

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1395th  
MEETING**

Friday, 3 December 1965,  
at 10.30 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 107:</i>	
<i>The inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty</i>	
<i>General debate. . . . .</i>	243

*Chairman:* Mr. Károlly CSATORDAY (Hungary).

AGENDA ITEM 107

The inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty (A/5977, A/C.1/L.343/Rev.1)

GENERAL DEBATE

1. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed satisfaction at the fact that the First Committee had decided to give priority to the item on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty, which had been proposed for inclusion in the agenda by the USSR (A/5977). That question had become urgent particularly because of the increasingly grave turn of world events. Several regions were the scene of fighting in which thousands of human beings were being killed. Peaceful towns and villages were being destroyed, while foreign soldiers were engaging in excesses of all kinds on the territory of sovereign States against the clearly expressed will of the peoples concerned.

2. The reason for that tragic and dangerous situation was that certain Western Powers were intervening by force in the domestic affairs of States and were seeking to undermine the independence and sovereignty of the young nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The proof could be seen in the tragic events which were taking place in Viet-Nam, the Congo, the Dominican Republic and many other trouble spots of the world. It was with justice that the representatives of several countries considered interference in the domestic affairs of States to be the principal source of international tension.

3. The United Nations was bound to act when the peoples cried out in indignant protest against that recrudescence of imperialism. The peace-loving countries must combine their efforts to remove from international relations arbitrary conduct and interference in the affairs of others. It was imperative to protect the small countries against the aggressive attacks of the rapacious imperialists. Under its Charter, the first duty of the United Nations was the

maintenance of international peace and security. Guided by the principle of the peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems, the founders of the United Nations had undertaken to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations. The obligation which all States had to respect the independence and sovereignty of other States was one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and of contemporary international law. That principle was also expressed in the resolutions and declarations of the Asian-African Conference, held at Bandung in April 1955, the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Belgrade in September 1961, and the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in October 1965. The latter Conference, in which fifty-seven African, Asian and Latin American States had participated, had declared *inter alia* that it condemned "the use of force, and all forms of intimidation, interference and intervention". Intervention in the domestic affairs of States could not be justified by any ideological, economic, political or other considerations. The right of any people to deal with problems of internal development and to choose its own future was sacred.

4. There would be some who would question the need to adopt a declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States, since the principles in question were already proclaimed in the Charter and other international instruments. But the fact was precisely that several Western Powers, members of NATO, were defying the Charter and violating the universal principles of international law. With regard to the situation in South-East Asia, for example, there was a wide gulf between the solemn assurances of certain States Members of the United Nations concerning their loyalty to international agreements and the Charter and their actual deeds. The world was following with great emotion the heroic struggle of the Viet-Nameese people against the foreign invaders. What the United States armed forces were seeking was the crushing of the vast liberation movement of the people of South Viet-Nam, an operation which the United States Press and public opinion had themselves described as a "dirty war". Washington was intensifying that war daily and carrying out the notorious "escalation", which could only increase international tension and which was fraught with grave consequences for the whole world. The ruling circles in the United States were pursuing a policy of flagrant aggression against a sovereign State, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, and were ceaselessly intensifying their bombing

of that country, completely disregarding the principles of international law, of the Charter and of international agreements. The forces of intervention, now numbering close to 200,000 men, were using not only the most modern aircraft and tanks, but also barbaric means of destruction such as gas and napalm and phosphorus bombs.

5. It was obvious to the whole world that the United States was acting as an aggressor and was violating the Charter and the 1954 Geneva Agreements,<sup>1/</sup> which guaranteed the peace, independence and neutrality of Viet-Nam and the restoration of its national unity.

6. The acts of aggression committed in South-East Asia and in other parts of the world were linked with the use of bases on the territory of other countries. The United States had massed troops and arms at their bases in Viet-Nam, Thailand, Taiwan, South Korea, Guam, Okinawa and elsewhere. Those armies and bases were used to exert pressure and for purposes of blackmail, and even for intervention in the domestic affairs of States.

7. The Soviet Union condemned most categorically the aggression committed by the United States and declared that it must cease so that the Viet-Nameese people might settle their own affairs without outside interference. It had given and would continue to give the Viet-Nameese people all the political, economic and military assistance they needed. It supported the four-point demands of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. It noted that President Ho Chi Minh had rightly declared that if the United States ended its aggression, peace could be immediately restored in Viet-Nam.

8. Recently, the United States had intensified its intervention in Laos, both directly, by bombing the zones controlled by the neutralist patriotic forces, and indirectly, by supporting the right-wing groups and giving them arms and money. That intervention was a flagrant example of how the United States violated international agreements—and particularly the agreements reached at the International Conference on the Settlement of the Laotian Question, held at Geneva from 12 May 1961 to 23 July 1962.<sup>2/</sup>

9. In addition, the territory of South Viet-Nam was being used by the United States interventionists and their henchmen in Saigon for the launching of attacks not only against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam but against another sovereign State, Cambodia.

10. The persistence with which the colonialist Powers were using armed force to stifle the national liberation movement of the African peoples indicated how important and urgent was the problem of imperialist aggression and interference in the domestic affairs of States. Among the criminal activities of imperialism and colonialism in Africa he would cite the intervention in the affairs of the Congolese people, the economic, political and military support given to the racists of Southern Rhodesia, which had just been the scene of a fresh crime against an African people, the assistance given to the Portuguese colonialists and the South African racists and, lastly, the organ-

ization of plots against the lawful Governments of young African countries.

11. One year ago the NATO Powers had mounted a colonial-type military expedition in which the United Kingdom, the United States and Belgium had participated. That intervention, allegedly intended to save the lives of foreigners residing in the Congo, had caused the death of thousands of Congolese and had enabled the reactionary forces to remain in power. The question had been the subject of a debate in the Security Council in which the indignant voice of Africa had been heard. In spite of the Council's very clear decision,<sup>3/</sup> the mercenaries of South Africa, Rhodesia and other foreign countries had continued their dirty work in Congolese territory. Very recently, when the situation seemed for the first time to have been restored to normal, a military coup d'état aimed at bringing to power the leading supporters of the neo-colonialist policy had taken place in that country, with the overt intervention of foreign elements. It was noteworthy that the Leopoldville putsch had coincided with a visit to the Congo of two generals, one United States, the other Belgian. That combination of events had, moreover, followed the seizure of power in Southern Rhodesia by a racist clique. Those events proved that the ultra-reactionary forces were hurriedly strengthening the bastions of racism and colonialism and broadening the front of the imperialist forces in Africa.

12. Furthermore, the racists of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, like the Portuguese colonialists, had found friends and protectors on the banks of the Rhine. The Rhodesian industrialists, for example, had placed military orders to the value of £5 million in West Germany and were negotiating for the transfer of some of their assets from London to West Germany.

13. The peoples of the Middle East too were among the victims of foreign interference. In 1958, for example, United States marines had landed in Lebanon and United Kingdom paratroops had intervened in Jordan. More recently, the colonialists had committed acts of aggression against the Yemen Arab Republic and had bombed peaceful settlements in South Arabia. Finally, the United Kingdom authorities had taken new repressive measures against the indigenous population of Aden, causing indignant protests in the General Assembly. Aden was now the centre for activities hostile to the national liberation movement in that part of the Arab world.

14. He denounced United States policy in Latin America, where, too, its main victims were small countries. The flagrant acts of interference for which the United States was responsible included the provocation, blackmail and threats to which the Republic of Cuba had been subjected because of the social system it had chosen. In addition, the United States maintained a naval base on Cuban soil. Intervention broke out like an epidemic as soon as events occurred in Latin America which were not to the liking of ruling circles of the United States. Thus, in January 1964 United States armed forces had intervened in Panama, causing many casualties among the civilian population. In April 1965 another Latin American country, the

<sup>1/</sup> Agreements on the Cessation of Hostilities in Indo-China, signed at Geneva on 20 July 1954.

<sup>2/</sup> See United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 456 (1963), No. 6564.

<sup>3/</sup> See Security Council resolution 199 (1964) of 30 December 1964.

Dominican Republic, had suffered armed intervention by the United States for the fourth time in its history. Mr. Juan Bosch, the former President of the Dominican Republic, had recently stated that the desire of all Dominicans was to see the interventionists leave the country's territory as soon as possible. In addition, the former Minister for Foreign Affairs in the constitutionalist Government had stated that the United States General Palmer was in fact the dictator of the country. At the Second Special Inter-American Conference, held at Rio de Janeiro in November 1965, a group of eminent Dominican leaders had stated to the Press that the inter-American forces had come to Santo Domingo not to defend the principles of democracy, but to trample those principles underfoot, under the banner of anti-communism.

15. In defiance of the United Nations Charter, in particular of Article 53, the United States was attempting to involve the Organization of American States in its criminal activities, and the flag of that organization had been used for more than six months to camouflage the occupation of the Dominican Republic. The United States was also planning to create a "permanent inter-American force", and supported the most reactionary elements in Latin America.

16. The unfavourable reaction of the Latin American countries should normally have caused the military leaders in Washington at least to think twice about the responsibility they were assuming and the consequences of their policy. They had not done so, for they had continued to draw up plans designed to permit them to use the Organization of American States as an instrument of intervention. On 20 September 1965, the United States House of Representatives had adopted a resolution aimed at justifying armed intervention in advance, on the pretext of fighting "subversive activities". That was a flagrant example of the attempts which had been made to justify Pentagon intervention in the affairs of the Latin American States. Thus a great Western Power was attempting to extend and perpetuate its policy of violation of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States by first giving such interference a pseudo-theoretical basis. Mr. Harriman, the United States Ambassador-at-large, had said at a news conference at Montevideo on 6 May 1965 that the principle of non-intervention which had been valid during the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth was now becoming obsolete.

17. In addition, an attempt was being made to camouflage intervention by the use of the regional organization, and plans were being made to set up a permanent military and police apparatus which could pounce on any Latin American country which incurred the displeasure of the White House. Those United States policies had met with resolute opposition from the peoples and Governments of Latin America. Thus, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chile had recently reaffirmed his Government's dedication to the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, and the Mexican Senate had stated that adherence to the principle of non-interference was the best guarantee of peace and understanding between nations. Finally, at the conference recently held at Rio de Janeiro several Latin American

countries had called the principle of non-intervention the "corner-stone of the inter-American system".

18. Certain Western Powers followed a different method of intervening in the internal affairs of States, namely, economic assistance to the developing countries. Several official United States documents, and legislation and decisions enacted by Congress, made the granting of aid conditional on the adoption by the recipient States of measures designed to encourage foreign private investment, and bound the countries concerned to abjure the right to nationalize foreign property or take other measures entirely within the competence of their Governments. In that connexion he referred to the Keating amendment, which had become section 112 of Title 1 of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1962, and which provided that in the administration of aid funds great attention should be given to countries that shared the view of the United States on the main questions of international policy.

19. The Soviet delegation believed that it was the bounden duty of the United Nations to speak out for scrupulous implementation of the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty. Many countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America were striving for the international adoption of effective measures against foreign interference. It was for that reason that the Soviet delegation had decided to submit a draft declaration to the General Assembly.

20. He read out the main paragraphs of the Soviet draft resolution (A/C.1/L.343/Rev.1) and said that in bringing the question before the General Assembly the Soviet Union had been guided solely by constructive considerations and by its desire for the maintenance and consolidation of peace. Those who today failed to respond to the policy of piracy and arbitrary intervention in the affairs of others with a categorical "no" might tomorrow be its victims. The Soviet Government was convinced that the adoption of the draft declaration would be of great assistance to the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America who had shattered the fetters of colonialism and were now striving to consolidate their political independence and to achieve economic independence. The adoption of the declaration would meet the vital interests of small countries which were not in a position to defend their rights and independence against imperialist interference.

21. He was surprised that the representative of Costa Rica, in his statement at the 1392nd meeting, should have expressed doubts as to whether the First Committee and the General Assembly could study and adopt the draft resolution in a relatively short time. The representative of Costa Rica had said that it had taken the Latin American countries a century to win acceptance for the principle of non-interference, and had recommended that the question should be referred to a special committee for study. It was not difficult to guess the purpose of that proposal, which was evidently inspired by those who were anxious to defer the adoption of a declaration. But the General Assembly had adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial

Countries and Peoples in a very short time, while the freedom struggle of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America had lasted for centuries. Moreover, the question of the inadmissibility of intervention did not require long study, for the subject was not a new one, and all that was needed was to ensure respect for the principles proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations and recognized by contemporary international law. The adoption of the draft declaration would help to give more concrete form to the principles of the Charter, particularly that under which Members were enjoined to refrain from the threat or use of force. If artificial difficulties were not put in their way, the First Committee and the General Assembly would be able to dispose of the task effectively and rapidly.

22. He appealed to all who were concerned to defend the sovereignty and independence of countries and peoples, and particularly of small States, and who wished to put an end to arbitrary action, aggression and interference in the domestic affairs of States, to reject firmly any attempt to prevent the speedy adoption of the Soviet draft declaration. He hoped that States Members would co-operate in that important undertaking.

23. Mr. GALINDO (Colombia) said that the increasing concern which the question of intervention in the domestic affairs of States was arousing in the United Nations was easy to explain for a variety of reasons. It was not too much to say that in the present circumstances no method of establishing peace and security throughout the world could be effective unless it dealt resolutely with that form of aggression. It was an established fact that certain States were intervening directly in the domestic affairs of other States either by imposing on them political ideas or a particular form of government, or by resorting to propaganda or social, political and armed subversion, which was thus becoming the instrument of a new form of colonialism: the new colonialism, like the old, deprived peoples of the right to self-determination and reduced them to a state of political servitude. As a result, more and more centres of dissension were being created and material and human resources wasted. The ideological struggles, however, could barely conceal the thirst for domination of those who advocated them, for the promises of liberation held out to the victims of such aggression were never realized and the peoples became even more deeply sunk in political anarchy.

24. It was natural and essential that the United Nations, in accordance with the Preamble to the Charter, should endeavour to remedy a situation which was more and more openly undermining its very foundations. The Colombian delegation believed that any policy of intervention, either direct or indirect, in the internal or external affairs of a State was incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. It therefore wished categorically to reaffirm Colombia's adherence to the international legal principle of non-intervention, basing itself strictly on juridical theory, its sole purpose being that the General Assembly should categorically reaffirm its adherence to that principle, for which Colombia, as an American member of the inter-

American regional organization, had constantly fought since it had achieved independence.

25. It was in the instruments on which the Organization of American States was based that the principle of non-intervention had first been made a rule of positive law. That gave the countries applying the inter-American legal system the moral authority to present their views on the question and to protest whenever that essential rule of international co-existence and security was violated or threatened. Unless that principle was effectively maintained and respected, the equal rights of nations large and small, as recognized in the Preamble to the Charter, would be purely nominal, for the autonomy of the small countries would always be at the mercy of a stronger country. Nor could any real coexistence between nations be expected, because coexistence implied co-operation in all fields. In the name of its national heritage, Colombia was bound to defend that principle and to induce as many States as possible to counter the new kind of attacks which insidiously violated it.

26. He recalled that it was at the Congress of Panama, which had been convened in 1826 on the initiative of Simón Bolívar with a view to inducing the new States of Latin America collectively to defend their recently acquired independence, that the Treaty of Perpetual Union, League and Confederation,<sup>4/</sup> establishing the principles of collective security and non-intervention, had been signed. Those principles had guided President Woodrow Wilson when he drafted the Covenant of the League of Nations. The history of inter-American relations showed that the principle of non-intervention had been the keystone of all the attempts at collaboration between States, through the International Conferences of American States, which had met sporadically at first and then at regular intervals from 1890 onwards. He referred in particular to the Sixth International Conference of American States, which had met at Havana in 1928, and to the Seventh Conference, which had been held at Montevideo in 1933 and at which the Convention on Rights and Duties of States,<sup>5/</sup> in which the principle of non-intervention had been accepted as a rule of international law, had been signed. That principle had been reaffirmed in the Additional Protocol relative to Non-Intervention<sup>6/</sup> signed three years later at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, which had taken place at Buenos Aires in 1936.

27. The free world could be thankful that far-seeing statesmen, with a sense of justice and a profound respect for the loftiest principles of human civilization, had succeeded in removing all seeds of discord between neighbouring countries, with the result that it had been possible to keep the Second World War far from American shores. The United States could legitimately be proud of the fact that it too had endorsed the principle of non-intervention and had decided in favour of true collaboration, thanks to

<sup>4/</sup> Treaty of Perpetual Union, League and Confederation between the Republics of Colombia, Central America, Peru and the United Mexican States, 15 July 1826.

<sup>5/</sup> League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CLXV (1936), No. 3802.

<sup>6/</sup> League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CLXXXVIII (1938), No. 4351.

which the inter-American alliance had emerged strengthened by the struggle against the Nazi danger and the American countries had been able to participate jointly in the founding of the United Nations. Friendship between nations presupposed frankness. The principle of non-intervention had already been governing the collective life of the American peoples long before the establishment of the United Nations, since it was stated in articles 15 and 16 of the Charter of the Organization of American States,<sup>7/</sup> an institution which the Latin American countries were now, more than ever, bound to defend and support, for it offered materially weak peoples the protection of law, itself guaranteed by the collective strength of the States members of the Organization of American States.

28. Unfortunately, in recent years a real conspiracy against the principle and the practice of non-intervention had become clearly discernible. Subversive activities against the internal public order of States were being promoted and fomented from outside; Heads of Government were openly encouraging the organization and maintenance in the territory of other States of armed bands which, on the pretext of revolutionary war, subjected the country concerned to a terrorist régime, in order to force it to place its fate in the hands of a foreign Power. Colombia denounced the guerrilla wars which, on the ground of alleged ideological affinities, sought to bring the country attacked under the domination of a party that obeyed the orders of a foreign Government. That type of intervention had all the characteristics of indirect aggression, as the Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States had declared in July 1964, after verifying the fact that arms landed on the territory of a Latin American country had come from the arsenals of the Government that had been installed by force in another country. The Governments of the American States which were at present the victims of intervention had adopted appropriate counter-measures, but those interventionist activities were hampering their development. Nevertheless, when arrested, the rebels were always the first to claim the protection of the institutions they sought to destroy. Furthermore, the strategists of those aggressive acts of intervention periodically launched Press campaigns in the developed countries with a view to diverting the flow of capital from the developing countries chosen as targets for intervention. The Colombian delegation vehemently protested against such practices, which were in contradiction to the statements in support of peace, economic development, self-determination of peoples and social progress made at the United Nations by the promoters of those methods. Some might think that by prolonging under-development or by fostering it by means of subversive interventions, a revolution could finally be brought about; but a revolution could not itself ensure a country's wealth and happiness, and moreover every revolution inevitably led to the establishment of tyranny and to further revolutions which were always considered by their promoters to be the only just ones. He recalled that Nazism had emerged

<sup>7/</sup> Signed at Bogota on 30 April 1948 (United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 119 (1952), No. 1609).

precisely as a revolution of reaction. Lastly, it should not be forgotten that revolutions and attempted revolutions were wars which by sowing the seeds of anarchy destroyed peace. That was why the United Nations Charter categorically prohibited direct or indirect intervention by a State or group of States in the domestic affairs of others. It was essential therefore that the General Assembly should strongly reaffirm that principle. The resources and energies thus released could much more usefully be devoted to promoting the development of the small countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia.

29. Another danger presented by that new form of provocation was that it sought to induce States to abandon the principle of non-intervention. Although the continuation of such a state of affairs could no longer be tolerated, it was inadmissible to combat subversive infiltration by another form of intervention. As it had stated recently at the Second Special Inter-American Conference, Colombia was opposed to intervention of any kind, regardless of its motives, origin or methods.

30. The United Nations must find a way to guard against such provocations, for by the nature of their objectives the present forms of indirect and clandestine intervention constituted actual aggression. For that reason, the Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States, held in July 1964, had described them as acts of aggressive intervention. Article 1 of the United Nations Charter stated that one of the purposes of the United Nations was to take effective collective measures for the prevention of threats to the peace. Such provocations could indeed become a threat to the peace: the General Assembly could prevent that by, as a first step, adopting a declaration strongly condemning the said provocations.

31. Colombia had long been endeavouring, on the juridical plane, to identify those acts of intervention which since the Second World War had multiplied and had developed into a global strategy. On acceding, in 1934, to the Anti-War Treaty (Non-Aggression and Conciliation) of 10 October 1933,<sup>8/</sup> to which all the Latin American States and ten European States had subsequently acceded, Colombia had entered a reservation, stating that it deemed it necessary to define aggression in the following terms:

"Support given by one State to armed bands formed in its territory which have invaded the territory of the other State, or refusal, in spite of the request of the State invaded, to do, in its own territory, everything within its power to prevent such armed bands from receiving aid or protection."<sup>9/</sup>

And in 1936, when subscribing to the Convention to co-ordinate, extend and assure the fulfilment of the Existing Treaties between the American States,<sup>10/</sup>

<sup>8/</sup> See League of Nations, Treaty Series, vol. CLXIII (1935-1936), No. 3781.

<sup>9/</sup> See League of Nations, Treaty Series, vol. CLXXXI (1937-1938), No. 3781.

<sup>10/</sup> See League of Nations, Treaty Series, vol. CXCIV (1939), No. 4548.

Colombia had again entered a reservation giving a similar definition of aggression.

32. In short, the ideas which Colombia was now supporting formed part of its traditional policy in international affairs. Their purpose was, as it had been thirty years previously, to define and prohibit the forms of aggressive intervention from which the world was at present suffering.

33. The threat of aggression was so obvious that it was unnecessary to point out that it was part of a constant, but secret, policy on the part of States which resorted to intervention and moral violence of that kind. The intention of giving encouragement and firm support to subversive activities was often quite openly expressed in official and public statements, and there were specially subsidized agencies—in their way, essentially military bases—for carrying out actual operations practically all over the world, although the countries concerned were at the same time proclaiming their sincere attachment to the principle of non-intervention in the affairs of other States and were insisting that the principle should be strictly observed. Statements of that kind were an offence against the principles and objectives of the United Nations, which had been brought into being by the wish of free peoples to prevent the victory of nazi and fascist totalitarianism.

34. Since the United Nations had been created, it had often found it necessary to devise effective obstacles to indirect aggression on the international level. In its resolution 380 (V), the General Assembly had solemnly reaffirmed that aggression in any form was the gravest of all crimes against peace and security throughout the world. The International Law Commission, in its draft code of offences against the peace and security of mankind,<sup>11/</sup> had suggested some very precise definitions of indirect aggression. Other United Nations bodies had considered the question; but they had never completed their studies, since it had always been thought that the necessary solutions could be deferred until a later stage.

35. But procrastination might undermine the legal and political structure of the United Nations. The consequences of indirect aggressive intervention, when it was developed to the maximum possible degree, were already clearly visible. One only had to look at the obstacles which the United Nations was encountering in organizing its peace-keeping operations through the Security Council, where the political interests linked with that strategy were undoubtedly able to protect it from the effects of international institutional action in favour of peace and the independence of States, and transform it into a powerful instrument of political, ideological, social and economic colonization. Even if indirect aggressive intervention did not give rise to nuclear war, more and more countries were running the risk of conventional war and internal anarchy without any possibility of receiving assistance from the United Nations; and they were therefore obliged to resort to unilateral, individual or collective defence rather than to the established peace-keeping machinery.

<sup>11/</sup> See Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 9, chap. IV.

36. For all those reasons, his delegation had joined in sponsoring a draft resolution<sup>12/</sup> reaffirming the inadmissibility of direct or indirect intervention by States in the domestic or foreign affairs of other States, in terms which included specifically not only direct armed intervention but also—and above all—indirect aggressive intervention intended to impair the sovereignty, the security or the political, economic and cultural integrity of States; the draft resolution also clearly condemned the strategy of encouraging armed bands—organized and subsidized by foreign Governments—to undertake subversive activities which were a threat to world peace and a flagrant violation of the principle of the self-determination of peoples.

37. The CHAIRMAN announced that several representatives wished to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

38. Mr. PRADITH (Laos) wished to offer some clarification regarding a passage in the Soviet representative's statement which related to Laos.

39. He was surprised that the USSR, which was one of the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference,<sup>13/</sup> was unaware of what had actually happened in Laos following the recent capture at Thakhek of fifteen North Viet-Nameese soldiers, including a captain and a lieutenant. He would later give a full explanation of that incident and provide all the necessary details on those unfortunate victims of the North Viet-Nameese policy of aggression against his country.

40. He assured the Soviet representative that there was only one neutralist force and one neutralist party in Laos—namely, those led by the Prime Minister, Prince Souvanna Phouma, and by General Kong Le. That force and that party had, in fact, been formally recognized at Geneva. Any other so-called neutralist or patriotic forces were illegal, and the Soviet Union should help Laos to get rid of them, particularly as it was always asserting that it was an Asian State.

41. With regard to the alleged United States bombing attacks on Laotian territory, the Soviet representative knew better than anyone else that Laos could not authorize any foreign aircraft to enter its air space, or any foreign soldier to set foot on its territory. If the United States ever dared to fly over Laotian territory and to send troops into Laos, the latter would meet with the same fate as the Viet-Nameese military prisoners.

42. His country did not forget that it was deeply indebted to the Soviet Union for all the unconditional assistance which the latter was providing. It would therefore support any Soviet proposals for safeguarding international peace and security.

43. Mr. ALARCON QUESADA (Cuba) said he wished, first, to reply to certain statements made by the Peruvian representative at the 1394th meeting. The latter had announced that a draft resolution was to be submitted by a so-called Latin American group. The

<sup>12/</sup> Subsequently circulated as document A/C.1/L.349.

<sup>13/</sup> Geneva Conference on the problem of restoring peace in Indo-China, held from 16 June to 21 July 1954.

Cuban delegation wished to state once again that it rejected the claims of countries which asserted that there was a Latin American group in the United Nations. If there were such a group, its existence would be a violation of the Organization's essential principles and purposes. His own country, which was a founder Member of the United Nations and which—in view of its geographical situation and its history—was undoubtedly a Latin American country, had nothing whatsoever to do with the draft resolution concerned. Those who claimed that there was a Latin American group in the United Nations were merely trying to impose on the United Nations the aggressive and discriminatory policy pursued in regard to Cuba by the so-called Organization of American States under the orders of United States imperialism. No representative had the right to reduce the United Nations, with its great moral, legal and political prestige, to the lamentable level of the so-called regional Latin American organization.

44. He did not wish at the present stage to reply to the entire statement made by the Colombian representative, though he would do so later; but he did wish to refer to certain facts which the latter representative had mentioned.

45. The Colombian representative had referred to the Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States which had been held in July 1964 and at which, at the instigation and under the guidance of the United States Government, a new plan of aggression against Cuba had been prepared. It had been asserted at that meeting that consignments of arms had been landed on the Paraguaná peninsula in Venezuela, and that the arms had come from Cuba. But, even before the meeting had been held, the Cuban Government had expressly declared that the arms in question belonged to the United States Central Intelligence Agency, which had placed them there in anticipation of a new aggression against Cuba.

46. It seemed that the members of the Organization of American States were quite capable of detecting indirect aggression, or of discovering arms when they appeared, without accompanying troops, on an uninhabited peninsula; but they were blind and dumb in the face of flagrant aggressions and arms flourished by foreign troops, as was the case in Santo Domingo.

47. The Colombian representative had not made any reference to United States intervention in Santo Domingo; but he had felt obliged to echo the lies disseminated by the United States when, in his reference to the Ninth Meeting of Consultation, he had described the Cuban Government as a Government established by force from abroad.

48. At the present stage of the discussion he would not ask how the present Colombian Government had been established or was kept in being. He merely wished to point out that if his own country's Government had in fact been established by force, the force concerned was the revolutionary force and the heroic struggle of a people weary of a century and a half of colonialist and imperialist oppression. The force on which his country's Government was based had been put to the test, and it would reveal itself

again each time his country was the victim of an aggression, such as those which had been supported by United States imperialism with the connivance of representatives of certain Latin American countries.

49. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) noted that though the Soviet representative had urged the inclusion of item 107 in the agenda on the grounds that intervention in the affairs of States was a source of international tension, he had been quick to assert, in connexion with events in the Congo, that the persons now in power in the Congo were the best advocates of neo-colonialism. It went without saying that anything which was not in line with Soviet ideas was bad. That superiority complex, which the Soviet Union manifested in regard to other States, and which it displayed in expressing its own views of what was right, was the very thing that was held against it even by many friendly countries. There was no need to mention the People's Republic of China in that connexion.

50. Any changes which might occur in the Soviet Union were the concern of the Soviet people only. The day before yesterday, they had worshipped Stalin; yesterday they had toppled him from his pedestal and had even treated his remains with indignity. Yesterday they had worshipped Krushchev; today they had banished him from office. That was exclusively their own affair. Those were political events which fell within the sovereignty of each State.

51. The comments which the Soviet representative had made on his draft declaration suggested that the text was based on good intentions—but good intentions of the kind with which the road to hell was paved.

52. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reserved the right to reply at a later stage on the substance of the matters raised by the representatives of Laos and the Congo. For the moment, he wished merely to observe that explanatory and interpretative statements should be used for clarifying the facts and the actual situation, and not for expressing personal emotions or views.

53. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the list of speakers on agenda item 107 should be closed at 6 p.m.

54. Mr. Bohdan LEWANDOVSKI (Poland) requested that, in view of the importance of the item under discussion, the list of speakers should not be closed until 6 p.m. on Monday, 6 December.

55. Mr. GARCIA DEL SOLAR (Argentina) supported the Polish representative's proposal.

56. Mr. VIZCAINO LEAL (Guatemala) said that a number of delegations had requested instructions from their Governments regarding the statements they might make in the present discussion; and, until the instructions had been received, it was difficult for them to express any views on the time when the list of speakers should be closed. The Chairman might, therefore, raise the matter again on Monday afternoon, and consider then whether the list should be closed on Monday evening or later.

57. Mr. Bohdan LEWANDOVSKI (Poland) withdrew his proposal, and supported the Guatemalan representative's proposal.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of objections, the Committee would decide on Monday afternoon when the list of speakers should be closed.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.