

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1405th
MEETING**

Thursday, 9 December 1965,
at 8.45 p.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) 315

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.2, L.350 and Corr.1, L.351, L.352, L.353/Rev.2, L.354)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan), welcoming the initiative of the Soviet Union in bringing the question of non-intervention before the United Nations, said that the Arab nations had for centuries been victims of foreign intervention and aggression and certain parts of the Arab world were still suffering from the introduction of foreign elements. Now, at a time when there was a new desire for international co-operation and recognition for man's right to freedom and independence, the United Nations had a duty to protect fundamental rights and to reaffirm its determination to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

2. All forms of intervention were contrary to human rights and to the principles set out in the Charter of the United Nations. The examples of direct intervention since the end of the Second World War were many and varied. The great Powers had intervened to drive a people out of its country and replace it with foreign immigrants, and had failed to fulfil their obligations for the maintenance of peace and security under the Charter. Economic pressure was another form of intervention, calculated to influence the policies of other countries in specific matters. Yet another type of intervention was actually practised within the United Nations, namely, the pressure of all kinds which was exerted by certain States to obtain votes for resolutions contrary to the elementary principles of the Charter and the inherent right of self-determination.

3. There was nothing new in the principles which the Committee was discussing. The Charter, in Articles 1 and 55, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights set out the principles

of equal rights and self-determination, respect for the sovereignty and integrity of States and the rule of law. Nevertheless, despite those noble principles, there had been numerous examples of direct or indirect intervention in the domestic affairs of other States, hampering peaceful coexistence and threatening international peace and security. The principle of non-intervention had been proclaimed at the Asian-African Conference, held at Bandung in 1955, at meetings of African States, and most recently, at the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in October 1964. It was also specifically expressed in the constitutional instruments of such regional organizations as the League of Arab States, the Organization of American States and the Organization of African Unity.

4. Following the adoption of other historic declarations by the United Nations, there was now an urgent need for a declaration reaffirming the principle of non-intervention. As a result of the frequent violation of that fundamental principle, international tension was growing and the struggle for national liberation had become intensified. It was often charged that that struggle was inspired from without or dictated by subversion; but liberation movements stemmed from the desire of peoples to live in freedom and independence. On the American continent, Simón Bolívar and George Washington were examples of men who had led such national liberation movements. The fact that other nations often gave legitimate assistance to such just struggles in no way justified the allegation that national liberation movements were inspired by foreign intervention.

5. The many different forms which intervention could take necessitated an explicit definition of the term. Any declaration adopted by the Committee should therefore stress that every State had a right to the free exercise of its inherent right of self-determination, without any foreign pressure whatsoever, in particular the use of force. International harmony and co-operation would only be meaningful if all forms of intervention were eliminated. He therefore hoped that the Committee would find the draft resolution submitted by the United Arab Republic and several other countries, including Jordan (A/C.1/L.353/Rev.2), acceptable as embodying all the elements inherent in the principle of non-intervention.

6. Mr. GRANADO (Trinidad and Tobago) said that despite the profession of lofty ideals, powerful nations continued to consider that fundamental principles of morality were flexible according to circumstances. The small nations therefore had a special contribution to offer as the defenders of freedom, morality and truth.

7. His country was firmly opposed to all forms of intervention in the affairs of other countries, whether overt and direct or more subtle and insidious. The Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago had said that the only admissible form of intervention, which must be organized through the United Nations, was intervention necessary to keep the peace.

8. Many pretexts were put forward to justify intervention, but genuine peace must be based not on deception and mistrust but on trust and co-operation. Until the United Nations could achieve a climate of trust, its expressed desires and hopes would not become realities. The role of the United Nations should be that of a co-ordinating force, endowed with appropriate powers as the expression of its Members' moral opposition to intervention in the affairs of other countries.

9. Trinidad and Tobago, a small country, desired only to live in stability and peace without foreign intervention. It sought aid from friendly countries which were prepared to respect its sovereignty, but was determined that such aid must not be used for purposes of interference.

10. The great significance which today attached to prestige in world affairs was a significant cause of tension and conflict. If nations were to achieve real co-operation they must confine the concept of prestige within sensible limits and accept the fact that there were many different attitudes, ideas and patterns of behaviour in the world. He therefore appealed to the members of the Committee to approach their discussions in that spirit, in order to reach a meaningful decision.

11. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) said that the observance of the principle of non-intervention was a prerequisite for the maintenance of international peace and security, and for the development of relations based on sovereign equality, mutual respect and co-operation between States. The chief cause of tension in the modern world was the brutal use of force by the imperialist Powers to hold up economic, social and political change and to preserve their own domination over entire countries and peoples.

12. The most flagrant example of armed intervention was the war of aggression being waged by the United States in Viet-Nam. The United States involvement in the internal affairs of Viet-Nam begun in 1950 with the dispatch of military advisers. A few months after the signature of the 1954 Geneva Agreements, the United States had increased its commitment. In violation of those agreements, it had set up and overthrown Governments in South Viet-Nam and installed military bases, which were now being used to massacre the South Viet-Nameese people and to devastate the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. The alleged request for assistance by a Government that had been installed by the United States, and the alleged commitment of the United States, in no way justified its brutal aggression in Viet-Nam. An alarming feature of the debate had been the defence of United States policy by the representatives of certain countries, who had claimed that it was not the United States and its allies who had intervened in Viet-Nam, but the people of Viet-Nam itself who

had intervened in their own affairs. The aggressors had claimed that Viet-Nam was destined to remain divided under the terms of the Geneva Agreements, though in fact the division was intended to be only provisional. That situation might suit the divisive policies of certain imperialist countries, but it was contrary to the interests and needs of the Viet-Nameese people. The Geneva Agreements themselves had stated that the division should come to an end after a specified period. In an attempt to justify its policy of aggression, the United States had launched a strident campaign of official statements on infiltration from the North. Its aim was not to cease, but to extend, its intervention.

13. The uprising of the South Viet-Nameese people against imposed Governments was their own internal affair which could be settled equitably without loss of life. Like every other people, the South Viet-Nameese had the right to decide their own destiny and institutions. Their true representatives were the National Liberation Front, which enjoyed the support of the overwhelming majority of the population and of world opinion. The Bulgarian delegation condemned the aggression against the Viet-Nameese people and supported their just struggle for independence.

14. Armed intervention was tending to become a daily practice and a political doctrine of the United States, as illustrated by its intervention in the Dominican Republic, where it had crushed the popular uprising against a military oligarchy that had suppressed democratic institutions. In a subsequent attempt to legalize that action, the United States House of Representatives had passed a resolution authorizing the United States to intervene unilaterally and by force in the internal affairs of any country of the Western hemisphere. That resolution violated both the United Nations Charter and the Charter of the Organization of American States.

15. The United States had also been guilty of hostile actions against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cuba, whose heroic people enjoyed the support of all peoples, and in particular the people of Bulgaria. In the second half of the twentieth century such policies were doomed to failure. The international community demanded that open aggression should cease and that all forms of coercion and interference should be banned. Military bases and troops in foreign territories were a source of international tension and a threat to world peace. The United States had no right to assume the role of an international gendarme, which was a violation of the principles of international law and morality.

16. Political and economic pressures were another form of intervention. The "Hallstein doctrine" applied by the Federal Republic of Germany was a way of exerting political pressure on countries that had decided to normalize their relations with the German Democratic Republic. In some cases the establishment of economic relations and the granting of economic assistance were made dependent on conditions that restricted the freedom of the countries concerned. All such forms of intervention should be condemned. The principle of non-intervention was the basis for peaceful coexistence and international law. For those reasons, the Bulgarian delegation supported the USSR draft

resolution (A/C.1/L.343/Rev.1) and hoped it would be adopted by the General Assembly.

17. Mr. SCHUURMANS (Belgium) said that the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States was widely recognized to be the cornerstone of the United Nations Charter and one of the foundations of international law. Unfortunately, like so many ideas and principles, it was interpreted in many different and often contradictory ways.

18. Several speakers had stressed the need to include subversion among the reprehensible practices of intervention. At the present time, subversion was one of the most current and treacherous forms of interference in the affairs of other States. The newly independent countries seemed to be a favourite ground for the undermining activities systematically carried out by certain Powers. The evidence produced by the representatives of many Latin American, African and Asian States made it clear that harmonious relations were possible only if every State refrained from attacking its neighbours, whether openly or by subversion.

19. The right of every Government to request external assistance, if it deemed it advisable, should also be mentioned in any definition of non-interference in the affairs of other States. The Government concerned was alone competent to decide on so extreme a measure, and was under no obligation to justify its action in that respect to any third party.

20. In that connexion, he recalled that by a unanimous decision of the Belgian Parliament independence had been granted to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Republic of Rwanda and the Kingdom of Burundi. Belgium had no wish to interfere in any way in the internal affairs of those States, and scrupulously respected their independence. Under agreements, Belgium granted each of them technical assistance that was not accompanied by any conditions. It did so because it considered itself to have a moral duty to help the peoples for which it had so long been responsible to achieve full development and well-being. Belgium's disinterest was appreciated by the countries concerned and acknowledged by many others.

Mr. Benites (Ecuador), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

21. Mr. EL BESHIR (Sudan) agreed with those representatives who had called attention to the dangers of intervention for the newly independent nations. At the present time military aggression was taking place in countries where the people were courageously fighting for national sovereignty. The principle of non-intervention was of paramount importance to such States as the Sudan, which, together with other African and Asian nations, had repeatedly and emphatically affirmed, at Bandung, at Cairo and in regional summit conferences, their unswerving support for that principle.

22. Since the Second World War, all cases of intervention, whether by military or other means, had occurred in small States where one great Power had sought to limit the ambitions of another great Power alleged to be seeking economic, political or ideological advantage. The result had always been, and always

would be, the ruin and destruction of the small country concerned. Many parts of the world, especially in Asia and Africa, had witnessed intervention of that kind carried out by countries seeking to create spheres of influence.

23. On the continent of Africa, the right of peoples to shape their own destiny was threatened in various ways. For example, the peoples of Angola and Mozambique were still denied their basic human rights by colonialism, which must be liquidated. Secondly, the racist minority régimes that were violently oppressing African majorities and threatening neighbouring independent African States must be eliminated. Thirdly, the presence of foreign military bases was a continual threat to the sovereign rights of independent African States. Fourthly, certain Powers attached conditions to the economic aid offered to independent African countries in order to establish control over their national economies, thereby interfering in their domestic affairs.

24. His delegation would vote on the draft resolutions before the Committee in the light of the observations he had just made.

25. Mr. CHIMIDDORJ (Mongolia) said that the inclusion in the agenda of an item on the inadmissibility of intervention was particularly timely at a period when the international situation was being aggravated by the aggressive policies of the imperialist Powers. The question of non-intervention was closely linked to the question of guaranteeing the independence and sovereignty of small countries. Mongolia attached much importance to the latter question, in view of the dangerous situation that had arisen in Asia as a result of the adventurist activities of the United States.

26. The United Nations was based on the principles of sovereign equality and self-determination, and the Charter obliged all Member States to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. The need to respect those principles, as a prerequisite for peaceful coexistence and peace, had been acknowledged in many international documents and declarations. The principles had thus gained general recognition as norms of international law.

27. The forces of colonialism and neo-colonialism, however, were violating those principles and conducting intervention by various means, including the provision of assistance to the developing countries and the withholding of diplomatic recognition of certain States, as was done, for example, by the Federal Republic of Germany under the "Hallstein doctrine". The subversive activities carried out by the espionage organs of the imperialist Powers were another form of intervention. The Central Intelligence Agency was said to have played a leading role in political activities which had resulted in the Korean war, in the overthrow of the Mossadegh Government in Iran in 1953 and the fall of the Arbenz Government in Guatemala in 1954. The imperialist forces were trying to sow the seeds of discord among the newly independent and peace-loving countries and using territorial or frontier disputes dating from the colonial era for their own selfish ends. In recent years their activities had assumed the form

of intervention or armed aggression followed by occupation of foreign territories.

28. One example of the tendency was the war in Viet-Nam. By its armed intervention in South Viet-Nam and its aggression against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, the United States had violated the 1954 Geneva Agreements and refused to recognize the right of the Viet-Nameese people to settle their own internal affairs. United States aircraft were bombing towns in the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam several times a day. Influential circles in the United States were recommending the use of the most barbarous means of annihilating the South Viet-Nameese patriots, and massive air raids against industrial targets in the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. The United States was planning to reinforce its armed forces in that area and was equipping them with howitzers and guns capable of firing nuclear projectiles. The United States Seventh Fleet was already equipped with atomic weapons. Other States, including South Korea, New Zealand, Australia, the Philippines and Thailand, had also sent troops to South Viet-Nam, thus confirming the aggressive tendencies of the military blocks and so-called treaties of mutual security. South Viet-Nam was being used as a bridge-head for hostilities in Laos and provocations against Cambodia. The United States was fighting not, as it claimed, to defend South Viet-Nam from communist aggression but to perpetuate the division of Viet-Nam, occupy the country and use South Viet-Nam for the purpose of suppressing the national liberation movement in Asia and the Far East and launching aggression against peace-loving peoples. The Chief of Staff of the United States had openly stated that its troops might remain in South Viet-Nam even if there was a cease-fire agreement.

29. Opposition to United States policies in South-East Asia was growing all over the world and even in the United States itself. There was wide support for the just demands of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam. The Mongolian Government and people endorsed that support and demanded that the United States end its interference in the affairs of the Asian continent immediately and unconditionally.

30. Similar events were occurring in Africa and Latin America; the only difference was that in Latin America the United States had a monopolistic domination, while in Africa the colonial forces of imperialism often presented a united front against the independent African States and the still dependent territories. In Latin America, the United States Government had arrogated to itself the right to intervene at any time, and the House of Representatives had recently passed a resolution aimed at justifying United States intervention in any Latin American country on the pretext that so-called subversive activities were being conducted there; the creation of an "inter-American force" for that purpose was also envisaged. The United States, whose troops had caused much bloodshed in Latin America, had tried to stifle the Cuban revolution and reimpose a colonial régime on the Cuban people. Such threats to the sovereignty and independence of the countries of Central and South America were an

attempt to legalize the principle of interference in the affairs of other States, and had aroused strong indignation and resistance in those countries.

31. In Africa, the Western Powers were not only obstructing the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples but were trying to establish a new form of ascendancy over the newly independent countries. In pursuance of that policy, they had repeatedly committed armed intervention in African countries. They were also responsible for the continued existence in Africa of colonial and dependent territories. It was difficult to imagine that, without the protection and participation of the United States and the United Kingdom, countries such as Portugal and the Republic of South Africa would have been able to resist the struggle of the peoples seeking freedom and independence. The recent unilateral declaration of independence by Southern Rhodesia was further proof of the Western Powers' policy of intervention.

32. Military bases in foreign territories played an important role in the imperialist Powers' policy of threats, blackmail and aggression. Mongolia was in favour of the elimination of such bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops to their own countries. The United States was using for its war in Viet-Nam bases on Okinawa and Guam, the Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines, the Muang Ubon military airport in Thailand and other bases. Asia was encircled by a network of military bases, some of them owned by the United Kingdom. The United States and the United Kingdom were planning to use certain islands in the Indian Ocean for bases. The Western Press openly wrote that on the bases there were rockets with atomic warheads, aimed at certain towns and countries, including the Mongolian People's Republic. That was the true purpose of the bases, which it was claimed served purely defensive needs.

33. Anti-communism had always served as a pretext for the imperialists' rapacity and violations of international law and the sovereignty of small countries. Before the Second World War, the so-called anti-Comintern pact had included only three States—Germany, Japan and Italy; since then, however, the United States had fabricated several military blocks, such as NATO, SEATO and CENTO, and was trying to create a new block in North-East Asia. There was also a tendency to make a regional agency such as the Organization of American States into a kind of new military machinery. The purpose of all the military blocks was to give the United States the right to intervene in various parts of the world. In that light, all the assertions about the peaceful intentions of the United States—including its statements that it was ready to enter into negotiations on the Viet-Nameese conflict, while at the same time it was expanding its aggression—were simply attempts to distract attention from the true situation and gain time for a further increase in military might and in the threats to international peace and security.

34. It was therefore the duty of the United Nations to condemn any kind of intervention in the affairs of other States. The adoption of a declaration on that subject would be a timely reaffirmation of the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter and would

not be to the detriment of any State which truly desired peace and friendly co-operation among countries. The Mongolian delegation therefore disagreed with the suggestion that a decision on the matter should be postponed and with the attempts being made to obstruct the adoption of a declaration by the submission of numerous unacceptable amendments. If the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.343/Rev.1) was adopted, together with the constructive suggestions made by certain other delegations, the prestige of the United Nations would be significantly enhanced.

Mr. Csatorday (Hungary) resumed the Chair.

35. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) said that his delegation had supported the Soviet Government's proposal for the inclusion in the Assembly's agenda of the item under discussion. It was an extremely important one, and its title had been carefully worded to indicate clearly the essential link between the principle of non-intervention and the principle of the sovereignty and independence of States.

36. From the report of the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States^{1/} it appeared that jurists had different views on the exact clause in the Charter which prohibited intervention, but everyone agreed that intervention in the domestic affairs of States was contrary to the principles on which the United Nations was based. The first essential, therefore, was to try to define the concept of non-intervention.

37. In customary international law, the legal basis for non-intervention consisted of two complementary concepts—the equality and the sovereignty of States. The first included the obligation, for each State, not to extend its domestic jurisdiction at the expense of that of another State and to respect the equality which existed—in the abstract at least—between all States, regardless of their physical composition and the power relationship existing between them. Under the second concept, each State was recognized as being absolute master of its rights, without any control by a foreign political Power, within the limits of its territory and in the exercise of its domestic jurisdiction.

38. Neither of those principles was conceivable without the other; and in Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Charter they had been merged into the single principle of the sovereign equality of States. The principle of non-intervention was the logical and essential corollary of the principle of sovereign equality; or it might be described as another aspect of the same principle regarded from the standpoint of respect for the sovereignty of States by other parties.

39. The obligation not to intervene in the domestic affairs of States was not, in fact, derived only from the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Charter; it was also affirmed in paragraph 4 of that Article, which referred to the threat or use of armed force. The actions to which that paragraph referred, whether they were directed against the territorial integrity or the political independence of

a State, were of necessity acts of intervention, since they were designed to violate the basic sovereignty of the State concerned. In fact, paragraph 1 applied to all cases in which constraint was exercised on one State to compel it to subordinate its domestic jurisdiction to the interests of another State, while paragraph 4 referred more specifically to cases in which force was used to violate a State's sovereignty. Paragraph 7 of Article 2 merely stated that the United Nations also was bound by the principle of non-intervention.

40. His country was particularly well qualified to participate in the discussion since, as the President of the French Republic had recently pointed out and as the French Minister for Foreign Affairs had reaffirmed in a statement to the General Assembly at its current session (1341st plenary meeting), non-intervention was one of the basic principles of French foreign policy. Accordingly, France had itself refrained from intervening in the domestic affairs of other States and had opposed interventions when they had occurred; and, in so doing, his Government merely believed that it was applying one of the basic principles of international law incorporated in the Covenant of the League of Nations and later in the United Nations Charter. As the representative of Honduras had recalled, it was the philosophers and political leaders of the French Revolution who had laid the foundations of a legal concept which, enriched by long experience, had found its full expression in Latin America and, more recently, had inspired the Charter of the Organization of African Unity.

41. The Committee seemed to be unanimous in believing that the principle of non-intervention should be strictly observed, but many different views had been expressed on the content and scope of the principle. There was no agreement, for instance, on the meaning of the term "intervention". Some delegations said that it referred exclusively to acts of direct intervention, while others had drawn attention to the many forms of indirect intervention, such as encouragement to subversion and terrorism, the supply of arms and the training of guerrillas and agitators. It was, of course, quite right to draw the Committee's attention to indirect forms of intervention, which were unfortunately far too common; but any reference to indirect intervention raised the question of the legitimacy of direct intervention undertaken in reply to indirect intervention. Was it permissible, for example, to retaliate with armed intervention to actions such as the training abroad of subversive agents?

42. There had been some differences of opinion, too, on the definition of matters falling within the domestic jurisdiction of States. The definition of domestic affairs was difficult enough even in the case of sovereign States; and it was much more difficult if the principle of non-intervention were to be applied, as certain representatives had suggested, to much less clearly defined entities such as peoples.

43. Thirdly, different views had been expressed on the scope of the prohibition on intervention. Some representatives had argued that it should be permissible in certain cases to intervene in the domestic affairs of a State on behalf of a given movement or a given section of the population, which seemed to have

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes, agenda items 90 and 94, document A/5746.

legitimate political aspirations. But Europeans would remember only too well how the pretext of "assistance to oppressed national minorities" had been used between 1933 and 1940; and representatives of countries in other continents would no doubt have more recent experiences to remind them of the dangers of that particular argument. Conversely, the principle of non-intervention was limited by the right which every State possessed, by virtue of its sovereignty, to request assistance from any State or organization of its choice.

44. If every delegation intended to press, without amendment, all the proposals which it had made during the discussion, it would be impossible at the present session to complete a comprehensive study of the question—and he pointed out that the Sixth Committee was currently considering the same question in connexion with another agenda item. It might be possible, however, to reach agreement forthwith on a more general text based on the undisputed principles embodied in the United Nations Charter. A solemn reaffirmation of the principle of non-intervention in a general declaration would demonstrate the importance which Member States attached to the principle and their anxiety to ensure that it was respected throughout the world. Whatever procedure the Committee might adopt, his delegation would be ready to assist in bringing the discussion of the item to a positive conclusion.

45. Mr. KANO (Nigeria) said that his country was opposed to all attempts to bring about change, or to influence any African State, by force, undue pressure or interference in the internal affairs of one African State by another; and, in its own relations with sister African States, it had done its best to live up to those high ideals and precepts. What was needed throughout the world was example rather than precepts—action rather than pious declarations and sentiments. As earlier speakers had pointed out, there was no lack of declarations affirming the principle of non-intervention. What was lacking was the will of some States to abide by the spirit and the letter of that principle.

46. But, though scrupulous application of existing principles seemed to be more essential than the enunciation of new principles, his delegation had welcomed the Soviet Government's proposal for the inclusion of item 107 on the agenda, since it believed that a healthy discussion of the principle of non-intervention would be profitable to all countries.

47. The most obvious and blatant form of intervention was the use of force to intimidate the people of another country or to coerce another country to follow a particular course of action. There had been several cases in recent years of unilateral military intervention by States to achieve certain objectives—either political or economic, or both; and his country strongly deplored such action, not only because it was contrary to the principles of international law and morality but also because it created a feeling of insecurity and instability among peoples and States. Earlier in the session, the Committee had been discussing disarmament and related matters; but as long as the weaker States were afraid of intervention by their stronger neighbours or the great military

Powers, they would feel obliged to arm themselves, even if it meant depriving their people of food and the necessities of life. There was no justification for unilateral military intervention by States in other States, even to safeguard the former's vital interests, since specific procedures for the peaceful settlement of such questions were already laid down in the United Nations Charter. The threat or use of force was even more deplorable when it was applied by one State to compel the people of another State to reject or maintain any belief or ideology or to thwart the latter's free exercise of its inalienable rights to self-determination; and the forcible establishment or maintenance by certain States of puppet régimes without any popular support in other States was equally reprehensible.

48. Of the various forms of indirect intervention, subversion and the encouragement of military coups d'état were of course also to be condemned; but an exception should be made in the case of the efforts of peoples to achieve self-determination—for instance, the struggle of the black Africans in South Africa and in the so-called Portuguese Territories of Africa. The United Nations had in countless resolutions affirmed the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and condemned the policies of apartheid and the subjugation of peoples to colonial rule; and that position should therefore be clearly reflected in any declaration on non-intervention which the Organization might adopt.

49. Though Nigeria was a sponsor of one of the draft resolutions before the Committee, his delegation thought that the other draft resolutions had notable merits and was confident that the various drafts could all be harmonized into a single unequivocal declaration which would be yet another landmark in the codification of the principles of international law.

50. Mr. BUDO (Albania) said that the important principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, which was embodied in international law, in international treaties and agreements and in the United Nations Charter, was even more important in the present-day world, when the aggressive imperialist Powers—particularly the United States—were riding roughshod over the inalienable and sacred rights of nations. But the very fact that the sovereign rights of States were being violated with impunity by United States imperialists, and that no action was being taken by those whose duty it was to stop the criminal acts of the aggressors and who had the means to do so, made him wonder what indeed were the real motives underlying the demand for new provisions and resolutions on the principle of non-intervention. Any new principle which the General Assembly might adopt would, it seemed, be disregarded just as flagrantly as the existing ones had been.

51. The principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States had been established centuries ago; but it had assumed new significance after the October Revolution in Russia in 1917, and its scope and meaning had been further extended after the Second World War, with the emergence of new socialist States and the acquisition of independence by many African and Asian countries; it had been incorporated

in treaties and agreements between countries with different political systems; it was one of the five principles embodied in agreements between the People's Republic of China and other countries; it had been reaffirmed by the Asian-African Conference at Bandung in 1955; and Article 2 of the United Nations Charter expressly referred to the principle of the sovereign equality of States and condemned the use of force against any State and intervention in matters within their domestic jurisdiction.

52. Nevertheless, the history of the twenty post-war years contained countless examples of intervention by the imperialists—particularly the United States—against the independence and sovereignty of States. Faithful to its policy of intervention and aggression, and in conformity with its plans for war and world hegemony, the United States had committed acts of armed intervention against the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Viet-Nam, and Laos. It had committed acts of flagrant provocation against Cambodia and had brutally intervened in the internal affairs of the Congo (Leopoldville). It was constantly resisting the struggle of the colonial peoples for national liberation, by furnishing assistance to Portugal, the racist Republic of South Africa and the white settlers of Southern Rhodesia. It had committed further acts of aggression in Latin America, and had provoked a crisis in the Caribbean by its aggression against Cuba; it had committed armed intervention in the Dominican Republic, where it was still maintaining troops. It had established thousands of military bases throughout the world, thereby threatening the sovereignty and independence of States.

53. By its intervention in the Far East, it had created a particularly serious situation. After its direct—but totally unsuccessful—intervention against the Chinese people's struggle for national freedom, it had established the Chiang Kai-shek régime on the island of Taiwan, which it had then converted into a base for acts of provocation and aggression against the People's Republic of China and other peace-loving countries of Asia. Since the founding of the People's Republic of China, the United States had carried out countless acts of intervention and provocation against that great socialist country which was pursuing an exclusively peaceful policy; and for sixteen years it had prevented the lawful representatives of the Chinese people from occupying China's seat in the United Nations. Instead, it had insisted that members of the Chiang Kai-shek clique should be allowed to participate in the work of the United Nations, although they represented no one; and that, too, was a gross intervention in affairs within the domestic jurisdiction of a sovereign State. Further, in pursuit of its hostile policy towards the People's Republic of China, the United States had obliged the United Nations for several years to discuss the so-called question of Tibet.

54. Mr. SHU (China), speaking on a point of order, said that the Albanian representative's observations on the political situation in China had no foundation in fact and were irrelevant to the item at present under discussion.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that that did not constitute a point of order, and it was not the proper time to exercise the right of reply.

56. Mr. BUDO (Albania), speaking on a point of order, said that points of order could only be raised by the lawful representatives of Member States and not by individuals who had absolutely no right to participate in the Committee's discussions.

57. Mr. THACHER (United States of America) thought that, since there had been no interpretation into English to indicate the nature of the Chinese representative's point of order, the Committee should not, at so late an hour, begin a sterile debate on the rights of various representatives to be present and to assert points of order. Accordingly, he moved under rule 120 of the rules of procedure that the meeting be adjourned.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 119 of the rules of procedure, he would put to the vote forthwith the United States motion for the adjournment of the meeting.

59. Mr. BUDO (Albania) said that there was no rule of procedure authorizing one representative to interrupt another representative's statement in order to move the adjournment of the meeting.

60. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) wondered whether the phrase "during the discussion of any matter" in rule 119 really meant that a motion for adjournment could be introduced before a representative who was already addressing the Committee had completed his statement. His delegation, at least, did not wish to deprive the Albanian representative of the right to continue his statement.

61. Sir Roger JACKLING (United Kingdom) assumed that the United States representative's motion for adjournment was a conditional one, based on the fact that the interpretation from Chinese had not been available, and that the meeting could be continued at least long enough to allow the Albanian representative to complete his statement.

62. The CHAIRMAN noted that a number of delegations felt that it would be courteous to allow the Albanian representative to conclude his statement and that the Committee might consider the United States motion for adjournment afterwards. Since the United States representative was apparently agreeable to that procedure, he invited the Albanian representative to continue his statement.

63. Mr. BUDO (Albania), continuing his statement, said that the United States was still occupying South Korea, which it had converted into a base for aggression and provocation against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the People's Republic of China and other peaceful countries of Asia, thus obstructing the realization of the Korean people's legitimate aspirations for the peaceful reunification of their country. For more than twelve years the United States imperialists had been intervening in the domestic affairs of South Viet-Nam, waging a savage campaign of aggression against its people in order to enslave them and make South Viet-Nam a bridge-head for the further extension of that aggression, in accordance with its plans for war against the People's Republic

of China, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and other Asian countries. In bombing the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam it was brutally intervening in the domestic affairs of a sovereign State and violating the Geneva Agreements of 1954, the most elementary norms of international law and the basic principles of the United Nations Charter. To justify that policy it had, in accordance with its usual practice, calumniated the country in whose domestic affairs it was intervening. In line with those tactics, the representative of a certain country in that area had claimed when addressing the Committee that North Viet-Name soldiers had infiltrated into Laos. That was an entirely false assertion, for the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam had always pursued a policy of peace and good-neighbourliness and had scrupulously respected the provisions of the Geneva Agreements. As far as Laos was concerned, the aggression by the United States against the Laotian people and its violation of that country's neutrality should be denounced by all. The Viet-Name people, who were fighting for their right of self-determination and their national independence, had liberated four-fifths of their country and were confronting the United States with inevitable defeat. Now the United States imperialists had changed their tactics and were proposing so-called unconditional negotiations in order to deceive world public opinion. The Viet-Name people, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam rejected that manoeuvre and had declared that the problem had only one possible solution, namely the cessation by the United States of its aggression against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, the withdrawal of all its armed forces and mercenaries from Viet-Nam, and the termination of all intervention in South Viet-Nam so that the South Viet-Name people could be left free to manage their own affairs.

64. In Latin America too the United States was pursuing its policy of intervention and aggression. It had intervened continuously in the internal affairs of Cuba, intensifying its subversive and aggressive activities against that country for the sole reason that the Cuban people had rejected the yoke of United States imperialism and established a socialist régime. It had launched against Cuba the armed intervention of Playa Girón, and had organized the naval blockade in 1962, committing open aggression against that country. The measures taken by Cuba to strengthen its defences were taken in exercise of the supreme prerogative of every sovereign independent State, and the United States had no right to intervene in order to impose its will. Moreover, United States forces were still stationed in Santo Domingo, trampling underfoot the sovereign rights of the Dominican people.

65. In concert with the other colonialist Powers, the United States imperialists were intervening in the domestic affairs of various African and Asian countries. In certain cases, such as that of the People's Republic of China in 1962 and Pakistan in 1965, they had actively encouraged the aggressors and supplied them with military equipment.

66. Those activities, together with the acts of intervention and aggression committed by the United States in pursuance of the Truman and Eisenhower doctrines

and other doctrines which were equally false, clearly demonstrated that the United States was the most violent enemy of the freedom and independence of peoples and was using gunboat diplomacy to replace international law by a doctrine of intervention and aggression.

67. He recalled in that connexion the so-called Mutual Security Act under which the United States had distributed hundreds of millions of dollars to finance subversive, diversionary and terrorist activities against the socialist countries. That legislation had been invoked to justify armed intervention, so-called preventive war and subversion against other peoples too, as demonstrated by the adoption in the United States House of Representative of a resolution under which the United States arrogated to itself the right to intervene by force in any country of the Western hemisphere.

68. The United States had intervened continually in the domestic affairs of Albania during the post-war period. After the end of the Second World War the United States diplomatic mission in Tirana had become a centre of hostile activity against the People's Republic of Albania, engaging in diversionary and terrorist activities and economic sabotage.

69. In seeking the overthrow of the people's régime and the restoration of the oppressive rule of the traitors who had collaborated with the nazi and fascist occupation authorities, the United States had given direct assistance to Albanian war criminals, organizing and training them to be used against the People's Republic. The imperialist conspiracy aimed at organizing an armed uprising and overthrowing the Albanian Government which was discovered in 1961 was a case in point. The operation, which was to have been carried out with the assistance of the United States Sixth Fleet and forces from other countries, had been aimed at transforming Albania into a colony and a bridge-head for United States aggression against the freedom and independence of other countries. The plot had met with total failure, thanks to the revolutionary vigilance and monolithic unity of the Albanian people and their Government.

70. Because the People's Republic of Albania had struggled to defend the Marxist-Leninist basis of its socialist system and to safeguard its sovereignty and independence and because it had vigorously rejected all attempts at chauvinistic dictation and domination made by a great Power, it had also been the object of hostile measures and acts on the part of that great Power which were in no way different from certain practices used by imperialist Powers. Despite their demagogic protestations of support for the freedom and independence of peoples and the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States, the fact was that the leaders of that great Power had engaged in activities designed to sabotage the building of socialism in Albania, in order to weaken its defensive capacity and thus facilitate the fulfilment of the imperialists' aggressive plans. Those activities included slanderous radio and Press propaganda and threats and blackmail including the cancellation of all agreements between the two countries, the unilateral severance of all relations and the organization of an economic, political and military blockade. The leaders

of that great Power had not even hesitated to call upon the Albanian people to launch a counter-revolution against the Albanian leaders.

71. Despite those hostile activities, the People's Republic of Albania was flourishing, because the Albanian people was concentrating all its energy on the task of peaceful socialist construction and was maintaining its vigilance against the aggressive plans of its enemies. The Albanian people enjoyed the internationalist friendship of the peoples of the socialist countries and shared the solidarity of all peoples throughout the world who were dedicated to peace and freedom. Albania had consistently pursued a policy of peace and good-neighbourly relations with other countries, respect for their sovereignty and adherence to the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States. Albania itself had never intervened in the domestic affairs of another State but had scrupulously observed the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter. It was pursuing a policy of internationalist solidarity with the socialist countries and of peace and friendship with other countries, based on the principles of equality, non-intervention, respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and national independence of States, and peaceful coexistence among countries having different social systems. Accordingly, it had always supported the struggles for sovereignty and independence waged by subjugated peoples against the imperialist aggressors, notably the United States. It fully supported the national liberation struggle of peoples enslaved by the colonialists and rejected the arguments of those who, on the pretext of the danger of a world war, opposed that struggle and urged the dependent peoples to capitulate to their oppressors.

72. In the light of the foregoing, his delegation had doubts as to the true intentions underlying the move to have the United Nations consider the question of non-intervention. Its doubts seemed all the more justified now that the Committee had before it draft resolutions which were extremely vague and contained no measures directed against the United States and the other imperialist and colonialist Powers whose policy of intervention and aggression had created a grave threat to world peace. In his view, such draft resolutions could produce no positive results. The peoples of the world did not need mere declarations

or vague provisions which would add nothing to the existing norms of international law and the fundamental principles enshrined in the Charter. What they needed were concrete and effective measures directed against the imperialists' policy of intervention and aggression, against imperialist and colonialist domination. If the United Nations was going to contribute to the struggle of the peoples against the imperialists it must clearly condemn all acts of aggression and all armed aggression by the United States and other imperialists and colonialists and it must demand that they put an end to all forms of aggression and intervention, and provide if necessary for the application of the sanctions specified in Chapter VII of the Charter. His delegation would be ready to support the adoption of such measures.

73. Unfortunately, the United Nations would not be in a position to take such measures because the United States would prevent any action designed to check its policy of aggression. As long as the United States remained in a position to exercise its harmful influence in the United Nations, the world body would be incapable of performing its essential functions in accordance with the principles of the Charter. Those Member States which supported the cause of the peoples and sincerely wished to strengthen the United Nations should close their ranks and spare no effort to free the Organization from the pernicious grip of the United States, which continued to use it as an instrument of its policy of aggression and world domination.

74. Mr. PACHARIYANGKUN (Thailand), exercising his right of reply, said that he wished to refute two false allegations made by the representative of Mongolia with respect to Thailand. Firstly, the allegation that Thailand had sent troops to Viet-Nam was entirely groundless; the Government of Thailand had never sent military personnel of any kind to Viet-Nam, for it was itself engaged in a life-and-death struggle against various forms of aggression, particularly infiltration and subversion by Powers which were seeking to extend their domination over its freedom-loving people. As for the second allegation, concerning the presence of a foreign base in Thailand, his delegation had already refuted such false statements on many previous occasions.

The meeting rose on Friday, 10 December, at 12.10 a.m.