

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**2nd
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 11 January 1980,
at 10.55 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. The PRESIDENT: I should like to propose that, as I announced yesterday afternoon, the list of speakers be closed at noon today. May I take it that the General Assembly agrees to this proposal?

It was so decided.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should also like to request members who wish to submit draft resolutions to do so as soon as possible.

3. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): We congratulate you, Sir, and indeed congratulate ourselves for having such a skilful President.

4. On 29 December, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait met with the Soviet Ambassador to Kuwait. He conveyed to the Ambassador the opposition of the Government of Kuwait to the intervention by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in Afghanistan. He explained that Kuwait could not accept military intervention by any Power in the domestic affairs of a country that was Moslem, non-aligned and fiercely independent, a country whose people have resisted the imposition of foreign ideology that is contrary to their religion, culture, environment, history and character. On 30 December the spokesman of the Cabinet stated after a Cabinet meeting that Kuwait opposed the armed intervention in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan.

5. The main feature of the history of the people of Afghanistan is their fearless resistance to foreign domination. They have never allowed foreigners to rule them. They have never hesitated to make enormous sacrifices in order to maintain their independence. Relations between the people of Afghanistan and the Arabs date back more than 1,000 years. The religious, cultural and geographical links that have existed between the Arabs and the people of Afghanistan made it incumbent upon us to defend the right of the people of Afghanistan to decide their own destiny without foreign interference. There is no doubt that there has been foreign intervention in Afghanistan, in violation of the non-aligned character of the country, in breach of the Charter of the United Nations and in contravention of international law.

6. I should like to quote the Prophet Mohammed. It is very difficult to translate into English what the Prophet said, but in this connexion, I have to grapple with translation. He said:

“If you see the outrageous, you must change it with action; if you cannot with action, then with words; if you cannot with words, then in your heart—and that is the feeblest form of resistance.”

Here, we see the outrageous and here we have to resist it with words, simply because our commodity in the United Nations is words. It is better to resist the outrageous with words than to close our eyes to it.

7. The contention that the Soviet troops are inside Afghanistan at the request of the Government of that country is not very valid, simply because the present Government is a direct result of the Soviet intervention. This Government is nothing but a window-dressing with no authority. No doubt it will fall once foreign troops pull out.

8. No Government can claim legality as long as it is propped up and maintained by foreign troops. It is obvious that the people of Afghanistan do not want an imposed ideology, an ideology which is foreign to their religion, to their culture, to their history and to their character. They oppose the Marxist theory, which came with the Soviet tanks. Indeed, they are entitled to decide their own destiny without foreign interference.

9. My delegation supports any call for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan; any call for the preservation of its Islamic non-aligned character; any call for respect for its territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence; and any call for non-interference in its domestic affairs.

10. We should not be over-self-righteous or selective in our opposition to the violation of the Charter. In this respect, there are many who have skeletons in their closets. On Sunday, 6 January, in his statement before the Security Council, the representative of the United States had the following to say:

“No State, not even a great Power, can be allowed to ignore with impunity the responsibilities, obligations and commitments it assumed when it became a Member of the United Nations.”¹

I hold him to his words. Unfortunately, however, they show that there is a discrepancy between words and actions. They also show how quick we are to defend the

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, 2187th meeting.*

Charter when it suits our interest to do so. It would be useful to ask the United States delegation to look at its record in connexion with the Israeli violations of the Charter.

11. We oppose the action of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, but we also take exception to the sudden attitude of self-righteousness about the sanctity of the Charter. In our opposition to the violation of the Charter we should not be selective, and in our pronouncements on the validity of the Charter we should remember our own weaknesses.

12. We cannot accept the introduction into international law of this new principle that, on the pretext of brutality, legality can be toppled. That is what I call the “Pol Pot formula”, which means that neighbouring countries have the right to intervene and topple a legal Government on the pretext that that Government is brutal. We cannot accept that newly introduced formula and we are opposed to its use in international relations. We are also opposed to the abuse of legality for great-Power rivalry. The problem in Afghanistan should be judged on its own merits, and super-Power rivalry should not be introduced into that question.

13. We are opposed to the revival of cold-war rhetoric. We hope that this debate will assist the people of Afghanistan in their endeavour to assert their own will in their own country, free from foreign interference, foreign domination and super-Power politics.

14. Mr. BARTON (Canada): We are gathered here in extraordinary session because the territorial integrity and the political independence of a State Member of this Organization has been infringed, in complete disregard of the fundamental principles of the Charter. We are gathered here because a great Power—the Soviet Union—has, in default of its special responsibilities and in defiance of principles that are binding on all, invaded and occupied a smaller and non-aligned neighbour nation. We are gathered here because the exercise by the Soviet Union of a self-protective veto has rendered the Security Council incapable of exercising its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

15. The grave breach of international peace which has been committed by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan cannot and must not be ignored. The notion that by doing so we would be interfering in the internal affairs of a Member State is surely one of the most fantastic ever to have advanced in the councils of this Organization.

16. It is well to probe into the arguments used by the Soviet Union and its friends in Kabul to justify the military intervention that has taken place. The assistance of the Soviet Union is said to have been requested by the Afghan leader who has not been allowed to live to regret it. This assistance has also been represented to many of our Governments as consisting of, to quote the Soviet representative, “limited military contingents” which will be withdrawn once external aggression has ceased. Such claims are difficult to reconcile with the facts of the situation, which show that there are nearly 100,000 Soviet troops—more than the total armed forces available for the defence of Canada—to repel an aggressor who is nowhere to be seen.

17. No, the facts are that the Soviet forces are not battling an external aggressor; they are battling Afghans who, for the crime of resisting an alien Government imposed on them by undemocratic means, are being branded as counter-revolutionaries. There can be no justification for such action. The international community cannot condone such a transparent attempt by a great Power to extend its sway over a small neighbour that has represented no threat to the security of the Soviet Union. If each of us were to interpret our security concerns as requiring conformist régimes along the length of our national borders, the Charter of this Organization would indeed be a scrap of paper.

18. The consequences of the Soviet intervention for the people of Afghanistan are evident enough. But our primary concern here is with the threat that this action poses to international peace and stability. It is not surprising that other non-aligned countries, in the region and elsewhere, feel threatened; that they are asking themselves: whose turn will it be next? In a region of the world which has been afflicted by endemic unrest and conflict, the Soviet action adds a particularly dangerous dimension to an already serious situation. We must stand ready to give our collective support to all efforts which may be undertaken by the countries of the region to bolster their national security and territorial integrity. In this Organization, in particular, we must record our complete rejection of the motives for Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. We must, in the words of the procedure that has been invoked to convene us here today, unite for peace.

19. What the Security Council was prevented from doing, we must now set out to do here. The world community that is represented here must condemn the Soviet action in Afghanistan as a clear violation of the basic principles of the Charter. We must demand the immediate withdrawal from Afghanistan of all Soviet troops. This surely is the first essential step towards restoring stability in the area and enabling the Afghan people to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination.

20. We are not asking the impossible. We are asking of the Soviet Union what the Soviet Union would ask of any other State if the roles were reversed. We are concerned about the impact of the Soviet action on so much that we have accomplished by working together here and in the other agencies of the United Nations. The climate of international confidence has been badly shaken. The indivisibility of détente has been challenged. Relations between many of our countries and the Soviet Union are going to be under increasing strain as we try to make it clear to the Soviet Union that it will not be held immune from the consequences of its actions. The lessons of history have left their imprint on us as they have on the Soviet Union.

21. My delegation whole-heartedly supports a firm judgement by this Assembly against what has happened in Afghanistan. While we recognize that resolutions of this Assembly have no mandatory force, we submit that a resolution to that effect will express the judgement of the large majority of nations of the world and, that being so, its political and moral value cannot be casually dismissed and ignored. If the many past initiatives of the Soviet Union on non-intervention and non-use of force are not to be

emptied of their content, now is the time for that country to live up to its professed beliefs. Only in total respect for one another's sovereignty and independence will we be able to continue striving for international co-operation and understanding.

22. Mr. LA ROCCA (Italy): As representative of the country which currently exercises the presidency of the European Community I am speaking on behalf of its nine member States.

23. The events which led to this emergency session of the General Assembly are well known and were extensively discussed in the debate which took place in the Security Council from 5 to 9 January 1980, at the request of 52 States Members of this Organization, belonging to practically all regions of the world.

24. The Nine regret that a draft resolution reaffirming some basic principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and calling, in the light of those principles, for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan was vetoed in the Security Council by the delegation of the Soviet Union. They note however that the draft resolution was supported by 13 members of the Council, including all those belonging to the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. They also note that in the course of the lengthy debate which took place in the Council, the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan and the justification given for it were rejected by an overwhelming majority of delegations.

25. The debate in the Security Council has thus shown the degree of concern of the international community at the events which are taking place in Afghanistan and their implications for peace and security in the region and in the world as a whole. The Nine fully share that concern. All the evidence available shows that the purpose of the Soviet military intervention was to overthrow the Government of Afghanistan and replace it with a régime more responsive to Soviet interests. It is well known that internal tensions exist in Afghanistan and that they arise from the aspiration of the Afghan people to live and be ruled in accordance with its social and religious traditions. Accordingly, our Governments cannot accept the argument that this military intervention was prompted by external acts of aggression against Afghanistan and that it was therefore based on the exercise of the right of self-defence, individual or collective, enshrined in Article 51 of the Charter.

26. The Nine are convinced of the need for the immediate withdrawal of the Soviet troops from the territory of Afghanistan. They call for full respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of that country. They reaffirm the right of the people of Afghanistan to determine their own form of government and decide their own destiny, free from external interference. They are also deeply concerned about the suffering of the Afghan people, the plight of the refugees and the increasing burden for neighbouring countries represented by those refugees.

27. The Nine attach particular importance to the urgent fulfilment of those conditions which are the prerequisites for the re-establishment of the atmosphere of trust which is the basis of the policy of détente and which has been

seriously shaken by the military intervention of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. Our countries have been endeavouring to improve their relations with the Soviet Union. There has been obvious progress for the benefit of all and for that of the situation of Europe as a whole. We see that progress as an important contribution to the safeguarding of world peace. However, détente is indivisible and has a global dimension, which means that particular restraint is required on the part of those countries which bear a special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. We therefore urge the Soviet Union, as one of those countries, to abide by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and promptly put an end to its military intervention in Afghanistan. We recall in this regard that the Soviet Union has introduced many initiatives in the United Nations which it has claimed underline its attachment to international peace and security.

28. The Nine hope that the General Assembly will conclude this debate by supporting such a call by an overwhelming majority. What in fact is at stake here is not only the independence and territorial integrity of Afghanistan, but the very principles on which the international community has attempted for years to build a system of international relations based on the equality of States large and small and on respect for the rule of law. Should political expediency prevail and the armed invasion of a small country by a great Power be condoned or tolerated, there would be a great risk that the rule of law would be progressively eroded and replaced by the rule of force.

29. Mr. KARIM (Bangladesh): Bangladesh's stand on this question has been explained at length on more than one occasion. It is reflected in our position as one of the 52 signatories of the letter that requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council,² as a sponsor of the draft resolution³ that was defeated by the lack of unanimity among the permanent members and by our vote in favour of Security Council resolution 462 (1980), which has led to the convening of this emergency special session. I shall therefore be brief.

30. The situation in Afghanistan poses a fundamental challenge to the international community, the credibility of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the integrity of international law and the conduct of international relations on the basis of mutual respect and sovereign equality.

31. At stake are the inalienable rights of all peoples to determine their own destiny, including their right to choose their own form of government and social, economic and political systems free from outside interference, coercion or constraint of any kind whatsoever. In Afghanistan this right has been infringed.

32. At stake are sacrosanct principles of the Charter which enjoin on all Members respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State, non-interference in internal affairs and non-use or threat of the use of force. In Afghanistan those principles have been

² *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1980*, document S/13724 and Add.1 and 2.

³ *Ibid.*, document S/13729.

violated by the very fact of armed intervention and the continued presence of foreign troops.

33. At stake are larger issues of peace and security affecting the stability of Afghanistan, the region as a whole and the world at large. The defusion of international tension and détente among the big Powers is threatened, and there is a grave danger of a renewed era of confrontation and cold war.

34. At stake, finally, is the future of a small Moslem country, a founding member of the Non-Aligned Movement, faced with the armed presence of a super-Power and the imposition of a régime against the will of its people.

35. My Government has strongly expressed our deepest concern at developments in Afghanistan, a fellow non-aligned and South Asian neighbour with which we have the closest fraternal relations and to which we are bound by long-standing historical, cultural, religious and geographical ties. The Soviet Union has openly admitted that it has introduced its military forces into Afghanistan. We have declared that the presence of those Soviet troops and their direct involvement in Afghanistan's internal affairs pose a serious threat to peace and stability in the region and to world peace. We believe that the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan is a serious violation of the fundamental principles of the Charter and inconsistent with the Charter's aims and purposes. We are committed to upholding the sovereign and inalienable right of the freedom-loving people of Afghanistan to determine its own destiny free from outside interference or subjugation of any kind whatsoever, especially interference or subjugation involving the use of force in any form, as a result of any plea or on any pretext whatsoever.

36. Bangladesh therefore believes that this Assembly must call for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan, so as to allow the people of Afghanistan the free and unfettered exercise of their sovereign and inalienable rights. This Assembly must also strongly reaffirm that the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned status of Afghanistan must be fully respected.

37. Bangladesh is prepared to support any measures proposed by this Assembly to that end.

38. Mr. ÅLGÅRD (Norway): Please allow me at the outset to express my delegation's great satisfaction at seeing you, Sir, presiding over this emergency special session of the General Assembly.

39. The sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly has been called against a background of continuing Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan and the inability of the Security Council to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, owing to the negative vote cast by the Soviet Union on 7 January of this year against a draft resolution sponsored by the non-aligned members of the Security Council.

40. Norway voted in favour of that draft resolution, because it reaffirmed fundamental principles of interna-

tional law as contained in the Charter of the United Nations and because it contained concrete suggestions on how to restore peace in Afghanistan and in the region.

41. Since the Security Council was not able to adopt a decision regarding the application of these fundamental principles in the matter under discussion, the Norwegian delegation supported the adoption in the Security Council of resolution 462 (1980), sponsored by the Philippines and Mexico, which called for an emergency special session of the General Assembly.

42. The discussion of the situation in Afghanistan in the Security Council has clearly demonstrated the deep concern to be found in all regions of the world at the armed intervention in Afghanistan by a neighbouring country. This wide-felt apprehension is based, above all, on the following two considerations.

43. First, there is wide agreement that the Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan constitutes a violation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Afghanistan. It constitutes a clear interference in the internal affairs of another country, in contravention of established principles of international law, including those of the Charter of the United Nations. No country, big or small, can acquiesce in actions of this kind which tend seriously to undermine the very fabric of these fundamental principles on which inter-State relations must be based. The international community must forever remain vigilant in the defence of these principles, unless new credence is granted the dictum that might is right. The defence of these principles must be heard and felt whenever and wherever breaches of them occur—be it in Africa, Europe, Asia or Latin America.

44. The second observation that I should like to make relates to the short-term and long-term international consequences of the type of action that we have witnessed in Afghanistan over the last two weeks. This action has in the short run dramatically contributed to increased tension and instability in the region. This is in itself a development which must be regretted and reversed.

45. A tragic result of the recent armed intervention in Afghanistan and the unrest over the last few years is the great influx of refugees into neighbouring countries. The necessary conditions must be created for the voluntary return of those refugees. This will require the co-operation of Member States and international organizations. Various kinds of international humanitarian support are urgently needed to relieve the hardship of the Afghan refugees. The Norwegian Government is prepared to contribute its share to assist the refugees in this respect.

46. Recent developments in Afghanistan have implications also beyond the country itself and the region as a whole. It should come as no surprise that the armed intervention in Afghanistan has such broader international implications. As I stated in the Security Council on 6 January:

“Whereas there is no alternative to a process aimed at lessening international tension and conflict in the long run, no one can accept that the very principles on which

such a process must be built can be violated, as they have been in the case of Afghanistan.”⁴

47. At this stage, therefore, the Norwegian Government wishes to reiterate its view that it is of the utmost importance that peace and stability again be restored in Afghanistan and that the threat of wider conflict be removed.

48. This emergency special session of the General Assembly should consequently deal with the mandate entrusted to it by the Security Council by calling for the immediate, total and unconditional withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan. The right of the people of Afghanistan to determine, free from outside interference, their own form of government must be respected. This presupposes strict observance of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of another country and full respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States, regardless of their political affiliation or status.

49. Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden): Mr. President, my delegation is very pleased to see you presiding over this emergency special session of the General Assembly, and we offer you our full co-operation.

50. The international community is faced with the fact that the Soviet Union, backed by its enormous potential and armed forces, has invaded a small neighbouring and non-aligned country and installed a régime to its own liking. The invasion of Afghanistan is a violation of basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations. It violates the principle of non-intervention; it violates the principle of respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity; it violates the principle of non-use of force. These principles are key concepts of international law and international behaviour.

51. Sweden joined 51 other States Members of this Organization in asking for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security. We did so in keeping with our traditional policy of asking for United Nations action whenever basic rules of international behaviour and fundamental principles of the Charter of our Organization have been violated. The Security Council, which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, was not able to agree on a resolution that would have given guidance in resolving the present critical situation in Afghanistan. In the present circumstances, it is therefore natural, in our view, that a matter of this portent should be brought to the General Assembly, and my delegation welcomes this debate.

52. My Government cannot accept the explanations offered by the Soviet Union for its intervention in Afghanistan. The facts speak for themselves. There is no doubt in our minds that this intervention is a clear and undeniable violation of international law and should be condemned as such. This view of the Swedish Government and people was expressed by the Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs on 28 December 1979, when he stated that we must categorically oppose the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan.

53. An enforced military presence in a small non-aligned country is a flagrant interference in the internal affairs of that country and a serious violation of its sovereignty. Furthermore, this armed intervention threatens to upset the balance in an already troubled part of Asia and is bound to endanger international peace and security as a whole.

54. Every nation and every people has an unquestionable right to determine its own political, economic and social future without any interference. That right is a basic principle of the Non-Aligned Movement, of which Afghanistan is a member.

55. A small country has the same right as a super-Power to decide its own destiny. The Charter of our Organization ensures all countries, big and small, of their right to sovereignty and territorial integrity and should protect them from intervention and use of force. Furthermore, the Charter gives a special responsibility to the super-Powers, as permanent members of the Security Council, to be guardians of international peace and security.

56. I should like also to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the deteriorating situation with regard to the problem of refugees in the area—a situation causing suffering to a great number of human beings. This problem is of a humanitarian nature and calls for concerted action by the world community as a whole.

57. A serious aspect of the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan is that it risks undermining vital international relations. My Government has witnessed and tried to contribute to the process of détente and welcomed the growing co-operation between the super-Powers. We particularly looked forward to the coming into force of the SALT II agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as other measures in the field of disarmament. Instead, we now face the prospect of increased tension and dangerous confrontation in world politics. The progress made in the field of détente brings advantages to all States. The process must not stop. We plead with the great Powers to continue the policy of détente. It is especially important that it be carried on in the field of disarmament and within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

58. In conclusion, my delegation joins all those who have urged the Soviet Union to end its military intervention in Afghanistan and to allow the people of Afghanistan freely to choose their own future.

59. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, first of all I should like to congratulate you on your election to your important post and to wish you every possible success in your work in the presidency.

60. The Soviet delegation has already stated that the consideration in the United Nations of the so-called question of the situation in Afghanistan is entirely illegitimate and represents a flagrant violation of the sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Since a discussion on this question has nevertheless been imposed on the General Assembly, the Soviet delegation considers it necessary to make some comments.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fifth Year*, 2187th meeting.

61. Those who have created the unsavoury agitation about the Afghanistan question deliberately seek to conceal, behind a screen of misinformation and slander, the real purport and true picture of events occurring in Afghanistan. However, for those who really want to see and understand the true state of affairs, it is not difficult to do so. For this, what we must do, first of all, is to refer to the official statements of the Government of Afghanistan and, in particular, to the statements made here in the United Nations by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan, Mr. Shah Mohammad Dost.
62. These statements made it abundantly clear that the April 1978 revolution in Afghanistan was one of the most important events in the history of that ancient country. It was a major milestone in the general process of the liberation struggle of peoples against colonial, feudal and imperialist oppression. The very first steps taken after the establishment in Afghanistan of the democratic power of the people demonstrated the determination of the Afghan people to put an end, once and for all, to social injustice and economic and cultural backwardness and to build a genuinely independent Afghanistan.
63. It is clear that the emergence of a new Afghanistan and the overcoming of its backwardness are, in themselves, by no means simple tasks. However, the objective internal difficulties which had arisen as a result of the age-old domination of feudalism in that country became much worse when the opposition undertaken against the progressive course of the country by internal counter-revolution was complicated by the active and ever-expanding intervention from outside. Outside imperialistic forces and internal reaction entered into a direct conspiracy aimed at the elimination of the people's power in Afghanistan and the restoration of the former régimes.
64. From the very first months after the victory of the April revolution, Afghanistan became the target of direct and flagrant intervention by certain Western Powers and China. Those Powers embarked upon a whole programme of supplying counter-revolutionary gangs with money and arms, training them and infiltrating them into Afghanistan across the frontier. A leading role in the organization of this criminal conspiracy against the Afghan people was assumed by the United States.
65. In December 1978, in connexion with the events in Afghanistan, the American magazine *U.S. News and World Report* wrote that the United States had big stakes in a struggle pitting Moslem conservatives against the Moscow-backed rulers.
66. Something about which political leaders in the United States had preferred to remain silent was stated with characteristic bluntness by the American military: former Commander-in-Chief of the NATO forces, General Haig, in an interview with the Belgian newspaper *Soir*, stressed that a response had to be given to the emergence of Afghanistan, Southern Yemen and Ethiopia as States close to the Soviet Union.
67. Such calls did not remain mere pious hopes: proceeding to action, the American authorities established close contact with the leaders of the Afghan counter-revolution, and it is noteworthy that two of the ringleaders of the rebels, Ziya Nezri and Zia Nasser, are American citizens. The former is a zealous supporter of the monarchy which was overthrown in Afghanistan and, at the beginning of March 1979, on the very eve of the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Herat, he was at the United States State Department asking for support. He also had meetings with representatives of Senators Church and Javits, who preferred to refuse to answer the questions of journalists about what they had been discussing with Nezri.
68. It is well known that the territory of Pakistan has been and still remains a major spring-board for anti-Afghan actions. Thousands of saboteurs have undergone training for subversive activities in the Pakistani provinces neighbouring Afghanistan. According to *The New York Times* of 16 April 1979:
- “The nerve center of the rebel campaign is at Miram Shah, in the northern Waziristan District of Pakistan A system of couriers carries information and orders back and forth between the rebel fighting units in Afghanistan and the planners of the operations at various bases on the Pakistan side of the porous border.”
69. The Chinese leadership actively joined in the subversive activities of the imperialist circles. From the very beginning, Peking spared no resources or efforts to undermine the gains of the Afghan revolution. It was not only a matter of the Chinese leadership carrying out an unbridled campaign of slander against Afghanistan; acting hand in hand with the Western special services, it helped, and continues to help, in the formation, beyond the confines of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and even in China itself, among other places, of subversive squads which are then sent into Afghan territory. Through their agents, the Chinese expansionists have intensified the subversive activities of Maoist groups in Afghanistan and have done everything in their power to co-ordinate their activities with other reactionary gangs.
70. As is known, in October 1979 in Pakistan there was a Chinese military delegation, headed by the Deputy Chief of Staff, Chang Tsai-chien. It did not stay in the capital but actually went to areas bordering on Afghanistan, particularly to the towns of Quetta and Peshawar, which were centres for the training of anti-Afghan bands and gangs. That delegation's visit had the specific purpose of co-ordinating and activating subversive activities against the Afghan people. Earlier, a similar visit to Pakistan was paid by Chinese military leaders headed by the Commander of the Chinese Air Force, Chang Ting-fa. They visited the Kyber Pass and a number of other regions bordering directly on the Afghanistan-Pakistan frontier.
71. A report published in the Canadian magazine *Maclean's* about the activities of Chinese specialists on Pakistani territory deserves attention. In particular, it described how American agents, in their struggle to halt the spread of narcotics, met a group of Chinese near the Afghan frontier. A suspicion arose at first that these were Chinese from Hong Kong who were heroin traffickers dealing with purchases of opium poppies. However, it was established later that they were in fact officers and instructors in the Chinese army. “They were here”, the journal stated, “to

help train and equip right-wing Afghan guerrillas for their holy war against the Moscow-backed Kabul régime of Noor Mohammed Taraki.”

72. While training their agents and infiltrating them into Afghanistan, the Chinese authorities were working hard to equip the anti-Government groups with arms. Noting this, the French magazine *Courrier de politique étrangère* last summer wrote:

“The road built by the Chinese linking the Uigur-Sinkiang autonomous region with Pakistan is being used for the transport of weapons, ammunition and propaganda material designed for the carrying out of subversive activities on Afghan soil.”

73. A great many more such facts could be adduced. Of course, neither the Chinese nor the Western delegations mentioned these in the meetings of the Security Council, nor will they mention them in the meetings of the General Assembly. But if we take all these and many other well-known facts and put them together, they will irrefutably demonstrate one thing: the existence of direct armed intervention from outside in the affairs of Afghanistan. It is also clear that had it not been for such intervention, the Government of Afghanistan would not have had to appeal to the Soviet Union for military assistance, and our country would not have had to give it.

74. After the April revolution, the Soviet Union was the first to recognize the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and stated its resolute support for the efforts of the Afghan people to build a new life. The signing in December 1978 of a Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation between the USSR and Afghanistan was of historic significance both from the point of view of the comprehensive expansion and deepening of Soviet-Afghan links and from the standpoint of the strengthening of peace on the Asian continent and the world at large. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, on 20 April 1979 stressed:

“We are sure that the Treaty will promote the creation of a foreign policy climate which will permit the people of Afghanistan to take firm steps along the path of building their nation and of progress in circumstances of peace and security. The maintenance of such a climate is in keeping with the interests of all States and all peoples of that part of the world and also with the goals of strengthening international détente as a whole.”

75. The Soviet Union believed that the imperialists and the Chinese hegemonists would come to realize the irreversibility of the events that had occurred in Afghanistan and would not cross a certain line. At the same time, it should have been very clear to everyone that the USSR would not abandon its friend the Afghan people in its distress. However, foreign intervention in the events in Afghanistan has not only not ceased but actually has been escalating. The very fate of the Afghan revolution hangs in the balance.

76. In the circumstances the Government of Afghanistan once again urgently appealed to the Soviet Union—as it had

repeatedly done before—to render it immediate assistance and support in its struggle against external aggression. The Soviet Union responded positively to that request on the basis of the community of interests of the two countries in matters of security, stipulated in the Soviet-Afghan Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation, and also in the desire to preserve peace and stability in that area.

77. It is quite clear that the maintenance and development of co-operation between Afghanistan and the USSR falls exclusively within the field of their bilateral relations, and no one has the right to interfere in these matters.

78. In order to fulfil its duty towards the Afghan people the Soviet Union came to the assistance of that people by sending limited military contingents to carry out tasks consisting exclusively of the provision of aid to repel armed intervention from outside. The request of the Afghan leadership and the positive response of the Soviet Union to that appeal were in keeping with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, which provide for the inalienable right of States to individual and collective self-defence for purposes of repelling aggression and re-establishing peace.

79. The Soviet Government clearly and distinctly stated that, once the reasons that had given rise to the request of Afghanistan to the Soviet Union and the Soviet action in response to that request no longer existed, the Soviet Union intended completely to withdraw its military contingents from the territory of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. It had and still has no intention of intervening in matters relating to the State or social system of Afghanistan or its internal or external policies. Assertions about the involvement of the Soviet Union in the internal events in that country are an out and out fabrication and slander.

80. A number of delegations have been making attempts to link the introduction into Afghanistan of a limited Soviet military contingent with the elimination of Hafizullah Amin. In statements of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan, Mr. Shah Mohammad Dost, it has been demonstrated that the removal from power of Amin was carried out by patriotic and genuinely revolutionary elements inside the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan. That was a legitimate consequence of the further development and consolidation of the April revolution, an entirely domestic matter concerning the Afghan people. The introduction of a limited contingent of Soviet troops into Afghanistan was in no way linked with changes in the Afghan leadership.

81. The Soviet Union is sympathetic to the statements of the new Afghan leadership which stress that the essence of the policy of the new Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, which has decisively put an end to the despotic methods of Amin and his cohorts, lies in ensuring the democratic rights and freedoms of the whole Afghan people, carrying out social democratic reforms in the interests of the people of Afghanistan and guaranteeing freedom of religion, regardless of national or tribal membership, and, in particular, total freedom of the Islamic religion. It is well known that it is precisely the new leadership in Afghanistan which has restored the rule of law

in the country and declared an amnesty for all political detainees.

82. The official statements of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan show that the new Government is aiming at the establishment and development of friendly relations with all States, and above all its neighbours, and that it has confirmed its determination strictly to comply with the relevant international treaties and agreements, its loyalty to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and its intention to abide by the policy of non-alignment.

83. Speaking on 10 January at a press conference before local and foreign correspondents the Head of the Afghan Government, Babrak Karmal said, among other things,

“We are aiming at good relations with the peoples of Pakistan and Iran. I take an optimistic view of the prospects of our relations with those countries. I am sure that, in co-operation with the peoples of Pakistan and Iran, we shall very soon put an end to the designs of American imperialism and of Peking. The people of Afghanistan”—he pointed out—“will stand shoulder to shoulder with the liberation movements of the Arab States in their struggle against imperialism and Zionism.”

84. In the present circumstances of fundamental reforms going on in Afghan society, the task of the United Nations would appear to be to promote the creation of a propitious climate for the pursuit of the progressive course embarked on by the new Government of Afghanistan and, in any case, not to take any steps which might hinder that process. Unfortunately, we are confronted with a situation where the United Nations has found itself embroiled in matters with which it should not be dealing. The claims of Washington and Peking to dictate to the people of Afghanistan—and this even with the help of the United Nations—constitute a violation of the sovereign rights of the Afghan people and flagrant interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

85. Naturally the question arises: What are the real purposes and goals of the fuss and uproar made in the United Nations—by the United States and China and certain other countries—around the so-called Afghanistan question, which has been artificially created by those circles themselves? What is their real goal in this flagrant slander of the policy of the Soviet Union and their distortion of the sense and purpose of the recent events in Afghanistan?

86. Now the United States and its allies are attempting to assume the mantle of champion of small countries. But one might well ask where the United States and its allies are whenever in the United Nations or outside it the question arises of support for the struggle of peoples for their self-determination and independence—when, for example, the South African racists kill hundreds of peaceful inhabitants in Zambia, Angola and Mozambique, and when the Israeli aggressors bomb Lebanese villages and Palestine refugee camps. In such cases the Western Powers take the aggressors under their wing and repudiate any proposals to apply any effective measures of retribution against them. That is understandable, since the United States itself has more than once intervened in the affairs of small countries

and attempted to dictate to those countries and prevent them from exercising their self-determination. The peoples of the world will long remember the flagrant intervention of the United States in the affairs of Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Chile, Nicaragua and many other States, not to mention its shameful war against the Vietnamese people.

87. It is also worth recalling the coup d'état undertaken by the CIA in Iran in 1953, as a result of which the Shah's arbitrary rule in that country was prolonged for a quarter-century. And now we are all witnessing the United States taking under its wing that despot and plunderer of the riches of the Iranian people and inflaming the situation around Iran, threatening its people with every kind of punitive action. The Soviet Union is firmly convinced that Member States of the United Nations that genuinely wish to bring about the strengthening of international peace and co-operation should not permit the United Nations to be exploited by the United States as its instrument in these unsavoury affairs.

88. I should like to draw the attention of representatives to one further aspect of the question we are discussing. The United States and its allies are attempting to use the rostrum of the United Nations to compromise the assistance rendered by the Soviet Union to Afghanistan. One wonders whether the reason for this is to deprive the States that have adopted a course of independent development of the possibility of appealing for help to friendly countries in other cases in which they are subjected to attacks by imperialists and their agents. Even in recent years there have been quite a few such instances. There was the rebellion in Biafra and there were the attacks on Angola, Mozambique, Benin, Zambia and many other young States.

89. It is no accident that when, in March 1976, the Security Council was considering the question of the aggression by South Africa against Angola, five Western Powers members of the Council abstained in the vote on resolution 387 (1976) containing a provision on “the inherent and lawful right of every State, in the exercise of its sovereignty, to request assistance from any other State or group of States”. It is to be hoped that this aspect of the matter will not escape the attention of the developing countries.

90. Recently in the West, and particularly in the United States, a broad-ranging political and propaganda campaign has been launched against the Soviet Union. The signal for this campaign was the statement of the President of the United States on 4 January. In this connexion, in a statement published in Moscow by TASS on 6 January, it was pointed out that:

“The statement of the President of the United States of America caught the attention in the Soviet Union, just as in many other countries. It is largely couched in the verbiage of the cold war and is permeated with the spirit of the cold war. Political estimates contained in the statement and practical steps planned by the United States Administration in the international arena are unbalanced and show neglect for vital long-term interests of peace, relaxation of international tension and constructive development of Soviet-American relations. This

statement is not at all in keeping with the responsibility which the United States, as a large Power, is called upon to bear for the maintenance of universal peace, for the ensurance of security of peoples and widening of mutually advantageous peaceful co-operation among States.”

91. The artificially trumped-up Afghanistan question is not the reason for the present assault by the United States on the policy of peaceful coexistence and its attempts to drag the world back to the times of the cold war. It is only a pretext for justification of a policy that American ruling circles have been following for some time now. As long ago as 1978, at the demand of the United States, the NATO countries adopted a decision to increase their military expenditures to an unprecedented level and prepared a broad programme of intensive military preparations designed for long-term purposes—practically up to the end of this century. Quite recently, at the end of 1979, the United States imposed on a number of Western European States the decision to deploy on the territory of that continent new American nuclear missiles. Along with this, the American Government has made proposals with regard to a further major increase in the military budget of the United States. Now the President of the United States not only has proposed to shelve the question of the ratification of the SALT II treaty but has also stated that a number of measures will be adopted to limit Soviet-American relations. On this, the TASS statement to which I have referred had this to say:

“As to the Soviet side, it never sought such ties, for instance in the commercial and economic and cultural spheres, as a favour. It always stressed that the development of some or other ties, just as the maintenance of good relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America as a whole, is a mutual affair. If the White House decided to influence in some way the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, this is a hopeless undertaking. Such attempts failed in the past and they will fail now.”

92. In carrying out a massive campaign against détente in a desire to heat up the international atmosphere, Peking wishes to keep up with the leading circles of the United States. Peking has more than once demonstrated its addiction to the policy of expansion—suffice it to recall its support for the anti-governmental “movements” in India, Indonesia, Burma, Thailand, Malaysia and the Philippines. Let us recall also the Chinese-Indian conflict of 1962, the pressure on the Mongolian People’s Republic, the seizure of the Paracel Islands. More than once it has been said that the Chinese leadership bears a heavy responsibility before the whole world and mankind for the tragedy of the Kampuchean people and the aggression against Viet Nam. Participation in the organizing of subversive action against Afghanistan was the logical extension of this hegemonistic course.

93. In recent days the representatives of many countries, both here in the United Nations and outside, have expressed concern at the fact that the further development of the international situation might lead to a recrudescence of the climate of the worst times of the cold war. We whole-heartedly share those apprehensions.

94. The Soviet Union vigorously condemns the attempts of the American politicians and the Peking leaders artificially to heat up a so-called Afghan question, so that under cover of that they can turn the wheel of international developments back to times when enmity between countries and military hysteria were being instigated and whipped up. However, for its part the Soviet Union intends firmly to steer a course of peaceful coexistence and détente. We are convinced that this policy, which is in keeping with the vital interests of all peoples, will overcome all barriers and obstacles created by its opponents and ultimately become once again the prevailing trend in international affairs.

95. Mr. CRESPO-ZALDUMBIDE (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Ecuador joined in sponsoring the request made on 3 January by a number of States Members of the United Nations for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security. We were prompted to take that decision by our conviction that Ecuador cannot be indifferent about the defence of the principles of international law when those principles are being violated, nor sit idly by when peace and security are being threatened.

96. In the light of the fact that the Security Council has been prevented, because of a lack of unanimity among its permanent members, from adopting measures which would allow it to fulfil its lofty task of maintaining international peace and security, the sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly has been convened, in the hope of giving full effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the values for which mankind had been fighting, for the affirmation of its collective dignity.

97. My country firmly believes that the principles of non-intervention, the self-determination of peoples and abstention from the threat or the use of force in international relations are the very essence of world law and order and must be respected in all circumstances by all peoples.

98. At the session of the General Assembly which has just concluded, the entire membership of the United Nations witnessed and participated in the adoption, on 14 December, by 111 votes in favour, of resolution 34/103 entitled “Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations”. That resolution, which incidentally had the sponsorship of the Soviet Union, expresses, *inter alia*, the serious concern of the international community over the fact that hegemonism, global as well as regional, pursued in the context of the policy of dividing the world into blocs or by individual States, manifests itself in the use of force, foreign domination and intervention.

99. The legal heritage of the United Nations, which is the great hope of mankind and especially of the weaker countries whose strength lies in the institutions of law and in the moral value of world public opinion, embodies, affirms and reiterates in any number of solemn resolutions the rejection of all forms of pressure in international relations, whether that pressure be political, ideological, military, economic or cultural.

100. We must not forget that it was arbitrary totalitarianism, the destruction of the most important values of

mankind and scorn for the dignity and sovereignty of weaker peoples which prompted the world, in a moment of supreme wisdom, to resolve to organize a legal order in an effort to bring about peaceful coexistence in freedom, in keeping with the view that each individual's rights end where his neighbour's rights begin. The United Nations, for that reason, continues to be the sole hope of peace in this world beset daily by the spectre of nuclear might. For that reason my country places its trust in compliance with the resolutions of the world Organization whenever circumstances occur, such as those we are considering today, in which one State is invaded and its territory physically occupied by another State.

101. Ecuador has always vigorously condemned intervention and the use of force in all its manifestations, territorial occupation and other acts directed against the unity and integrity of nations. It could not have been otherwise, for boundless respect for the principle of non-intervention is one of the corner-stones of American international law, one that has been reaffirmed at many regional conferences and that was finally incorporated in the charter of the Organization of American States.

102. Today more than ever before it is up to the stronger countries to relinquish the unfair advantages that they have secured through the use of force and to accept only those advantages derived from reason and law. Ecuador has always upheld the need for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and we therefore cannot but condemn this armed aggression and demand an immediate withdrawal of the foreign troops which at present occupy the territory of Afghanistan.

103. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The General Assembly of the United Nations has had imposed on it the examination of a question the discussion of which constitutes a clear interference in the internal affairs of a State Member of the United Nations.

104. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic, like the representatives of other States, has already pointed out at a meeting of the Security Council that the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan poses no threat to peace or international security or to neighbouring or other States. The Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, Shah Mohammad Dost, quite rightly objected categorically to the discussion of the so-called situation in Afghanistan.

105. It is quite clear that the imperialistic and other hegemonistic forces needed these debates for the intensification of their intrigues against the progressive revolutionary reforms which are taking place in Afghanistan. Their hasty actions in the last few days have shown that they do not shrink from hindering the normalization and stabilization of the situation in and around Afghanistan.

106. The Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan explained in detail here the programme proclaimed by his Government for the carrying out of further democratic changes in Afghanistan. I venture to indicate just some of the important measures contained in that programme: the repeal of all anti-democratic and inhuman

laws; measures to ensure respect for the principles of Islam; freedom of conscience and religious belief; the guarantee of conditions for the exercise of democratic freedoms, including the freedom to create progressive patriotic parties and mass organizations; freedom of the press and freedom of assembly; and the right to work and to education. If everything were done according to the will of those forces which long before this time were planning and leading campaigns against the Afghan people, none of the points of this programme would ever be put into effect. Furthermore, the mass media of that country report every day that certain circles in the United States and China, and also in other States, are sparing no efforts and no resources to intensify their subversive military actions against the revolutionary developments in Afghanistan.

107. We should really stop and think about the fact that the parties to the Camp David agreements at the present time have become actively involved in such events and are openly stating their intention to train and arm counter-revolutionary gangs on an even larger scale against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The peoples of Africa, the Middle East and the Near East can no longer fail to see the clear-cut danger which would threaten them if the United States Air Force were able to operate from the territory of one of the new Middle East allies and if actual joint military manoeuvres were to be carried out with the armed forces of that State.

108. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic has no doubt whatsoever that the Afghan people, under the leadership of the Chairman of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, Babrak Karmal, will confidently continue on the course towards the successful implementation of the goals of the April revolution, without imperialist intervention from outside, especially because the people of Afghanistan has in the Soviet Union a reliable friend and because it can count on the support and solidarity of the other socialist countries and progressive forces.

109. As was stressed by the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan in his statement in the Security Council,⁵ Soviet military personnel have already once before given effective support to the Afghan people in its struggle for national independence and liberation from imperialist domination. The current military assistance from the Soviet Union, given on the basis of the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation of 5 December 1978, is also designed exclusively to halt the armed intervention of imperialism and other reactionary forces in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. Claims that the Soviet Union is intervening in the internal affairs of Afghanistan are devoid of the slightest foundation and simply reveal a total absence of logic. What basis can there possibly be for a socialist country to force the Afghan people to give up the anti-imperialist and democratic course which it embarked on with determination after the April revolution of 1978? Only those imperialist and reactionary forces could have an interest in doing that because for them the April revolution from its very beginning was a headache and from that time on they did everything possible to turn back the developments in Afghanistan.

⁵ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fifth Year*, 2185th meeting.

110. Any demands for the cessation of military assistance from the Soviet Union—whether one likes it or not—are aimed against the inalienable right of the Afghan people itself to decide its own fate, which includes choosing the ways and means of ensuring the security and independence of its own country. As members know, every State, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter, has the right to individual or collective self-defence, regardless of its political or social system, the size of its territory, its level of development or political influence. And so those statements which clearly flow from the selective application of that provision of the Charter and recognize the right of self-defence as belonging only to certain States whose social system is to the liking of certain circles can only give rise to bewilderment. How otherwise should we understand, for example, the statement of a representative in the Security Council who invoked as an argument for condemning Soviet assistance to the Afghan people the hostility of his Government towards a possible Marxist régime in Afghanistan? This reflects the whole deliberate political propaganda campaign orchestrated by the imperialists and reactionary forces against the just cause of the Afghan people. But no one should forget that that kind of attempt has always been staged in order to prevent the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples and to hinder progressive social development. It therefore appears more than strange that it should be, precisely the representatives of the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) who are attempting in this debate to pretend that they are the champions of the interests of the small and medium-sized States.

111. In this regard, we should like to ask a few questions. Could anyone seriously contest the fact that it is precisely the imperialist Powers which have been doing everything possible to impede and hinder the liberation struggle of the peoples against colonial domination and for national independence? On whose side are the NATO countries whenever the question arises of deciding on effective sanctions against the racist régime in South Africa in the interests of liquidating racism, *apartheid* and the oppression of the people of Namibia? Still fresh in our memories is the repeated veto by certain permanent members of the Security Council against such decisions. Or maybe it is in the interests of small or medium-sized States when the United States of America opposes all possible demands for the withdrawal of its military bases and its troops, which are in all parts of the world. Nor should we forget that it was only the imperialist Powers that were on the side of the hated dictatorships in Iran, Nicaragua, South Korea and South Viet Nam, when the issue was the crushing of the liberation struggle of the peoples of those countries—not to mention the still-continuing political, moral and military support for the Pol Pot régime, which bears responsibility for the murder of three million people in Kampuchea.

112. Most surprisingly there has been a sudden upsurge of love for the former bloody régime of Amin in Afghanistan. To this very day the NATO countries have been co-operating with the *apartheid* régime in South Africa.

113. Quite a few delegations have expressed in this debate their concern about the threat to the international process of détente and have warned of a return to the times of cold war. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic

considers such appeals entirely appropriate in connexion with a certain course of international relations. However, we believe that those appeals should be directed to the proper address. We would venture to recall in this regard that it was precisely the socialist countries which overcame the stubborn resistance of the imperialist and other reactionary forces and achieved a breakthrough towards a process of political détente and which from that time forth have been consistently championing the deepening of that process and also the idea that it should be complemented by military détente. The Warsaw Pact States once again unambiguously stated their determination to pursue the same course in the future too, since there is no sensible alternative. Therefore a halt should be called to the fruitless attempts to cast doubt on that determination to bring about détente in connexion with an artificially whipped-up campaign about the so-called situation in Afghanistan.

114. No one can hide the fact that certain NATO circles have been using that campaign as an argument for intensifying their desire to plunge the world into cold war and to build up the arms race. They have been attempting to hide their dangerous actions—which are aimed at expanding step by step the radius of action in the Middle and Near East by the imperialist military bloc—behind a smoke-screen. In this, the primary goal is declared to be the assurance of the notorious strategic belt of imperialism in the vicinity of the frontiers of the USSR. It is not the policy of the Soviet Union, but the far-reaching strategic aims of imperialist forces, which are relying on growing support from a Far Eastern hegemonist Power, that are threatening the security of the peoples of this region.

115. It would be irresponsible to fail to notice the increasing number of reports which openly state that there are plans for a direct military coalition between those countries. We shall not forget that a leading Chinese figure, while on American territory and to the applause of the United States hawks, said that China was teaching a lesson to the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam. As a result the Chinese aggression was committed against the long-suffering people of Viet Nam—aggression fraught with the danger of a major international conflict.

116. No one should overlook the campaign which has been stage-managed by the imperialist and hegemonist forces against the Afghan people. In view of the concentration of the considerable military potential of the United States of America in the Persian Gulf, a concentration which has been building up for some months now, any further exacerbation or intensification of that campaign could only lead to a deterioration of the situation in that area.

117. In accordance with its policy of principle of support for all peoples struggling against imperialism and hegemonism and for their national independence and social progress, the German Democratic Republic will continue actively to support the just cause of the Afghan people. The demands aimed against that people's right to self-determination and calling into question the sovereign rights of a neutral and non-aligned Afghanistan will be repudiated by the German Democratic Republic. The people and Government of the German Democratic Republic are sure that counter-revolution will not be helped either by mercenaries

directed by agents of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), by Chinese instructors or by other reactionary henchmen, or by the propaganda campaign which has been staged against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The valiant Afghan people will pursue its own course.

118. Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): Few Powers if any have identified so sympathetically with the aspirations of the peoples of Africa for liberation and self-determination as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Be it in our just wars against European colonial Powers, or in our struggle against the *apartheid* policies of the Government of South Africa, or against the usurpation of power in Southern Rhodesia and Namibia, the Soviet Union has always offered us assistance and encouragement. Few countries if any have worked more strenuously than the Soviet Union to promote the course of *détente* and the relaxation of world tension—a course to which the non-aligned countries are irrevocably committed, because it alone provides an opportunity to abolish unequal relations and privileges between States acquired by force.

119. No country or Power has assisted the third world to defend its independence and sovereignty and to eliminate racism and alien occupation more than the Soviet Union. No words that I shall say today can therefore fully convey the deep sense of disappointment and disillusion which the Government and people of Nigeria felt when they heard the news of the Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan, a third-world developing non-aligned country which posed no immediate threat to the peace and security of the Soviet Union.

120. The consequences and implications of Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan are so grave that no arguments based on Article 2, paragraph 7, or Article 51 of the Charter or on the existence of any bilateral agreements can be adduced to justify that intervention or to prevent the General Assembly from considering it. In any case, the question of whether a matter covered by international agreements, by the general provisions of the Charter or by overriding considerations of the maintenance of international peace and security can be regarded as falling essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a country was settled quite conclusively during the second emergency special session in 1956 when the General Assembly considered a similar situation. The General Assembly is therefore right to be seized of this matter following the failure of the Security Council to address itself positively to the draft resolution contained in document S/13729 of 6 January 1980, submitted to it by Bangladesh, Jamaica, Niger, the Philippines, Tunisia and Zambia, on the recent developments in Afghanistan and their implications for international peace and security.

121. Nigeria will never play the role of a pot calling a kettle black. We will never subscribe to the use of double standards which lead some States to view identical situations with favour in one set of circumstances and with distaste in another. We are and shall remain consistent in our condemnation of all violations of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which enjoins all States to

“...refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State . . .”.

122. Be it in Africa, South-East Asia, Latin America or, as now, in Afghanistan, we shall condemn without reservation any and every interference in the internal affairs of States by external forces. We shall always remain faithful to our conviction that all sovereign States must be left to solve their internal problems by themselves. We have also consistently defended the principles of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples everywhere. We are therefore not being selective in condemning the present Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan.

123. Nigeria would never subscribe to a doctrine that justified armed intervention and the violation of the integrity of any State in the name of defending the gains of any revolution. Conversely, we shall never support similar intervention and the violation of the sovereignty of any State because there is a *status quo* to be preserved. Changes of government in Africa, as in other parts of the world, must not be brought about by external forces. Just as we do not accept the concept of spheres of influence, so we do not believe that any State is good enough to determine the leadership of another State on moral or any other grounds.

124. Our manifest concern in this debate, as in other cases when we have not hesitated to condemn the overthrow of Governments anywhere by or with the assistance of external forces, is to uphold the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and to defend the birthright of all peoples everywhere to determine their own destiny free from outside interference, coercion or intimidation of any kind. We therefore call for the unequivocal withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

125. The people of Afghanistan, which for centuries have preserved their sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence, must continue to exercise the right to choose their own form of Government, as in the past, and not by coercion through the presence of foreign troops.

126. We are equally concerned that the intervention by and presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan should not be used to destroy *détente* and to exacerbate international tensions. Cold-war rhetoric and sabre-rattling can only jeopardize or delay the return to normal in Afghanistan and in the region. A return to the cold war will not only heighten world tension but also accelerate the arms race, with consequent damage to the prospects for transferring resources from armament to development.

127. We therefore hope that deliberate efforts will be made to de-escalate the present tension, so that the objectives of the Second Disarmament Decade, which commenced this year, will be achieved and so that the obstacles in the way of ratifying the SALT II treaty can be removed without delay. Furthermore, we hope that all countries, particularly the neighbouring countries, will contribute to the lessening of tension in that region of Asia by exercising restraint and ensuring that the conflict is not widened or intensified.

128. While the situation in Afghanistan is symptomatic of the troubled times in which we live, the fact that it is being considered in the councils of the United Nations—first in the Security Council and now in the General Assembly—augurs well for the Organization as a vital forum for the

solution of international disputes. This point of view needs emphasis and support, since no peaceful and harmonious alternative exists to action within the framework of the United Nations.

129. The permanent members of the Security Council have a special responsibility to ensure that world peace and security are maintained under the aegis of the United Nations. Consequently, we are doubly concerned that, while we are today calling upon the Soviet Union to respect international law and justice by immediately withdrawing its forces from Afghanistan, another permanent member of the Security Council is undermining Security Council resolution 460 (1979) on Southern Rhodesia. It has not only been reneging on its word of honour but has also been cynically violating specific provisions of that resolution. I refer to the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

130. Its current handling of the situation in Southern Rhodesia has cast serious doubt on its intentions and motives in the entire exercise. It has not only tolerated the presence of South African troops in Southern Rhodesia but has also actually and officially deployed them in support of the views and interests of the erstwhile rebel régime. This is clearly contrary to the Security Council resolution on Southern Rhodesia.

131. Secondly, it has been encouraging the use and deployment of those notorious private armies—also called auxiliaries—which have been the bane and scourge of the people of Zimbabwe.

132. Thirdly, the extent to which it has put into use and active service the illegal Rhodesian armed forces and security forces is threatening the success of the outcome of the Lancaster House Conference,⁶ in which we had placed so much hope for the return of peace and stability to southern Africa.

133. Let us therefore hope that from the present consideration of the developments in Afghanistan there will emerge a more aware international community, more committed to the observance of its United Nations obligations, more prepared to use the United Nations to solve international disputes and more faithful to the purposes and principles of our Charter.

134. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): This sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly has been convened because of the failure of the Security Council to respond to the grave situation in Afghanistan, a situation that is fraught with far-reaching negative implications for international peace and security. We are witnessing a massive military operation and intervention by a powerful neighbour in a small, defenceless non-aligned country. That intervention has jeopardized peace and security in the region and in the world. It has set an example and a precedent that may well be followed by others. Today it is Afghanistan that is the victim; tomorrow it may be its neighbours or the small countries in the Middle East or some other part of the world. The threat to the building of an international order based on the values, norms and principles enshrined in the

Charter of the United Nations and upheld by the Non-Aligned Movement is self-evident.

135. Pakistan believes that the United Nations world order is indispensable for the survival and progress of the small and developing countries. The people and Government of Pakistan therefore cannot but be deeply concerned over the armed intervention being carried out by a super-Power in Afghanistan, our immediate neighbour with which the dictates of geography and the vicissitudes of history have intertwined Pakistan in an indestructible common culture and faith and in national interests.

136. The deep apprehension shared by a great majority of nations at the events in Afghanistan following the Soviet armed intervention in that country were manifest in the Security Council debates preceding this emergency special session. Thirteen members of the Council, including all the members representing third-world nations, deeply deplored the armed intervention and demanded the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan. They emphasized strict respect for the sovereignty and national independence of that country and reiterated the inalienable right of its people to determine their own destiny. They declared unequivocally where they stood.

137. The intervention is being justified principally on the following grounds: first, it is alleged that the induction of foreign troops in Afghanistan was necessitated by armed attacks instigated by “imperialist and reactionary circles against the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan”, and the presence of Soviet troops was thus considered vital for maintaining the sovereignty and national independence of Afghanistan. The second justification used is that that action was undertaken in response to requests made from time to time by the Afghan leadership under the provisions of the Soviet-Afghan Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation of December 1978. It has also been asserted that the Soviet action is in keeping with Article 51 of the Charter, which speaks of the right of individual and collective self-defence, because Afghanistan could not be allowed to be turned into a “beach-head for preparations for imperialist aggression” against the Soviet Union. Thirdly, it is argued that the Soviet troops were not involved in bringing about the latest change of government in Afghanistan and that their presence was exclusively a bilateral matter between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union.

138. Those arguments have failed to carry conviction with the international community. That is evident from the result of the vote in the Security Council at its 2190th meeting on 7 January. The debate in the Council has exposed the fallacies and contradictions of those assertions.

139. No evidence has been presented to substantiate the allegation of foreign interference in Afghanistan, much less of foreign armed attacks in that country. A few false and fabricated speculative press reports cited in the Security Council alleging that Afghan insurgents were being trained in Pakistan territory cannot be said to substantiate such a charge when there are scores of authoritative articles carried by the international press pointing to Soviet involvement in the internal affairs of Afghanistan since April 1978.

⁶ Held at London between 10 September and 15 December 1979.

140. On numerous occasions in the past, my Government has reiterated Pakistan's scrupulous adherence to a policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. Whether it was the régime of President Daoud or that of his Marxist successors, namely, Noor Mohammad Taraki and Hafizullah Amin, Pakistan was never averse to exploring or reluctant to explore through dialogue at all levels, including that of the summit, the possibility of establishing amicable relations on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence with Afghanistan. The fact that every one of those Afghan leaders had advanced claims of territorial aggrandisement against Pakistan was not permitted by us to become an impediment to the search for a *modus vivendi* based on the imperatives of good neighbourliness.

141. The problem of the Afghan refugees is not of our making. Our concern for them is entirely humanitarian. They have been given shelter by Pakistan in accordance with universally accepted principles and practices and the 1951 United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees,⁷ supplemented by the 1967 Protocol,⁸ as well as the relevant provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [*General Assembly resolution 217 A (III)*].

142. The Government of Pakistan has placed restrictions on the movements and activities of the Afghan refugees. The officials of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees have inspected many of the more than 30 camps set up to shelter the refugees. The presence of these refugees has placed a heavy burden on our limited resources. Their number has now reached over 400,000. The overwhelming majority of them are poor and have fled from oppression and victimization. They are not criminals and fugitives.

143. The sustained uprising of the people of Afghanistan is an entirely internal phenomenon. It is an expression of their rejection of an alien ideology to which they do not wish to submit. Their resistance is rooted in their devotion to Islam and their deep-rooted national tradition of uncompromising struggle against imperialism and colonialism, their tradition of never submitting or yielding to foreign conquerors.

144. Article 51 of the Charter, which speaks of the right of States to individual and collective self-defence, has been invoked in *ex post facto* justification of the Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan. But the same Article restricts the right to the case of actual occurrence of an armed attack. The Article also makes it obligatory that the measures taken in the exercise of the right of individual and collective self-defence should immediately be reported to the Security Council.

145. The circumstances in which the armed intervention has taken place fall far short of the conditions in which Article 51 of the Charter can be invoked. Afghanistan was not invaded, nor was there a single foreign soldier present on its soil, apart from Soviet military personnel.

146. A non-existent threat of an invasion, and considerations of collective self-defence, are obviously being

advanced to justify the large-scale dispatch of Soviet troops into Afghanistan. Their number is reportedly nearing 100,000. These forces are deployed in all parts of Afghanistan. The Afghan forces have been disarmed. Can that be regarded as a measure meant to protect Afghanistan from external aggression, which alone can justify recourse to Article 51 of the Charter?

147. The presence of foreign troops in Afghanistan is not a bilateral matter; it is a matter of grave international concern. The armed intervention in Afghanistan on the grounds that the Soviet Union could not have allowed that country to become a "beach-head" for aggression against itself constitutes a most alarming precedent. On this pretext, any country, even the most exemplary of non-aligned nations, could become a victim of armed intervention by a more powerful neighbour. What confidence can be placed by the non-aligned world in assurances by great Powers to respect their sovereignty, national independence and territorial integrity and to eschew aggression, military invasion and armed intervention in the pursuit of their competition and rivalry for spheres of influence and strategic gains?

148. The principles of respect for State sovereignty, national independence, territorial integrity of States, non-interference in their internal affairs and non-use of force in international relations are sacrosanct. These principles cannot be qualified or compromised in favour of the export of ideology or the consolidation of its gains.

149. The international community is unequivocally committed to these principles in the Charter of the United Nations and in the various declarations and resolutions enunciated by this world body. We have not lost all hope that a great Power like the Soviet Union will fully recognize the grievous consequences of its armed intervention and will immediately undertake to reverse the course of its action. The baleful change in the international political climate is already manifest: détente and disarmament are threatened by a resuscitation of bloc policies and a renewal of the nuclear and conventional arms race. The goal of a New International Economic Order cannot but recede further, and the forces making for polarization and alignments will be infused with a new lease on life.

150. Attempts to impose from outside a solution of the current internal crisis in Afghanistan will not serve the cause of peace or bring stability to that country; it will only prolong the agony of the Afghan people. My Government and people are deeply anguished over reports in the international press of continuing and indiscriminate repression being carried out against the Afghan people. We hope these reports are unfounded.

151. In conclusion, Pakistan considers it imperative that the General Assembly issue a unanimous call for the immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of the foreign armed forces from Afghanistan; for the creation of conditions which could enable the people of Afghanistan to determine their destiny without outside interference or coercion; for respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Afghanistan and for strict non-interference in the internal affairs of that country; and for the creation of stable and tranquil

⁷ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 189, No. 2545, p. 150.

⁸ *Ibid.*, vol. 606, No. 8791, p. 267.

conditions in Afghanistan which can enable the Afghan refugees to return voluntarily to their homeland under conditions of security of life and honour. Until their return, the international community should extend its assistance to alleviate their suffering.

152. I should like to reiterate firmly and categorically my Government's abiding policy of friendship and goodwill towards the brotherly people of Afghanistan, whose welfare and progress is close to our hearts.

153. We cherish peace and tranquillity in Afghanistan as deeply as we desire them for our own country. It is the earnest hope of the people of Pakistan that the indomitable people of Afghanistan will soon emerge from their travail, find peace and stability in their country and fully reassert their national and Islamic identity.

154. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Some idea of the importance which the international community has attached to the recent events in Afghanistan can be gained from the fact that the draft resolution introduced by the non-aligned members of the Security Council received 13 affirmative votes, although the negative vote cast by a permanent member prevented its adoption. Hence it has been necessary to convene this sixth emergency special session of the Assembly to take up that item, although it should more properly be called an "urgent" session.

155. My delegation has already addressed the Security Council⁹ and clearly expressed my Government's concern over the Soviet military aggression which has violated the political independence of Afghanistan, jeopardizes international peace and security, disrupts détente, which had been

making such headway in recent years, and puts an end—only temporarily, we hope—to the ratification of the SALT II treaty by the other great Power. All of this can only lead to the re-emergence of the cold war, with all the dangers that involves for the medium-sized and smaller countries.

156. These facts are undoubtedly so serious as to justify the international community's feeling insecure from this moment on. From this rostrum, on behalf of my Government, I would appeal to the Soviet Union to ponder the serious consequences which its actions might have for the world, and immediately to withdraw its military forces from Afghanistan so that that country may exercise whatever political options it wishes to exercise, in accordance with democratic procedures.

157. Because it is a permanent member of the Security Council, because of the impact of its actions in this Organization and because of the fact that it is beyond question a great Power, the Soviet Union must be aware of its responsibilities to contribute to the maintenance of world peace and not to jeopardize that peace by such actions as those which add nothing to its historic past.

158. My delegation does not wish to dwell any longer on this matter, because the urgency of this session of the Assembly requires the adoption of decisions without the need for lengthy statements that would only stand in the way of the prompt and effective action that on this occasion the Security Council was unable to take.

159. Let us hope that at least the Assembly and the opinion of the largest possible number of States may make the Soviet Union see the error and the danger of its action.

⁹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year*, 2187th meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.