CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

It is an inalienable right of every state to manage its own affairs independently. Normally, a state possesses “sovereignty” over its subjects and its affairs within its territorial limits. Consequently, international law imposes an obligation on every state to abstain from intervention in the internal and external affairs of any other state. Dictatorial interference in the affairs of another sovereign state is known as intervention. It means interference has got to be dictatorial in order to constitute intervention. According to Kelsen, “the intervention prohibited by international law is usually defined as dictatorial interference by a state in the affairs of another state. A dictatorial interference is an interference by threat or use of force”. According to Hall, intervention takes place “when a state interferes in the relations of two other states without the consent of both or either of them or when it interferes in the domestic affairs of another state irrespective of the will of the latter for the purpose of either maintaining or altering the actual condition of things within it”. According to Oppenheim, intervention is dictatorial interference by a state in the affairs of another state for the purpose of maintaining or altering the actual condition of things. It concerns, in the first place, the external independence, and in the second, either the territorial or the personal supremacy. But it must be emphasized that intervention proper is always dictatorial interference, not interference pure and simple. Therefore, intervention must neither be
confused with good offices, nor with mediation, nor with intercession, nor with co-operation, because none of these imply dictatorial interference.

In 1966, the General Assembly of the United Nations resolved that no state has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever in the internal or external affairs of any other state. However, circumstances may demand intervention. Intervention, which is dictatorial and is prohibited in the international law, however, can be justified on certain grounds, which are given below:

2. Self-Defense or Right to Exist.
3. Right Over Protectorate.
4. In pursuance of UN Charter.
5. In violation of International Law.
6. In protection of Persons and Property Abroad.
8. Intervention in Civil War.

Any such exceptional rights of intervention of states must be subordinated to their primary obligations under the United Nations Charter, so intervention must not go so far as the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. No matter how moral or desirable or plausible sum of the foregoing justifications of intervention may have appeared in specific instances, the fact remains
that intervention per se is an act in violation of rights which should be inviolable, represents a hostile act, and may be taken to be an ‘act rendered possible only because of the superior force of the intervening state’.

The past few years have witnessed other instances of armed intervention, surrounded in a number of cases by such a multitude of contributory and confusing issues that debate about them is still going on. The duty to abstain from armed intervention clearly means also that no state may permit the use of its territory for the staging of hostile expeditions against another state. According to Lawrence, state should intervene very sparingly on the clearest grounds of justice and necessity and when they do so, they should make it clear that their voice must be attended to and their wishes carried out.

The Soviet attitude towards intervention is very closely connected with their theory of sovereignty. The aim of the Soviet Government, as set forth by the Third International, being to foment world revolution and thereby establish a class-less commonwealth, when a foreign non-communist state is viewed as a struggle of classes, intervention on the part of the Soviets is a commendable and justifiable act by which the sovereign laboring class fulfils its duty of extending its own class achievements to those who are still deprived of the enjoyment of the privileges. The theory, advanced as early as Grotius, that intervention was not illegal when
undertaken for the purpose of liberating the masses from tyranny, is perfectly acceptable to the Soviets. When action comparable to intervention is taken by socialist countries, it can be characterized as fraternal assistance because, in the Soviet lexicon, intervention is defined as the exclusive sin of capitalist states. The Soviet vehemently deny that support for wars of national liberation constitutes a form of aggression or unlawful intervention.

The main purpose of Soviet policy is to have the East European States serve as assets, not as burdens or points of vulnerability, in the strategy of the USSR as a global power. From the very beginning, it was made clear that Eastern Europe, won at a high cost in Soviet lives, is vital to the security of the USSR. Stalin saw the territory as a glacis providing defensive depth and protecting the Soviet Union from invasion not just by some future Hitler but by a present and powerful America.

The study of Soviet interventions in general reveals that, it justified its interventions on the basis of "invitation" by 'legitimate' governments and "limited sovereignty" within the socialist community as propounded by Brezhnev in his "Brezhnev Doctrine". Lenin first propounded this theory in February 1918 by stating that the interests of socialism are higher than the interests of the right of nations to self-determination.
The United States' policy has always included contradictory attitudes and practices with respect to intervention. In order to discourage European intervention in the Western Hemisphere, however, the United States asserted the right to intervene in the affairs of Latin American countries in a fashion that expanded significantly throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The United States in this century expanded its definition of areas of vital interest to include most parts of the world, and, accordingly, has been tempted to intervene in the affairs of states far from the shores of the Western Hemisphere.

The legal logic employed by the United States to support its use of intervention historically has been couched in the articulation of Presidential doctrines. The foundation of US interventionist policy in the Third World rests in the “Monroe Doctrine” and its “Roosevelt Corollary”.

Since the Second World War, however, the term ‘communist’ has been used to justify US intervention against a variety of regimes with widely different ideologies and relationships with the Soviet Union. The “Johnson Doctrine” stated that the United States will oppose where it can or where it dares the establishment of new communist or communist-leaning governments, whether they come into being through foreign invasion, domestic revolution, or election. The presence of a communist element—-even the possibility of subsequent communist takeover----justifies US intervention. “Communism is so blatantly an international and not an
internal affair, its suppression, even by force, in an American country by one or of the other republics would not constitute an intervention in the internal affairs of the former".

Throughout the Cold War, proponents of US intervention have made two principal claims: that the Third World interventions protect American security by preserving the global balance-of-power; and that intervention promote democracy, thereby promoting human rights. The Bush Administration continued America’s past interventionist policies in the post-Cold War era. The Clinton Administration also said that it would act forcibly to promote human rights and democracy.

The study of US interventions in general reveals that, it justified its intervention on the basis of self-defence, humanitarian assistance, protection of nationals, and “invitation” by legitimate governments.

From the ancient Greeks to the present time, there have, always, been some states who intervened in other states in various ways, and by different means. The past and the present history is replete with examples showing that generally the strong states have intervened in the affairs of weak. In the period of colonialism, the European powers intervened almost everywhere or where ever they liked——considering and justifying it as their imperial prerogative. America, which itself was a colony of the British Empire became one of the strong powers in international system
after getting independence in eighteenth century. And, it very frequently started resorting to the use of intervention in its relation with other countries.

In the wake of World War II, some very significant changes took place in the world. The United States and the Soviet Union emerged as the only major world powers leading the two ideologically conflicting blocs—the Soviet East and the Capitalist West, former dominated and led by the Soviet Union and the latter by The United States. The process of decolonization was followed by another kind of colonization: neocolonialism, a system of indirect control and domination. The old system which began with colonialism was effectively maintained throughout the world during the last two centuries by the European colonial powers with Great Britain at the helm of affairs up to the end of World War II.

The end of World War II, which led to the decolonization of the Third World countries, also presented opportunities both for the United States and the Soviet Union to shape or to reshape the world according to their ideological preferences. The United States struggled for the maintenance and expansion of the old capitalist system. The Soviet Union desired the reshaping of the world on communistic/socialistic lines thereby ensuring a competitive rivalry between itself and the United States. The Third World soon became the battleground for their competition. And they got themselves extensively involved in influencing and directing the affairs of
the Third World countries through the application of variety of coercive measures both overt and covert.

They intervened on hundreds of occasions making use of different kinds of political, economic and military measures in the affairs of number of the Third World countries thereby violating the sovereign right of those countries to determine their policies as per their respective interests and desires. They made use of arms sales and assistance as the instruments of their foreign policies for the extension and consolidation of their respective control and domination in the Third World. Arms sales and assistance where effectively served to their foreign policy objectives by enabling them to earn foreign exchange and clearing off their stocks of obsolete weapons, also contributed to the arms build up activities in the Third World and sank it into the morass of economic and military dependence on both the United States and the Soviet Union. Furthermore, arms sales and assistance involving the training of military personnel and officials provided them opportunities for their ideological indoctrination and for their use at some opportune time as Coup mongers.

Other than arms sales and assistance both the United States and the Soviet Union made use of economic aid as levers to pressurize the Third World countries to act as per their desires. Their economic assistance programme did not operate in vacuum. They were rather linked to their
political, economic and military objectives. The United States due to its
economic superiority over the Soviet Union and being the largest supplier
of economic assistance to the Third World countries, used economic
assistance as an instrument of coercion more frequently. Moreover, it also
frequently applied economic sanctions to put pressure on the target Third
World countries to seek change in their policies as demanded by it. The
United States emerged as the dominant user of economic sanctions in the
post-World War II period.

Besides the United States and the Soviet Union, the International
Monetary Organizations, controlled and dominated by the developed
countries of the West, especially the United States like IMF and the World
Bank have also used economic loans as instrument of coercion. These
organizations attaching conditionalities to the loans they give to the Third
World countries seek changes in their policies especially in economic
policies which amount to grave infringement of their sovereignty as
independent nation states. The United States along with its Western allies
especially Britain and France sought to impose varied forms of economic
dependency and exploitations on the Third World countries thereby
exercising considerable influence on their economic development leading
to the creation of acute economic dependency of the Third World on the
developed nations of the West. Infact, the underdevelopment of the Third
World countries which was sought and done by the colonialists in the past
is deliberately being maintained by the developed countries of the West with the United States at the helm of affairs.

Within the realm of their coercive actions, there have been hundreds of occasions when both the United States and the Soviet Union intervened resorting to the demonstrative use of force without war, either to coerce or support the Third World countries as per their foreign policy objectives. While the United States used its armed forces as political instrument was overwhelmingly directed against the Third World countries in the post-World War II period, the Soviet Union’s use of its armed forces following the two decade after the War was mainly limited to the Eastern Europe. However, the Soviet Union in 1970s extensively directed the use of its armed forces against the Third World countries. Besides resorting to the demonstrative use of force without war, they on some occasions intervened militarily. In case of direct military intervention, the Soviet Union also lag much behind the United States. The direct military intervention undertaken by the Soviet Union in the Third World is the only solitary case of Afghanistan, while the United States intervened on many occasions. The more recent cases of US direct military intervention are Grenada, Haiti, Libya, Panama, Iraq, Sudan and Afghanistan.

There has also been a noticeable phenomena of regional powers’ interventionary activities in their respective regions and even sometimes
beyond their regions. Many regional and small powers like South Africa, China, India, Cuba, Libya, Pakistan, etc. have also practiced interventional policies in their neighbourhoods. In all the Third World regions, there have been conflicts and tensions between one country and other resulting from territorial disputes, ethnic divisions, clashes of economic interests, ideological cleavages, and antagonistic aspirations for power and domination. And many of the Third World countries like great powers have intervened on many occasions in the affairs of other countries.

The Third World countries since long have been the victims of stronger/great powers' designs to maintain their respective control over them. In the past, almost all were colonized and after their independence in the post-War era, they have been forced to surrender to the desires and interests of the major powers. And to force compliance, they have extensively intervened in the affairs of the Third World countries.

The Third World countries after getting independence felt that they have got rid of colonial exploitation and domination and are free to shape their own destinies. But the harsh realities of international system, the fundamental character of which is still determined by the great powers especially the United States with support of its European allies, the United Kingdom and the France, forced them to surrender to the hegimonistic
designs of the great powers. The Soviet Union emerged as an ideological rival to the US desires of harmonizing the whole world by American political and economic rules. Th Soviet Union itself while rivaling the United States, tried to color the whole world on communistic/socialistic lines. The Third World unwantedly become the part of their rivalry.

While both the United States and the Soviet Union intervened on number of occasions in the affairs of the Third World countries, the United States became increasingly outspoken in claiming the unilateral right to make the determination whether a conflict any where in the world constitutes a threat to its national security or international order, the United States placed undue emphasis on the Soviet Union as the main provocateurs of conflict and instability in the Third World overlooking the historical roots of these upheavals in the Third World. The United States' perceptions of the Soviet Union as trouble-maker and its challenge to US hegemonistic goals in the post-War provided a false context to the interventionary activities of the US in the Third World.

The United States pursuing its policy of interventionism established in nineteenth century continued its interventions in the same way as it had been doing in the past. It is to emphasize here that the United States often has intervened in the Third World for reasons that have little to do with its rivalry with the Soviet Union, but with its desire to safeguard and promote
America's economic and military interests. The US-Soviet rivalry has virtually disappeared with the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The communism is no more a force to reckon with. The Third World has been the actual theatre over the last five decades, where the United States was extensively involved. And the Third World stands to the greater chance of US interventionism.

The Third World countries will remain a battle-field for great powers, especially now for the United States, as it is evident from the role played by it in the recent Gulf crisis. Any state reluctant to relinquish its sovereignty will be visited by American onslaught. The recent US missile attacks on Afghanistan and Sudan and the ongoing US and British military assault on Iraq are naked examples of the violation of sovereign rights of the states and the provisions of the international law. The Third World countries would continue to be exploited and their policies, especially the economic policies will be controlled and dominated by the big powers. The Third World countries failing to accept the international rules of political, economic and military behaviour, formulated by big powers like the United States, Britain, France, etc., will be visited by their interventionist onslaught as they have experienced the interventionary activities of the big powers in the past.
The principle of "invitational intervention" has provided pretext to superpowers to use smaller states as a pawn on the Chess-Board of power politics in the past during the Cold War period. Now, after the collapse and disintegration of the Soviet Union, the United States has emerged as the only superpower and started dominating the world as an "International Policeman", by dictating terms even to the UN Security Council. And, the other major powers, like the Great Britain and the France, have started working as allies of the United States atleast in the present situations. Although, in the near future, no any country is going to emerge on the international scene, which can pose a challenge to the United States and stop her interventionary activities. In such a situation, this principle of "invitational intervention" would be used unhesitatingly without any check posing dangers to the sovereignty and independence of smaller states. However, it would be in the interest of international community to reject this principle. In fact, one is tempted to agree with Starke that, "in the case of strife which is primarily internal, and particularly where the outcome is uncertain, the mere invitation by either faction to an outside state to intervene does not legalise and otherwise improper intervention".