

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**4th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Saturday, 12 January 1980,  
at 11.05 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

President: Mr. Salim Ahmed SALIM  
(United Republic of Tanzania).

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

Question considered by the Security Council at its 2185th to 2190th meetings, from 5 to 9 January 1980 (continued) (A/ES-6/L.1)

1. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria): Mr. President, my delegation is pleased to see you presiding over the proceedings of this emergency special session and wishes to renew its pledge of full co-operation with you in the discharge of your important functions.

2. I wish at the very outset to reiterate my Government's strong disagreement over having the United Nations involved in an artificially created issue concerning the situation in Afghanistan. Unfortunately, the escalation of the political and propaganda campaign has also been paralleled with the further embroilment first of the Security Council and now of the General Assembly itself. But in neither instance can the bringing of this matter to the United Nations be justified from a sound legal point of view or from the premise of a fair political assessment of its merits.

3. In our view, every country has the sovereign right to determine its own social, economic and political system and to settle the problems of its domestic and foreign policy, including the right to legitimate self-defence and to the exercise of rights and obligations deriving from bilateral and other international treaties to which it is a party. Taken in their entirety, those rights are indeed matters within the exclusive competence of a State, as conceived by the generally accepted rules of international law and by paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations. Moreover, we cannot ignore the categorical objections repeatedly made by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan prior to and during the meetings of the Security Council and also in the statement made at this session of the General Assembly by the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan, Mr. Shah Mohammad Dost. As he pointed out in his latest statement:

"The recent developments in Afghanistan are entirely an internal matter and have posed no threat whatsoever to peace and security in the region or in the world to warrant the convening of such a session of the General Assembly." [1st meeting, para. 41].

4. Disregard of those fundamental considerations would lead to interference by the United Nations in the internal

affairs of a Member State. As my delegation already pointed out in the Security Council debate on 5 January:

"Experience has shown that whenever the United Nations has been involved in similar interference the results have invariably been negative . . ."<sup>1</sup>

5. The revolution that started in Afghanistan in April 1978 was indeed an anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution, which set in motion deep political, social, economic and cultural transformations. State power went to the working people, who, under the leadership of the People's Revolutionary Party, took the destiny of their country into their own hands in order to do away with the backward and unjust social and political system. Unfortunately, the Afghan people was not allowed to proceed peacefully with its endeavours to carry out the objectives of the April revolution.

6. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan had been subjected to counter-revolutionary provocations and armed incursions instigated, prepared and supported by the concerted efforts of domestic reactionary forces, imperialist and hegemonistic circles. They had fomented social strife and incited to rebellion in the country, with the aim of destabilizing the new régime by all means. This criminal conspiracy against the April revolution had recently assumed such dimensions as to put in grave jeopardy the initial achievements of the revolution, threatening the independence and territorial integrity of the country.

7. It has been well established that Pakistan, with the help of the United States and China, has allowed the territory along its borders with Afghanistan to become a stronghold for training anti-Government groups, supplying them with weaponry and sending them back into Afghan territory, thus becoming a staging area for aggressive acts against Afghanistan.

8. In this situation of distress the revolutionary Government of Afghanistan decided to exercise its legitimate right of self-defence, inherent in its sovereign power, and to appeal to a neighbouring friendly country for political, economic and military assistance to repel the armed provocations on its territory perpetrated from the outside. In response, the Soviet Union acceded to those requests.

9. The legal and political justification for such appeals, made several times, and for acceding to them was provided for in the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation signed between the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the USSR on 5 December 1978.

Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, 2186th meeting.*

10. The fact that the Soviet Union acceded to those legitimate requests and provided military assistance has been alleged to constitute “armed intervention” and described as a “violation” of the principle of non-interference. We firmly reject such allegations. In our view, the principles of international law governing relations between States cannot and must not be considered in isolation; nor should their application be judged out of the context of the concrete political situation at a given moment. To abandon such a comprehensive and objective approach may lead to arbitrary and biased interpretations and assessments. The political, economic and military assistance was rendered by the USSR, which has long-standing friendly relations with Afghanistan, on the legitimate request of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, precisely in order to protect the revolution, the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of that country. Of course we understand the motivations of those who, in their preference for the old, backward social and political system, have made desperate attempts to encourage and assist its restoration, either directly or acting by proxy.

11. It is evident also that the hostile campaign is targeted not only at the deep social and political transformations in a developing country like Afghanistan. With the carrying out of its April revolution, Afghanistan embarked on the road to a more advanced political system and adopted a firm anti-imperialist foreign policy orientation. It is not difficult therefore to comprehend that these attacks against the establishment of the revolution in Afghanistan are aimed also at intimidating other developing countries and forestalling their efforts to oppose imperialism and hegemonism and at propping up faltering oppressive régimes in other parts of the world.

12. It is to be regretted that the assistance rendered to Afghanistan in the defence of its revolution is being wrongly interpreted by some as a blow to the principle of non-alignment. In our view, non-alignment as such should not stand in the way of the progressive socio-political development of any country in accordance with the interests of its people; nor should it be grounds for depriving any country of its legitimate right to individual or collective self-defence, including reliance on the help of friendly countries in order to overcome a threat to its independence and territorial integrity.

13. The record of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, including my own, in rendering assistance to national liberation movements and to countries striving to strengthen their political and economic independence against colonialism and imperialism is well established and cannot be distorted by ill-intended fabrications. It is this same policy that guided the Soviet Union in its decision to respond favourably to the appeal by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, in order to remove the threat to that country's sovereignty and right to self-determination.

14. The debates in the Security Council and now in the General Assembly prompt a natural question to come to the fore: What are the real aims of those who launched the political and propaganda campaign against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union inside the United Nations and outside it, a campaign marked by such an arbitrary evaluation of the situation in Afghanistan?

One cannot possibly fail to notice that the most arrogant in their hypocrisy and double standards have been those who are the least entitled to lecture on international legality, for their record of interference in the internal affairs of other States and protection of reactionary and despotic régimes is so notorious.

15. In the case of the United States, it is well known that, even before the recent events in Afghanistan, it had already taken a course to reverse the achievements of détente and to proceed to a policy of “tough retaliation” and confrontation. This reanimation of the cold-war spirit and the hostile campaign against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union is but a propaganda ploy to conceal and justify a series of steps that could seriously exacerbate international tensions. Suffice it to mention the sizeable increase in military expenditures by the United States, its decision to deploy nuclear missiles in Western Europe, its indefinite shelving of the SALT II treaty, its supply of weapons on a large scale to Pakistan and other countries and its frenzied search for new military bases—all measures susceptible of unleashing a new round in the spiralling arms race.

16. We should also add its setting up of “rapid deployment forces” and its unambiguous threat to increase United States military presence in the Indian Ocean, including enforcement of a blockade. The political and propaganda campaign against Afghanistan has also been used to divert attention from a real crisis that the United States is facing in the same area.

17. We heard a claim that the crisis was not between the United States and Iran, but between Iran and the world community at large. I think that, to say the least, such a claim demonstrates the lack of an elementary sense of modesty and truth.

18. We have been witnessing unsavoury efforts to use the events in Afghanistan to legitimize the growing collusion between Washington and Peking and to open wide the door to encouraging and assisting the supply of sophisticated military technology and weaponry to China. It is therefore not surprising that the Chinese hegemonists, who have continually opposed the positive trend of détente, have now willingly joined in this political and propagandistic exercise of cold war.

19. The people of Afghanistan are going through a critical period in their endeavours to affirm the gains of their revolution. The new Government of Afghanistan has come out with a broad constructive programme, announced on 30 December 1979 by the Head of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of Afghanistan, Mr. Babrak Karmal, which is aimed at strengthening the social and political foundations of Afghanistan. We were impressed by the statement made at this session by the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan who reiterated the basic objectives of the domestic and foreign policy of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, including the enactment of democratic laws in all fields of public life and the carrying out of effective measures for national reconstruction. We noted with appreciation his words when he stated:

“The new Government has officially reaffirmed its strict adherence to the principles of the Charter of the

United Nations and to the policy of active and positive non-alignment.”

He added that his “Government . . . [was] desirous of maintaining friendly relations with all peace-loving countries, particularly with its neighbours and the Moslem countries”. [*Ibid.*, para. 60.]

20. I wish, on behalf of my Government, to reiterate the full support of the Bulgarian people for the people of Afghanistan and our solidarity with them in their noble endeavours, and our firm commitment to the traditional friendship and co-operation which has always existed between our two countries.

21. The people of Afghanistan, whose aspirations for a better life and for peace we fully share, need tranquillity and stability in order for them to carry out their broad programme of national reconstruction. In our view, the United Nations should play a positive role in contributing to the establishment of favourable conditions of peace and security in the area.

22. We share the concern expressed by many delegations that the attempts to increase tensions throughout the world on the unjustified pretext of the situation in Afghanistan may inflict severe damage to the international political environment. We firmly believe that it is the proper role of the United Nations at this juncture to stand out against the negative manifestations of cold war which may have far-reaching adverse political and economic implications for the international community at large and for the developing countries in particular.

23. The People’s Republic of Bulgaria, whose foreign policy is inspired by the fundamental objectives of peace, security and international co-operation, will continue to follow its course of peaceful coexistence and the promotion of positive trends in international relations.

24. Mr. BHATT (Nepal): The recent events in Afghanistan reflect a sad state of affairs in international relations. Twice in the course of the present and the last sessions of the General Assembly—within less than three months—the Assembly has been called upon to deal with situations of clear armed intervention by powerful countries against their weaker neighbours. Both cases indisputably fell within the jurisdiction of the Security Council. In the present case of the situation in Afghanistan the matter was indeed considered by the Security Council, but the Council was prevented by means of the veto from pronouncing its official judgement.

25. However, the statements made in the Council and the 13 affirmative votes—out of 15—cast in favour of the proposed draft resolution leave no doubt that the judgement of the world community was resoundingly in favour of respect for the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, against foreign armed intervention in Afghanistan and for the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from that country.

26. My Government has viewed the developments in Afghanistan with serious concern and anxiety. Afghanistan is an active and valued State Member of the United Nations, a fellow member of the Non-Aligned Movement belonging

to the same region as Nepal and a country with which Nepal maintains friendly relations.

27. A land-locked and developing country, Afghanistan is now being subjected to a massive armed intervention from a foreign Power. From the moment troubles had started in Afghanistan, two weeks ago, on 27 December, there had been evidence of almost daily introduction of foreign troops into that country. At stake are not only the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Afghanistan, but also the fabric of civilized relations between States. Also at stake are the principles of the United Nations, the non-use of force and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, as well as the confidence of the international community in the peaceful conduct of international relations. The consequences of this armed intervention are too awesome to contemplate. It constitutes a threat to international peace and security and unless eliminated immediately it will have a far-reaching negative impact on the peace, stability and atmosphere of co-operation and understanding in the region and beyond.

28. The position of His Majesty’s Government on this situation has been made clear by our official spokesman and by the Foreign Minister himself in Kathmandu recently. This position, in brief, is that the large-scale presence of foreign troops in Afghanistan and their direct involvement in the internal affairs of that country are a clear example of foreign armed intervention. Consistent with our deep commitment to the Charter of the United Nations—in particular, respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all States and non-interference in the domestic affairs of another State—His Majesty’s Government has always opposed and denounced all forms of foreign interference or intervention. We have regarded the present armed intervention in Afghanistan as a serious violation of these fundamental principles of inter-State relationships. His Majesty’s Government also believes, as a matter of principle and faith, in the inalienable and sovereign right of the people to determine and chart their own destiny by themselves without foreign interference.

29. For those reasons, my delegation will urge this Assembly to reaffirm the inviolability of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Afghanistan and to call for the immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of the foreign troops from Afghanistan.

30. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia): At the very outset, my delegation would like to reiterate its strong objection to the consideration by the General Assembly of the internal situation in Afghanistan, as a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States.

31. The recent debate in the Security Council on the situation in Afghanistan demonstrated that there was no threat to the neighbouring States, to the region, or to international peace and security. Consequently, there was no need whatsoever for the convening of this session of the General Assembly.

32. Since we are confronted with this artificially created issue I should like to outline the position of my delegation with regard to the question under consideration.

33. Our position of principle regarding the situation in fraternal Afghanistan was recently expressed by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and Chairman of the Presidium of the People's Great Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic, Comrade Yumjaagiyn Tsendenbal, who said:

“The Mongolian people expresses its solidarity with the struggle of the friendly Afghan people for the defence and consolidation of the gains of the April revolution against the encroachments of both internal and external reaction. The Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic fully support and highly appreciate the internationalist aid being rendered by the Soviet Union to the Afghan people at their request.”

34. As I have already pointed out in my statement in the Security Council on 7 January of this year,<sup>2</sup> the Mongolian people, having experienced in the past brutal oppression by feudal lords and external reactionary forces, is well aware of the present situation in Afghanistan, and especially the difficulties still facing the Afghan people.

35. The Mongolian people, in the course of building the People's Republic, has been subjected many times to the encroachments of imperialist and other reactionary forces, and each time has been able to rebuff those provocations and attacks and defend its revolutionary gains, thanks to the fraternal assistance of the Soviet Union, its immediate neighbour and closest ally, with which Mongolia has been maintaining relations of friendship and all-round co-operation since its emergence as the first People's Republic in the East.

36. Therefore, our people are well aware of the genuinely selfless character of the internationalist aid of the people and Government of the USSR.

37. The circumstances that compelled the Afghan Government to turn to the Soviet Union for assistance were very grave, indeed grave and critical for the very existence of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, which emerged as a result of the victory of the April revolution of 1978.

38. The deposed feudal lords and other elements of the internal counter-revolution, as well as the foreign reactionary forces, had stepped up their subversive activities, including armed incursions from a neighbouring country, and were intensively preparing for overthrowing the popular Government. In those circumstances, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan had no choice but to request the Soviet Union to render assistance in defending the revolution and the sovereignty and national independence of Afghanistan on the basis of the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union. We are happy that that request by the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan was responded to positively by the Soviet Union.

39. It should be noted here that this is not the first time that the Afghan people have received such assistance from

the Soviet Union. Both the request of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan for assistance and the granting of that assistance are in full conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and the principle of collective security and self-defence.

40. Many representatives in their statements here have come out firmly for the inalienable right of the Afghan people to self-determination and for its right freely to choose its form of government. The Afghan people, in overthrowing the hated oppressor feudal régime in 1978, was precisely exercising its right to self-determination. It is precisely in exercising its inalienable right to self-determination that the people of Afghanistan has chosen the people's democratic system and the path of social progress.

41. However, from the first day of the Afghan revolution, the reactionary elements in the country and imperialist and hegemonist forces from outside started interfering with the exercise of that right by the people of Afghanistan, because the road that that people had chosen was neither to the liking nor in the interests of those forces. And when the Afghan people, in defence of its right to self-determination and its revolutionary gains, requested a friendly country to render assistance and received much needed aid, all of a sudden those forces turned into the defenders of the cause of self-determination for the Afghan people. That is clear evidence of the hypocrisy and double standards of those who have imposed the discussion of this question on the United Nations.

42. I cannot fail to note that the imperialist circles of the United States of America and those of some Western Powers and the Peking hegemonists are of late intensively engaged in a slanderous campaign with regard to the events in Afghanistan. That malicious campaign will in no way help in solving the problem and is fraught with the danger of increasing tension and reviving the spirit of the cold war. The noisy campaign and flames of the anti-Soviet propaganda now being fanned by the imperialist and hegemonistic circles are intended to conceal the latter's conspiracies against the independence and progressive development of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, Democratic Kampuchea, Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and other States and to divert the attention of world public opinion from their aggressive designs in other regions of the world.

43. The imperialist and expansionist forces are exploiting the situation prevailing in Afghanistan as a pretext for interfering in its internal affairs. As has been evidenced by the present visit to Peking of the United States Secretary of Defense Harold Brown, the United States and China are stepping up their co-operation with regard to subversive activities against the Afghan people. According to various sources and reports, a large amount of Chinese and United States arms, ammunition and other military equipment is being delivered to the counter-revolutionary camps.

44. Those and other acts of the imperialist and hegemonistic forces, such as the creation of an interventionist fast reaction force for the purpose of suppressing national liberation movements, the decision to deploy new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe and the escalation of the United States military presence in the

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 2189th meeting.

Middle East and the Indian and Pacific Oceans, constitute a real threat to the security and sovereignty of States and to international peace and, as such, cause deep anxiety and concern among the peace-loving forces of the world.

45. It is gratifying to note that the new leadership has come out with a concrete, constructive programme aimed at defending and developing the gains of the April revolution and that the domestic and foreign policies of the new revolutionary Government enjoy nation-wide support and the sympathy of the population. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, headed by Babrak Karmal, has embarked upon the realization of measures to restore revolutionary order in the country and the implementation of a wide range of other measures aimed at improving the living standards and the cultural level of the people.

46. The United Nations, which is called upon to promote the economic and social advancement of all peoples in accordance with its Charter, should encourage and assist the revolutionary Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in its efforts for the stabilization of the situation in the country and in the region as well as its endeavours to carry out social, economic and cultural transformations aimed at improving the living standards of the people and building a new society free from exploitation and domination.

47. As far as the Mongolian People's Republic is concerned, the following is the statement issued on 10 January 1980 by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Mongolian People's Republic:

"The Government and the people of the Mongolian People's Republic decisively support the effective measures taken by the legitimate Government of the Afghan people and warmly welcome and endorse the internationalist aid being rendered to the people and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union on the basis of its obligations assumed under the Soviet-Afghan Treaty.

"The Government and the people of the Mongolian People's Republic, together with other peace-loving forces of all continents, condemn the acts of flagrant interference of the imperialist and expansionist forces in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan and demand that an end be immediately put to them."

48. Mr. BUENO (Brazil): Mr. President, I should like to convey the satisfaction of the Brazilian delegation at having Ambassador Salim presiding over our deliberations at this sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly. We wish him the best of success in the discharge of his duties and extend our good wishes to the other members of the General Committee.

49. The Brazilian Government has always held that the principles of self-determination and sovereign equality of States and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States are the basic foundations of international peace and security. Every State has the duty to abide by those principles and the right to demand their observance by all member States of the international community.

50. A breach of the principles of self-determination and non-intervention constitutes a threat to international peace and, as such, is a subject of great concern to the United Nations, which is the international body entrusted with the consideration of matters pertaining to international peace and security. Any action of a State which jeopardizes the national integrity and the sovereignty of another State is a step backwards in the development of international relations. Furthermore, Brazil has consistently condemned the use of force and the threat of the use of force in international relations.

51. The principles to which I refer necessarily determine our view of the evolving situation in Afghanistan. The Brazilian Government deplores the foreign intervention taking place in that country and expects that the deliberations of this Assembly will contribute to the normalization of the situation.

52. The convening of the General Assembly as a display of the widespread concern among the international community over the gravity of the situation provides a further opportunity to promote the purposes and principles upon which this Organization is built. We sincerely hope that this effort will constitute a step forward in the building of a collective commitment to the respect for those principles of self-determination and independence to which every people and State is entitled.

53. Mr. SOUTHCHAK (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation wishes once again to congratulate Mr. Salim on his assumption of the presidency of the General Assembly at this emergency special session. His qualities and his experience were apparent throughout the thirty-fourth session of the Assembly.

54. The delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, which, along with its sister delegations of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the Mongolian People's Republic, opposed the adoption of the agenda of the emergency special session contained in document A/ES-6/1 of 9 January, has in no way endorsed the unjustified convening of this session to consider an issue that comes exclusively within the competence of a Member State of our Organization. Indeed, the Security Council, the body entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, has just emerged from a debate no less acrimonious than this one, without, however, being able to determine the existence of a threat to peace under the terms of the Charter of the United Nations that, pursuant to resolution 377 (V), on uniting for peace, required the convening of such a session of the General Assembly in order to make any type of recommendations.

55. For some time now international imperialists and reactionaries, taking advantage of events in Afghanistan, have been attempting to mobilize international public opinion to support interference in the internal affairs of that country.

56. A situation does indeed exist in Afghanistan. It results from the action of the imperialists and expansionists of large countries who, after their ignominious defeats in their dirty wars of aggression against Viet Nam and the other

countries of Indo-China, have in recent years engaged in an escalation of their habitual aggression against independent States of Asia—in this case, Afghanistan—Africa and Latin America to impose on peoples retrogressive exploitative régimes that have been condemned by the non-aligned countries, the socialist countries and all forces that are devoted to world peace and justice.

57. After having for centuries endured the excesses of a dictatorial feudal régime that had kept it in squalor, obscurantism and stagnation, the heroic Afghan people rose up to overthrow that régime on 27 April 1978. The great victory of the Afghan people opened up a new era for that country, one of complete independence and genuine freedom, in which, for the first time in its history, the entire Afghan working people finally became master of its own destiny. But the just path followed by the Afghan people to build a progressive society became the target of the overthrown counter-revolutionary forces aided by imperialism and the expansionists of large countries, who from the outset had not abandoned their dark schemes to destroy the young revolutionary State of Afghanistan, whose geographical position is of extreme strategic importance. They thus assisted financially and materially the national reactionaries to make trouble in various parts of the country and to destroy the bases of the national economy and sow division among the various ethnic and religious groups.

58. Taking advantage of the confused situation that they thereby created, they even succeeded in corrupting and infiltrating a group of anti-revolutionary individuals in the leading circles of Kabul in order to carry out the coup d'état of last September. After having assassinated Mr. Noor Mohammed Taraki, the well-loved and respected leader of the Afghan revolution, Hafizullah Amin and his acolytes day by day followed a path treacherous to the Afghan nation and people by massacring and incarcerating a large number of patriots and revolutionaries. Confronted with such a situation, the real revolutionary forces, led by Babrak Karmal, rose up to overthrow the reactionary clique and set up genuine people's power in order victoriously to guide the Afghan revolution.

59. In the face of the great victory of the Afghan people, international imperialists and reactionaries, suffering even more stunning defeats, exaggerated the matter by raising a clamour with slanderous and unjustified accusations against Afghanistan and the Soviet Union, which together are working to safeguard the achievements of the Afghan revolution and the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan.

60. The bringing of the so-called situation in Afghanistan before the Security Council and the General Assembly has once again unmasked for the world the dangerous policy of domination and exploitation of peoples by international imperialists and reactionaries, who have committed acts of brazen interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. In this Assembly, as well as in the Security Council, we have heard expressions such as "carefully organized conspiracy", "armed attacks", and "interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan from abroad". No one can deny the existence of subversive activities perpetrated by the imperialist circles and international reactionaries. While the Afghan army of

liberation is still carrying out operations against internal reactionary forces in Afghanistan, the world is becoming better informed of the existence of preparations and plots against the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan, plots organized and led from training camps in the territories of neighbouring countries and armed attacks monitored from those camps with the material support of those circles. All of those acts infringe the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan, and they are a gross interference in the internal affairs of that country.

61. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, which weighed the gravity of the situation and all its consequences, in sovereignty decided to appeal for military assistance from the Soviet Union, assistance whose major purpose is solely to eliminate foreign threats to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan and to repel foreign armed attacks and aggressions against it.

62. The Soviet Union acceded to Afghanistan's request for assistance to preserve its independence, which was endangered by acts of armed provocation and aggression on the part of the imperialists and expansionists of large nations, by sending limited contingents to Afghanistan. That was a response to an appeal made by one sovereign State to another under the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation signed on 5 December 1978 and did not in any way constitute a violation of the sovereignty of Afghanistan. The Afghan action, like that of the Soviet Union, is just action in conformity with international law and the Charter of the United Nations which, in Article 51, enshrined the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations. It is in accordance with the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex*], a declaration which entitles peoples to seek or to receive support in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter in the exercise of their right to self-determination.

63. In the light of those internationally recognized principles, the fulfilment by the Soviet Union and Afghanistan of obligations which derive from the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation in no way conflicts with the Charter obligations of Members of the United Nations. On the contrary, it can only further friendly relations and co-operation between nations in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

64. We regret that co-operation between two sovereign States, the Soviet Union and Afghanistan, in the interests of their peoples and also in the cause of the lasting peace and security of the region should have been subject to a clamorous propaganda of slander directed by Washington and Peking to mislead the Security Council and the General Assembly about the real situation in Afghanistan.

65. The manoeuvres of imperialist circles and of international reaction are more subtle and treacherous, but the forces of progress devoted to peace and justice will not be duped by those manoeuvres.

66. Indeed, the Members of our Organization are perfectly aware of the danger threatening international peace and security, a danger posed by the imperialists and expansionists of large nations who have unceasingly interfered in the internal affairs of medium-sized and small States and committed acts of aggression, thereby flouting the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, a principle which the non-aligned countries have constantly supported and reaffirmed, and also flouting the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The deeds of international reaction in collusion with imperialism are only too well known to the peoples of Asia. We have proof of them in the armed aggression against Viet Nam in February last year and even now the threat of another “lesson” being given that country; and the activities of subversion and interference in the internal affairs of Laos, which are demonstrated by the assistance and support given to exiled Lao reactionaries to sabotage the peace, tranquillity and order of the country and to fight against the policy of the Government of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic. Nor have the international reactionaries to commit revolting crimes against the people of Kampuchea in order to discharge their responsibilities.

67. The blustering allegations of a so-called threat which the so-called situation in Afghanistan poses to international peace and security have been trumped up by international imperialists and reactionaries to serve as a pretext to provide destabilization and sow collective panic among third-world countries. By so doing, they hope to become the protectors of countries which are won over by that propaganda of fear, in order to legitimize their preparations with a view to strengthening their military potential in various parts of the world.

68. The Afghan people, under the leadership of the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan, has chosen the path of progress and of non-alignment in the conduct of its domestic and foreign policy. We are firmly convinced that that heroic people, strengthened by the support and assistance of friendly countries, will win new and great victories in the building of its country and in the struggle to safeguard the achievements of its revolution. My delegation, on behalf of the Government of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, would like to declare before this Assembly its firm support for the struggle of the Afghan people.

69. It is stated in the Charter, under Article 2, paragraph 7, that “Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State . . .”.

70. In accordance with that principle, the delegation of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic will not be able to support the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1 which would lead to interference of a more grave nature in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

71. Mr. VARELA QUIROS (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Less than a month ago, when the General Assembly adopted resolution 34/103, the representative of a great Power stated:

“The General Assembly has just adopted an important decision of principle condemning the policy of

hegemonism in all its forms and manifestations. On behalf of the peoples of the United Nations, the General Assembly has stated clearly that no State or group of States should in any circumstances or for any reason exercise hegemony in international relations or strive to assume a dominant position in the world or any region of the world.”<sup>3</sup>

The statement concluded as follows:

“True to that ideal of the October Revolution, and consistently pursuing a policy of peace, the Soviet Union will continue staunchly to counteract hegemonistic ambitions wherever they may emerge.”<sup>3</sup>

72. A few days later that same Power, the Soviet Union, invaded a small country which was unable to defend itself against that Power’s military might, and transformed a non-aligned, developing country into one more victim of “the policy of hegemonism and usurpation of its sovereignty and economic and national independence”,<sup>3</sup> to use the same terms then used by the representative of the Soviet Union when he alerted the peoples of the world to the danger posed by the policy of hegemonism to the developing countries.

73. This sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly had to be convened because the invasion perpetrated against Afghanistan—an invasion which has been condemned by the majority of the members of the international community—was justified and indeed firmly defended by the very representative who, from this very rostrum, condemned the policy of hegemonism with strong and compelling words. That same representative who today is trying to convert into the “yes-men” of other Powers those who only yesterday were in the ranks of the naive who by their votes contributed to the resounding diplomatic victory of the Soviet Union—that same representative loudly vetoed any Security Council action, even a simple declaration, to which the Powers are so accustomed and to which so little respect is paid, as facts clearly demonstrate.

74. My country, and strangely enough Afghanistan as well, was among those delegations which in good faith cast an affirmative vote for the now famous—I say “famous” because of the irony of the situation—resolution on hegemonism. No one then accused us of participating in some orchestration. No one then talked about falsehood. No one then drew a distinction between the good countries and the bad ones. No one then questioned the vote of Afghanistan because the régime of former President Amin did not conduct itself in accordance with certain principles and kept the prisons of the country filled with political prisoners or lent itself to “counter-revolutionary” manoeuvres. No one then foresaw the speed and deftness with which the Soviet army would sound the cannon to muffle the cries of the people for freedom. No one then realized how voracious would be the defenders of the doctrine of limited sovereignty, who rapidly provided the world with a new example of hypocrisy and mockery not only of the most fundamental principles of the Charter of

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 103rd meeting.

the United Nations, but also of its most hallowed policies of non-intervention and good neighbourliness in the field of international relations. No one then remembered those tiny nations of the Baltic—Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia—victims, like Afghanistan, of treaties of friendship.

75. The world's memory fails it, particularly in the case of the acts of the powerful. The world is already weary of words—and many have been uttered here. Here we try to give the same weight to words as does the speaker who uses them. But the result is that we do not understand one another, with each claiming to have the correct interpretation. If sovereignty meant the same thing to everyone, if international treaties were always as binding as are treaties of friendship and if the self-determination of peoples did not have different connotations depending upon who preached it, then it would be easier to understand each other and to proceed united to achieve the shared aims for which this Organization was founded, when the flames of a war which had inflicted such suffering upon mankind had finally been put out.

76. My delegation is not going to give a detailed narration of the events that have occurred in Afghanistan. Others have taken it upon themselves to do so and each has sought to interpret those events in accordance with his interests—to turn a highly perfected “fascist-type invasion”, as my delegation described it before the Security Council,<sup>4</sup> into an act of friendship, a generous act in the best interests of a weak, defenceless country threatened by external forces. These are the facts, and however one may wish to describe them, no one can change them. My delegation makes a sincere appeal that the truly peace-loving States should not hesitate to add their vote to the condemnation of the invasion of Afghanistan, so that all the peoples of the world will join in the general repudiation felt by the international community. That is the only way that the Powers—each one of them—will realize that the world will not remain silent when their acts endanger international peace and security. That is the only way that this Organization can fulfil its crucial role to preserve coming generations from the scourge of war.

77. In conclusion, my delegation would like to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/ES-6/L.1, which concerns the situation in Afghanistan and its impact on international peace and security, even though we believe that this draft should be more precise in its condemnation of the act of aggression perpetrated by the Soviet Union by identifying that country by name, and not euphemistically.

78. Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): This emergency session marks only the sixth time that the General Assembly has been specially convoked under the “uniting for peace” procedure to discharge the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations when the Security Council was prevented from doing so. On each of those occasions, the precarious peace guarded by this Organization was undermined by a crisis that challenged principles underlying the Charter of the United Nations. The infrequency with which the Security Council has used this extraordinary procedure attests to the world's collective

judgement that it be invoked sparingly and only in grave circumstances.

79. Today we are faced with a challenge to the principles of the Charter as grave as any that necessitated our meeting during previous crises. We need no long oration, no extensive remarks, to remind us why we are gathered here.

80. Afghanistan, a Member of the United Nations, has been invaded by the Soviet Union, another Member. It was invaded in violation of the Soviet Union's obligation not to use force against the territorial integrity and political independence of another State—an obligation imposed on the Soviets by both the Charter of the United Nations and a bilateral treaty between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan.

*Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania) resumed the Chair.*

81. Afghanistan, a non-aligned sovereign State, has been occupied by Soviet troops, in violation of the international legal principle that no State may intervene by force in the internal affairs of another.

82. Afghanistan has had its Government toppled and replaced by a régime chosen by the Soviet Union, in violation of every nation's right to self-determination by its people.

83. When I addressed the Security Council during its debate on this matter,<sup>5</sup> I chronicled the brutal series of events in Afghanistan. All here know how the Soviet Union airlifted tens of thousands of troops into the territory of its neighbour and took over the Afghan capital of Kabul. All know that after Soviet troops had surrounded the Presidential Palace in Kabul, the President of Afghanistan was summarily executed and a puppet leader from abroad was installed in his place. All know that the Soviet Union then undertook widespread military operations to subjugate Afghanistan and its people.

84. Every Member of the United Nations also knows that the invasion of Afghanistan poses a threat—a serious threat—to other countries, both in South-West Asia, where the current level of tension and instability is already high, and also elsewhere in the world. It poses a particular danger to Afghanistan's neighbours.

85. The Soviet Union and its allies, including the Foreign Minister representing the Soviet-installed régime now in power in Kabul, have asserted, both here and in the Security Council, that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was prompted by armed intervention in that country by other foreign Powers, including, as they tell it, the United States. They have asserted that all the world is well aware that Afghanistan has been the target of so-called imperialist aggression aimed at overthrowing the “popular democratic régime” that governs Afghanistan.

86. But all the world knows no such thing. Those allegations are an obvious attempt to divert attention from the central issue. The Soviet allegations are nothing more than a transgressor's attempt to mask its misdeeds, and no one can or should believe them.

<sup>4</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year*, 2187th meeting.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*



87. We are particularly insulted by the transparent falsity of the Soviet claim that its troops entered Afghanistan at the repeated invitation of the "popular democratic régime". As so many of my fellow delegates have pointed out during this debate, no reasonable man could possibly believe that the Government of President Amin had issued such a deadly invitation. Amin's Soviet-appointed successor was not even in office at the time Soviet troops first entered Afghanistan.
88. The truth of the matter is that the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan to quell determined opposition by the Afghan people to their own Government. The Soviet Union replaced one leader in Afghanistan with another to its own liking, and it is sheer hypocrisy for the Soviets to claim that their presence was necessary to prevent the overthrow of a "popular democratic régime" by so-called imperialist forces.
89. Neither the Charter of the United Nations nor any bilateral treaty affords the Soviet Union, or any country, the right to take military action in another country because it disagrees with the policies or performance of the existing Government. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan flouts international law, breaches world peace and threatens regional and global security.
90. The universal outcry against the attempt to subjugate a non-aligned State by its great-Power neighbour, the Soviet Union, proves that the world cannot condone military intervention by one State in another without legal or moral justification. The strong responses by many countries—including my own—to this act of aggression demonstrate to the Soviet Union that it cannot ignore international law without suffering serious consequences. The United States and other nations are considering other unilateral and multilateral measures further to demonstrate to the Soviet Union the magnitude of its error, including the withdrawal from cultural exchanges, trade missions and even the 1980 Summer Olympic Games.
91. But unilateral action on the part of individual States is most effective when it is taken in concert with collective action that expresses the will of the world community.
92. The Security Council considered the threat to peace raised by the Soviet invasion at length. The vast majority of its members voted to call for the withdrawal of the invasion force in Afghanistan, but the Soviet Union vetoed the draft resolution and stymied the Council's attempt to discharge its peace-keeping function under the Charter. Therefore the nations of the world have turned to the General Assembly to denounce that dangerous breach of peace and security.
93. It is imperative that we, the Member States of the United Nations, express in clear and forceful terms that we shall never condone lawless interference with the right of a sovereign people and the lawless invasion of its territory.
94. It is imperative that we demand the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, so that the people of that country can be free to set their own course in the world and to choose their own leaders.
95. It is imperative that we demonstrate that we cannot be duped into ignoring our responsibility to defend the principles of the Charter by tortured explanations that insult our intelligence.
96. Above all, it is imperative that we view this incident for what it really is. The Soviet Union insists that this General Assembly debate has been prompted by American and Chinese pettifogging; that it is being used as an excuse to renew the cold war; and that denunciation by the members of the General Assembly of the Soviet invasion will amount to an abandonment of the principles of non-alignment embraced by many nations represented here.
97. But the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan is no cold-war squabble. It is an act that the rest of the world cannot afford to ignore. It demonstrates that the Soviet Union has no real commitment to the principles of territorial integrity, self-determination and non-alignment when those principles conflict with the Soviet Union's perception of its own interests.
98. For this body to remain silent in the face of open aggression would be for the Members of the United Nations to condone a violation of the only principles that small nations can invoke to protect themselves from self-aggrandizement by larger and more powerful States. It is not the United States whose freedom is most threatened by Soviet indifference to the Charter; the small and non-aligned countries like Afghanistan are most imperilled.
99. So we cannot remain mute. We must speak out. We must stand united in support of the principle of freedom, in support of the principle of independence and in support of the principle of self-determination.
100. Mr. NARANCIO (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First of all, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your presidency of this emergency special session of the General Assembly during which you will have a further opportunity to demonstrate the qualities already manifested during your presidency of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly.
101. My Government has viewed with deep concern the events in Afghanistan. It has borne in mind the following facts: first, in the first weeks of December the Soviet Union seized Bagram Airport, north of Kabul, and sent the equivalent of one regiment by air; secondly, it sent troops and *matériel* to Kabul Airport and mobilized enormous forces and troops along Afghanistan's borders; thirdly, on 25 and 26 December in a massive Soviet airlift to Kabul some 10,000 men were taken to Afghanistan; fourthly, on 27 December the Presidential Palace in Kabul was surrounded by Soviet assault troops, at which time Afghan soldiers were attacked and overtaken. President Amin was killed and, simultaneously, Soviet troops attacked Afghan forces protecting Radio Afghanistan and other key government installations and took control of them; fifthly, Soviet troops seized all key civilian and military installations located in the Kabul area, setting up a defence belt around the city; sixthly, after the overthrow of the Afghan Government, two Soviet armoured divisions entered by land, one through Kushka and the other through Termez; seventhly, the existence of a treaty signed in Moscow on 5 December 1978 between the Soviet Union and the President of Afghanistan, Hafizullah Amin, was adduced; and, eighthly, a violent struggle is still raging today.

102. The events that I have set forth fly in the face of the very ideas held by the Soviet Union, as expressed in this Organization, and openly violate Article 103 of the Charter, which states:

“In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail.”

They also violate article 53 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which stipulates:

“A treaty is void if, at the time of its conclusion, it conflicts with a peremptory norm of general international law. For the purposes of the present Convention, a peremptory norm of general international law is a norm accepted and recognized by the international community of States as a whole as a norm from which no derogation is permitted and which can be modified only by a subsequent norm of general international law having the same character.”<sup>6</sup>

They violate article 3, paragraph (e), of the Definition of Aggression [*General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), annex*], which stipulates that the following constitutes an act of aggression:

“The use of armed forces of one State which are within the territory of another State with the agreement of the receiving State, in contravention of the conditions provided for in the agreement or any extension of their presence in such territory beyond the termination of the agreement;”

and Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which states:

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations 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.”

103. Furthermore, we have some doubts about whether Article 2, paragraph 2, of the Charter is being complied with. It states:

“All Members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter.”;

and we also have similar doubts with respect to Article 102, paragraphs 1 and 2, which states:

“1. Every treaty and every international agreement entered into by any Member of the United Nations after the present Charter comes into force shall as soon as possible be registered with the Secretariat and published by it.

“2. No party to any such treaty or international agreement which has not been registered in accordance

with the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article may invoke that treaty or agreement before any organ of the United Nations.”

All this has been mentioned already, but I have not referred to other rules, such as the stipulations in the Preamble of the Charter, since that would lengthen my statement.

104. Up to now I have referred to what has been said in the Security Council debates and has, in general, been accepted: it has likewise been said and accepted in the Assembly.

105. Moreover, it has also been emphasized that the Soviet Union has repeatedly put forward proposals on non-intervention, on the right of each State to choose its political system, against the use of force, against hegemonism, and so on. For example, during the twentieth session of the General Assembly, it put forward an item entitled “The inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty”. A resolution on the subject, resolution 2131 (XX), was adopted, paragraphs 1 and 5 of which read:

“1. No State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements are condemned.

“5. Every State has an inalienable right to choose its political, economic, social and cultural systems, without interference in any form by another State.”

106. According to the summary record, Mr. Fedorenko, representative of the Soviet Union, said the following in the First Committee during the twentieth session of the General Assembly, in 1965, when referring to an initiative taken by his country:

“It must not be forgotten that the main reason for the existing explosive situation was precisely armed intervention in the affairs of States. That was the source of international tension and it was that intervention which was gravely threatening the independence and sovereignty of States and peoples.

“... ”

“The Committee had the opportunity to formulate forthwith a document which would enable the United Nations to make a major contribution towards protecting the independence and sovereignty of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, defending peace and freedom and putting an end to international brigandage, armed intervention and other forms of interference in the domestic affairs of States. The Committee must not simply file away a question of such great importance. The peoples expected the United Nations not to engage in sterile and endless discussions but to take practical measures as soon as possible. If it failed to do so, it would not justify the hopes of the peoples which were vehe-

<sup>6</sup> See *Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties, Documents of the Conference* (United Nations publication, Sales No. I.70.V.5), document A/CONF.39/27, p. 287.

mently protesting against the interventions of certain imperialist Powers. All who really wished to put an end to aggression and the violation of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law should repulse the attempts that were being made to prevent the speedy adoption of a declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty.”<sup>7</sup>

107. The self-same Mr. Fedorenko quoted his Foreign Minister in the following terms:

“As Mr. Gromyko, the Soviet Minister for Foreign Affairs, had stated in the Supreme Soviet, the USSR had not been concerned, in putting forward its proposal, with its own immediate interests, because it was capable of defending itself alone; however, there were a great many young States in the world which must be given all possible support and guarantees against foreign interference if a policy of self-determination was to be pursued.”<sup>8</sup>

108. During the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, a Soviet proposal was adopted, as contained in resolution 32/150, “to establish a Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations” to draft an international treaty on the non-use of force in international relations.

109. More recently, the Soviet Union submitted a proposal to that Special Committee on 22 August 1978, article I, paragraphs 1 and 3, of which stipulates:

“1. The High Contracting Parties shall strictly abide by their undertaking not to use in their mutual relations, or in their international relations in general, force or the threat 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.

“3. No consideration may be adduced to justify resort to the threat or use of force in violation of the obligations assumed under this Treaty.”<sup>9</sup>

110. During the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union sponsored the inclusion of a new agenda item, entitled “Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations” and submitted a draft resolution<sup>10</sup> that took note of the fact that the policy of hegemonism, which reflected the desire of certain States to dominate other States and peoples, flagrantly contradicted the principles of the Charter and, first and foremost, the principle of the sovereign equality of States, and condemned the policy of hegemonism, stating that no State or group of States could in any circumstances or for any reason whatsoever pursue a policy of hegemonism in international relations or seek a position of domination in the world or in any region.

111. We wish to express our Government’s repudiation and condemnation of the armed intervention of the Soviet Union in Afghan territory. My delegation believes that an accurate interpretation of the deplorable episode that has brought us together today would take account of the historical context beginning with the fascist invasion of an African country, which can be compared with other similar events that have occurred up to today.

112. The representative of Senegal on 10 January 1980 [*1st meeting*] recounted the invasion of Austria on 12 March 1938. We may add that one year afterwards the Nazi army entered Prague as a result of a “request for protection” received from President Hacha, the successor of Benes. Then, on 1 September 1939, Poland was invaded.

113. We are not going to continue the painful succession of events; they are widely known. We should simply like to point out that, although it is well known that history does not repeat itself, what are known as historical series are made up of very similar events: there is a common mould in which are cast the episodes of each series and thus gives meaning to the process.

114. In this connexion one must recall that the failure of the League of Nations and its downfall began because of the fact that it was unable to avert the crisis of the 1930s. All this is not so distant in the past for us to forget it now. On the action to be adopted with regard to the subject under discussion will depend the survival of nations. The fundamental guarantee of the sovereignty of States is strict respect for law, without sophistry or falsehood. That is what we look for today, because it was for that reason that the United Nations was established, and today its very existence is at stake.

115. The Government of Uruguay holds that respect for the sovereignty of States is a basic principle of international law and underlies the Charter of the United Nations. It must be protected energetically. A moment has come when concrete definitions must be adopted to defend the Organization’s responsibility and the independence of States. This is why my delegation would propose and support a resolution that called for the immediate withdrawal of the invading forces, whose intervention in foreign territory can in no way whatsoever be justified.

116. My country was one of the signers of the Charter of San Francisco, and some of our representatives who put their signatures to it are still alive. Our record in the United Nations has demonstrated that we are faithful to the ideology of the founder of our nation, Artigas, who, during the struggles for independence at the dawn of the second decade of the last century, rejected force and the victory sometimes won by it as a method of influencing the will of peoples or of legitimizing a cause. This theme permeates his collected letters. My country also has recently experienced uncertainty and has suffered from other forms of aggression, such as terrorism and plots abetted by foreign aid. We have had to defend ourselves against those attacks with our own resources, with the armed forces and the people working together. We have asserted our freedom, sovereignty and security, despite the lack of understanding on the part of those who should have understood what was occurring, and in spite of a gigantic international campaign

<sup>7</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, First Committee*, 1404th meeting, paras. 12 and 15.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 1406th meeting, para. 35.

<sup>9</sup> A/AC.193/L.3.

<sup>10</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 126, document A/C.1/34/L.1.

of defamation. Hence we are not indifferent to the fate of others.

117. As Homer wrote in “The Odyssey”, “The Greeks were calmly living in the Cyclops’ den awaiting their turn to be devoured.” We do not think this is the time for us to follow such an example.

118. We would voice the hope that, although violent events, cruelty, suffering and aggression seem to be the moral order of the day and although there is a lack of concern for the values of humanism, it will be borne in mind that every affront to mankind’s sense of justice—as the eminent Uruguayan philosopher Carlos Vaz Ferreira pointed out—only evokes more and more universal condemnation. “Today’s horrors”, he said, “are different: they are the means, the technology; they are amoral in nature. What matters, however,” he added, “is that there is growing moral resistance, that there is more repugnance and concern being shown, and that a greater effort is being made—modest and wavering so far, but growing and more intense none the less—and by more and more people.”

119. That is our belief, and that is the source of our hope; for, as has been said, hope—as distinct from optimism—is the heroic virtue of the soul.

120. Baron von WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany): The Federal Republic of Germany welcomes the initiative taken by Mexico and the Philippines to bring the Soviet intervention, which is a matter of concern to the whole international community, before the forum of the United Nations General Assembly. A country of the third world, one of the non-aligned countries, was occupied by Soviet troops. The Security Council has discussed the circumstances in which this occupation took place. By casting its veto, the Soviet Union opposed the will of the majority and prevented the taking of a decision. The General Assembly is now called upon to take a clear stance.

121. My Italian colleague, acting as spokesman of the nine member States of the European Communities, explained the position of the Nine, which I should like to stress once again. In the Security Council, the Federal Republic of Germany has already presented its view, but it attaches great importance to reaffirming its position before this forum, in which all Member countries of the United Nations are represented.

122. My Government is deeply concerned about the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. We strongly support the view repeatedly expressed in the Security Council debate, as well as at the present session of the General Assembly: the military intervention by the Soviet Union not only constitutes a serious blow to the life and freedom of the people of Afghanistan; the Soviet Union’s intervention is a threat to the stability of the entire region and violates the fundamental principles of peaceful international relations and the indivisibility of détente.

123. The present session of the General Assembly is called upon to oppose the ruthless act of force and the serious threat to peace to which it gave rise.

124. Like many previous sessions of the General Assembly, the thirty-fourth, which has just ended, rightly

concerned itself once again and in great detail with the problems of international peace and security, détente, renunciation of force and the condemnation of hegemonic pretensions. Together with the other Member countries of the United Nations, the Federal Republic of Germany has taken an active part in this discussion. My Government stands for the principles of international peaceful relations and strongly advocates their implementation in all parts of the world. It notes with dismay that these principles are being flagrantly violated by one of the permanent members of the Security Council.

125. The Soviet intervention casts a dark shadow on the manifold and successful efforts which have been undertaken in the United Nations and elsewhere to improve co-operation and to build a more stable and just international order—and this at a time when we stand at the beginning of the Second United Nations Disarmament Decade, at the beginning of a year that will provide fresh impetus for economic and social progress in the third world by the initiation of a new round of global economic negotiations and by a special session of the General Assembly, this fall, on the international strategy for the next development decade. The Soviet intervention also casts a shadow on the beginning of the year designed to bring the nations of the world closer together in the spirit of the Olympic Games.

126. The crisis in Afghanistan directly involves peace and international security.

127. The motion for the convening of the Security Council, supported by 52 States, most of them from the third world, as well as the impressive majority in the Security Council for the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned States<sup>1</sup> Bangladesh, Jamaica, Niger, the Philippines, Tunisia and Zambia—manifest the profound alarm and dismay in the community of nations about the Soviet intervention.

128. The General Assembly is called upon to point out explicitly to the Soviet Union what the community of nations now expects of it, and that is the immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and respect for the right of the Afghan people freely to determine their political system and their future in accordance with their traditions and their religion.

129. The Federal Republic will vote in favour of the draft resolution before this Assembly.

130. Mr. ERALP (Turkey): The draft resolution contained in document S/13729, which was submitted recently to the Security Council and by which it was sought to put a rapid end to the foreign armed intervention against a sovereign, non-aligned Member of the United Nations, was defeated by the exercise of the veto by a permanent member of the Council. Had that draft resolution been adopted and complied with in good faith, it would have brought enormous relief not only to the countries of the region but also to the entire international community.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1980*, document S/13729.

131. Because of the failure of that attempt, we are once again meeting under your able leadership, Sir, this time in the hope of crystallizing the weight of the overwhelming majority of international public opinion by the adoption of a resolution of the General Assembly which, it is hoped, will be heeded by the intervening party. Instead of witnessing a show of sensitivity to world opinion, we observe with dismay that the intervention of foreign troops in Afghanistan is proceeding at an increasingly rapid pace, creating ever growing tension and anxiety in the region and the world.

132. The Soviet Union is a signatory of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, held in Helsinki. It was hoped that the spirit of peace and security engendered in that Declaration would extend beyond the bounds of Europe and gain world-wide appeal. That hope has now received a severe blow. The pretext that the foreign intervention in Afghanistan was based on an invitation and a call for aid by the Government of Afghanistan has been proved flimsy, as pointed out by many speakers. Indeed, it seems absurd to think that a Government would invite foreign intervention in order that it might itself be overthrown and replaced by another régime.

133. As I have said in the Security Council, we have and wish to maintain excellent good-neighbourly relations with the Soviet Union. On various occasions, high-level visits

have been exchanged between our two countries. Each of the joint communiqués issued after such visits contained the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and they have been re-endorsed and even supplemented by new and further confidence-building statements. For instance, the then President of the Soviet Union, Mr. Podgorny, paid an official visit to Turkey in June 1972. At the end of that visit, in addition to a lengthy communiqué, a "Declaration of the good-neighbourly relations between the USSR and the Republic of Turkey" was signed. That Declaration enumerated the principles by which the two countries would be guided in their bilateral and international relations. Among those eight principles are such elements as respect for the sovereignty and equality of States, respect for the territorial integrity and inviolability of State frontiers and non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

134. We maintain the hope that our powerful neighbour to the north will in its international relations be faithful to those lofty principles in all regions of the world and lend an ear to the solemn call of the international community to put an end to the present intervention, which is increasing, in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, a proud and noble nation, with which we have a centuries-long tradition of friendship and brotherhood.

*The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.*