

There are few interventions which can be justified by right and as such are not violations by the intervening State of the independence of another. They are discussed below along with other grounds which may not afford a reasonable justification for intervention.

1. **Self-Preservation.**- The supreme interest of the State overrides law. The right of self-preservation is more sacred than the duty of respecting the independence of other States. A State has a right to interfere in the affairs of another State where the security and immediate interests of the former are compromised. Interventions, therefore, in order to ward off imminent danger to the intervening State are justified by the force of circumstances. The danger must be direct and immediate, not contingent and remote. Further, the immediate cause for intervention must be sufficiently important to justify war. And, lastly, the necessity of self-defence must be instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means and no time for deliberation. (The Caroline).
2. **Enforcement of Treaty Rights** – A State is justified in interfering in the affairs of another State if the provisions of any treaty oblige the former to preserve the independence or neutrality of the latter. Such intervention does not violate any right of independence because the State that suffers has conceded such liberty of interference by treaty.

Invitational Intervention.- As regards invitation by the lawful government of the State to intervene in its internal affairs, the matter is not free from difficulty. It is again highly controversial whether the invitation from the government could be legitimately regarded as from the lawful government in such cases.

The most conflicting intervention has been the involvement of the United States and other States in the Vietnamese conflict. Although many writers, notably American, have justified the United States intervention in that conflict as a lawful intervention, it cannot be denied that the civil war in that case had been sponsored, aided and promoted by the United States of America, much to the woe of Vietnamese. This intervention may be said to be the outcome of the policy of maintenance of balance of power in the region.

3. **Grounds of Humanity.**- Another justification for intervention is based on the ground of humanity. Lawrence observes that in the opinion of many writers such interventions are legal, but they cannot be brought within the ordinary rules of International Law, which does not impose on the State the obligation of preventing barbarity on the part of their neighbours.

The barbarities committed in East Bengal by the Government of Pakistan in the name of a united Pakistan following a civil war towards the end of March 1971 were unprecedented; and in spite of the loud proclamations of the United Nations, established with the pious object of saving