ABSTRACT

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.

This study is an attempt to explain the Law and Politics of Intervention and its recent developments. Non-intervention is the rule, but it is frequently claimed, "my state or my side ought to be allowed to make exceptions to the rule in the form of permissible or justified interventions".

In 1966, the General Assembly of the United Nations resolved that, no state has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatsoever 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. Inpursuance of UN Charter.
5. Inviolation of International Law.
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 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 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.
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.

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 anywhere 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 at least 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".