

The Buenos Aires Protocol reads: "The High Contracting Parties declare inadmissible the intervention of any one of them directly or indirectly, and for whatever reason, in the internal or external affairs of any other Parties."²¹ This principle was incorporated in the Declaration of American Principles of Lima of 1938: "The intervention of any state in the internal or external affairs of another is inadmissible."²² The Declaration of Mexico of 1945 repeats the doctrine, saying: "Each state is free and sovereign, and no state may intervene in the internal or external affairs of another."²³

In the Inter-American Conference of Bogotá of 1948, when the OAS was founded, the doctrine was incorporated in the Charter of the organization as follows:

Article 15. No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the state or against its political, economic, and cultural elements.

Article 16. No state may use or encourage the use of coercive measures of an economic or political character in order to force the sovereign will of another state and obtain from it advantages of any kind.

Article 17. The territory of a state is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another state, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever. No territorial acquisitions or special advantages obtained either by force or by other means of coercion shall be recognized.²⁴

Article 15, in defining intervention as an "attempted threat against the personality of the state or against its political, economic, and cultural elements," introduced a very important change. This definition is so broad that if applied literally, almost anything can be classified as intervention. It might outlaw not only political or diplomatic pressure, but even common practices of economic bargaining. Any threat of force, including traditionally accepted practices in foreign affairs, might be condemned as constituting intervention. Among these may be mentioned concentration of troops along the border, military maneuvers, mobilization and what is generally described as "the showing of the flag." Under this provision, the sending of marines to the Caribbean area during last year's Nixon incident in Venezuela can be described as intervention (and it was considered as such in some Latin American circles). Under the clause "cultural elements" Haiti in 1949 complained to the OAS of "moral aggression" of the Dominican Republic, because of the belligerent broadcast of a radio station in Ciudad Trujillo. Similarly, the terms "coercive measures" (art. 16) and "measures of force * * * directly or indirectly" (art. 17) are extremely vague.

Intervention, as defined in Bogotá, is only 11 years old, but it is possible to look at its practice during this period. Under articles 15, 16, and 17 of the OAS Charter, both intervention and accusations of intervention have been frequent since 1948. Thirteen of the 21 American Republics have been involved at least once. Only Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Haiti, Mexico, Paraguay, and Uruguay

²¹ James W. Gantenbein, "The Evolution of Our Latin-American Policy, a Documentary Record," New York, 1950, p. 778.

²² Gantenbein, *op. cit.*, p. 778.

²³ Gantenbein, *op. cit.*, p. 820.

²⁴ Gantenbein, *op. cit.*, p. 858. But see, also, in this connection, Art. 19: "Measures adopted for the maintenance of peace and security in accordance with existing treaties do not constitute a violation of the principles set forth in articles 15 and 17."