of independence and neutrality in accordance with the Geneva Agreements of 1954. Official statements that the United States was ready to enter into unconditional negotiations with a view to a peaceful settlement were flatly contradicted by the escalation of the war and the intensification of the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and of South Viet-Nam. It was scarcely necessary to dwell on the United States representative's references to aspects of communist ideology. The socialist principle that peoples were entitled to their own social and political order without outside interference was well known; Lenin himself had pointed out that anyone who thought a revolution could be ordered from abroad was either a madman or a provocateur.

21. It was the duty of the United Nations to uphold the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States and to protect the independence and

sovereignty of all nations. The adoption by the General Assembly of a declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States would be an important contribution to international peace and security and to safeguarding the political and economic independence of peoples which had cast off the yoke of colonialism. Such a declaration would naturally not be to the liking of those who followed a policy of interference in the internal affairs of States, and it was not surprising that certain members of the Committee had attempted to pigeon-hole or side-track the Soviet proposal. As Mr. Gromyko, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, had said in the General Assembly (1335th plenary meeting), the proposal was not directed against any one State or group of States; but anyone who felt that the cap fitted was at liberty to wear it.

22. It was the duty of the United Nations to take steps to reduce international tension and the threat of war; he called on all members of the Committee to make every needed effort to ensure the condemnation of all forms of foreign intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the adoption of a decision which would make sure that such intervention did not occur in the future.

23. Mr. ALARCON QUESADA (Cuba) said that he would like to reply to the references to his country made by the United States representative. First, however, he wished to point out that there was a clear contradiction between what the United States representative had just said and the reason originally given for the United States intervention in the Dominican Republic. The United States Government had said at first that United States troops had been landed in the Dominican Republic to protect the lives and interests of United States citizens—though there was no principle or rule of international law which entitled any State to send troops to defend the property or interests

of its nationals in a foreign State. However, it now appeared that the real reason for the presence of United States troops in the Dominican Republic was to prevent certain institutional and social changes which the United States Government opposed—though there was no principle or rule of international law which entitled any State to pass judgement on political or social developments in another State.

24. In reply to the allegation that an iron dictatorship existed in Cuba, he would merely mention that Cuba, like many other Latin American countries, had in the past been governed by dictators who had ruthlessly oppressed the Cuban people. All those dictatorial régimes had been supported by the United States Government; they had been maintained in power by United States military and economic assistance, and they had never been criticized by United States spokesmen. The present Cuban Government, however, had the full support of the Cuban people, which was for the first time in its history governing its own country and forging its own destiny.

25. The United States representative had also alleged that young Latin Americans were being trained in Cuba for subversive activities in their own countries. In fact, the Cuban Government had on a number of occasions expressed its unconditional support of the principles of non-intervention in the domestic and foreign affairs of States, the right of all peoples to self-determination and the sovereign equality of all States. On the other hand, the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States itself had in 1961 trained, financed, organized and led a mercenary group whose avowed aim had been to overthrow the established Government of Cuba. The attempt had, of course, failed; but the late President Kennedy had publicly admitted his responsibility for that invasion of Cuban territory.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.