



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 announce that a draft resolution has been circulated in document A/ES/L.1. It will be introduced during the course of this meeting.

2. I should also like to inform the Assembly that it is my intention that the debate should be concluded tomorrow and that, if possible, we should proceed to the vote at the end of the afternoon meeting tomorrow.

3. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The world has just crossed the threshold of the 1980s in an atmosphere more fraught than ever with the danger and threat of war and aggression. The eloquent words and slogans of peace, security, the rights of sovereign peoples and countries, détente and disarmament, which gushed forth throughout the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly were still resounding in this very hall when it was learned that one of the Member States of our Organization had been brutally attacked by the armed forces of Soviet social-imperialism. And now the new decade must begin in the United Nations with the convening of an emergency special session of the General Assembly.

4. The seriousness of the situation created as a result of the military occupation of Afghanistan by the social-imperialist Soviet Union, as well as the implications and complications that may ensue, have faced the General Assembly with the imperious duty to react. In order to fulfil its duties it must act in accordance with the legitimate interests and rights of the Afghan people, which is currently the victim of the greatest of crimes that can be committed in relations among States, that is, military aggression and occupation. Some have described the debate on the problem of Afghanistan here in the General Assembly as interference in the internal affairs of that country. If the foreign military occupation of a country is to be regarded as an internal affair of the occupied country, then what would be the use of the concept and the term "interference in the internal affairs of a State"?

5. The massive invasion of Afghanistan by armed forces of the Soviet Union to occupy and subjugate that country is overt aggression launched against a sovereign country, a

State Member of the United Nations. That aggression is directed against the national interests and rights of the Afghan people, against the neighbouring peoples and the other countries in the region and against international peace and security.

6. The Soviet Union's aggression against Afghanistan is the latest in a series of aggressions that the super-Powers and the imperialist Powers have constantly been launching since the Second World War against freedom-loving peoples and States in various regions of the world. American imperialism has launched several barbarous aggressions in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America. It has killed and wrought devastation in Korea, Viet Nam, Laos, Cambodia. It has hatched coups d'état in Chile and elsewhere. Soviet social-imperialism carried out the military occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968 by means of armed aggression. Social-imperialist China, almost one year ago, also launched imperialist aggression against Viet Nam.

7. The latest fascist-type aggression launched by the Soviet Union against Afghanistan is the new edition of the occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968, from the point of view both of military action and of the tale prepared to justify it. The Soviet social-imperialists are trying arrogantly and with a marked lack of scruples to justify their military intervention in Afghanistan. The confusing and contradictory arguments and theses that they are putting forward to depict the occupation of a country as a legitimate act are nothing but another manifestation of their logic as aggressors and their scorn for peoples and world public opinion that condemn them with anger and indignation.

8. The keystone of the defence of Soviet social-imperialism is that their armoured divisions and squadrons of planes were sent to Afghanistan at the request of a Government of that country, supposedly to help the Afghan people to safeguard the victories of a revolution and to protect that country's national interests and those of the Soviet Union in the face of foreign interference. Of course they do not forget to adduce as an irrefutable argument the "Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation" between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union.

9. Now, all that is pure and simple fraud, which cannot fool anyone—unless of course one wants to be fooled. The occupation of Afghanistan leaves no doubt about the aggressive and fascist nature of the Soviet social-imperialist policy, about its expansionist and hegemonistic designs and warlike activities. The coup d'état last month in Kabul and the many other Soviet actions in Afghanistan which preceded it show quite clearly that the tragedy of the Afghan people was carefully and cruelly prepared by the civilian and military headquarters in the Kremlin.

10. The Soviet social-imperialists, applying the traditional schemes of aggressive Powers, have used all forms of intervention to disrupt the situation in Afghanistan and above all they have treacherously used to their own advantage the aspirations of the Afghan people to freedom and to the elimination of exploitation by the monarchy and by feudalism since the removal of the king and the coming to power of President Daoud. The violent and brutal seizure of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union was preceded by a series of events during which the Soviet social-imperialists decapitated, one after the other, their own men—those whom they had at first brought to power—in an attempt to find those who would be the most suitable and the most compliant as far as Moscow was concerned. It cannot be said with any certainty that there will be no new surprises.

11. The case of Afghanistan is in many respects a revealing indication of the dangers threatening countries that agree to **sign treaties—already of such sad repute—of friendship and co-operation with an imperialist super-Power like the Soviet Union. For that super-Power, those treaties are nothing but a one-way street which begins in Moscow and along which the armoured divisions can pass when the time comes, as it has in Afghanistan.**

12. The occupation of Afghanistan is a crime against a people and against the whole of mankind. It is one more challenge flung by the Soviet social-imperialists at all peoples that cherish peace and freedom; it is a menacing warning to other sovereign countries. The occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union is a typical example demonstrating how intense prior activity involving plots and conspiracies is followed by the direct invasion of a country by force and then a new wave of cynicism and threats in order to force the people of the country attacked and the international community to accept the fait accompli. The Soviet social-imperialists cynically declare that they have only sent a limited military contingent to Afghanistan, because they could not refuse and therefore not honour a repeated invitation from the Afghan authorities. Having said that, they at once let it be understood clearly that no other “invitation” to withdraw their occupation troops by the Afghan people or the international community would be accepted. As for the other claim—that the Soviet army will remain in Afghanistan temporarily—it suffices to recall that that army continues to be stationed temporarily in Czechoslovakia 12 years after the invasion.

13. The Soviet aggression against Afghanistan and the occupation of that country is a direct consequence of the constant efforts of the social-imperialist Soviet Union to achieve its policy of world expansion and hegemony, its strategic plans which involve a series of economic, political, ideological and military actions. In order to do that, Soviet social-imperialism is trying, among other things, to buy and corrupt the dominant cliques in various countries as well as political groups and individuals, and to foment plots and coups d'état in order to bring pro-Soviet régimes to power and to stir up quarrels and conflicts among other countries so as to destabilize whole regions. And so they even indulge in direct military intervention. All this subversionist and aggressive activity, which is vast and takes many forms, and all the Soviet hegemonist and neo-colonialist actions are camouflaged as assistance and support rendered to revolu-

tionary or national liberation forces and to developing countries. The Soviet Union is trying to make people believe that it is pursuing a Leninist and internationalist policy and that it supports the revolution. In fact it is aiding the counter-revolution.

14. In his work *Imperialism and the Revolution*, the leader of the Albanian people, Comrade Enver Hoxha, stressed:

“Despite what they pretend, the strategy of the Soviet social-imperialists has nothing in common with socialism and Leninism. It is the strategy of a predatory imperialist state which wants to extend its hegemony and domination to all countries on all continents.

“The hegemonic and neo-colonialist policy, which the revisionist Soviet Union is pursuing, clashes, as it is bound to do, with the policy which the United States of America is pursuing and which China, too, has set out on. This is a clash of interests among imperialists in their struggle for the redivision of the world. It is precisely these interests and this struggle that pit the one super-power against the other, that impel each of them to use all the forces and means at its disposal to weaken its rival or rivals, although clashes have not yet reached such a degree of exacerbation that they hurl themselves into armed conflicts.”¹

15. The events that are now taking place in Afghanistan, the tension and dangers created for other countries in the area around it, are the direct consequence of the intrigues and dangerous plots hatched by the imperialist super-Powers, consequences of American-Soviet rivalry, and the gunboat policy practised by the United States and the Soviet Union to the detriment of the independence, freedom and national rights of sovereign peoples and States.

16. The events in Afghanistan, the pressure, the blackmail, the blockades, and even the preparations of the American imperialists to **unleash aggression against Iran are closely linked.** First of all, what is involved is a manifestation of the increasing rivalry of the two super-Powers in the Gulf, in the Middle East and in the Indian Ocean in order to control oil deposits and strategic positions. After its stunning defeat in Iran through the fall of the Shah and the strengthening of anti-imperialist sentiment and the anti-imperialist movement, the United States engaged in a vast deal of activity to retake certain positions and to ensure for itself strong points in various countries. Soviet social-imperialism is also taking this opportunity to carry out plans to advance towards the oil wells of the Gulf and the Indian Ocean. The major objective of Soviet military aggression is to make a vassal of Afghanistan and transform that country into a permanent bulwark in the service of future aggressive plans against other countries in the region and to achieve an old dream of Tsarist Russia, namely, a breakthrough to the warm waters of the Indian Ocean.

17. But the two imperialist super-Powers also have common interests in that area. Both of them are attempting to subvert the revolutionary movements, to repress the peoples and to prevent them from taking the path of independent national and democratic development.

¹ Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, 2nd ed. (Tirana, The Institute of Marxist-Leninist Studies at the CC of the PLA, the “8 Nentori” Publishing House, 1979), p. 38.

18. Within the framework of their global strategy to establish domination and hegemony over the whole world, the United States and the Soviet Union are cunningly co-ordinating their efforts, while defying and accusing each other in order better to hoodwink public opinion. The Soviet occupation of Afghanistan took place at the same time as American imperialist pressures and blockade against Iran were expanding in scope and the possibilities for an American intervention were increasing. The Soviet aggression against Afghanistan is also a blow against the Iranian revolution, which has been caught in the cross-fire between the imperialist super-Powers.

19. The history of the recent past and of our time gives us enough examples to show that the United States and the Soviet Union manage to agree when they have an interest in doing so, and even at times of crisis in their relations when they have to maintain or take under their control other peoples and countries.

20. It has already become a frequent phenomenon in the practice of the two super-Powers that through agreements made in secret they divide areas into zones of influence in order to continue more easily their expansionist and hegemonistic rivalry. One can recall their bargaining to the detriment of the struggle of the peoples of Indo-China fighting against American aggression. We know too of their bargaining to the detriment of the struggle of the Arab peoples against Zionist imperialist aggression, bargaining that went on openly and behind the scenes, in spite of the great American and Soviet rivalry in the Middle East. The same practice is being used by the two super-Powers also against the Afghan and Iranian peoples and throughout the area of the Persian Gulf.

21. International peace and security have been gravely threatened as a result of the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan because that occupation will exacerbate all the imperialist contradictions in that zone. The American imperialists and the Chinese social-imperialists who are hypocritically attempting to pass for “defenders” of Afghanistan and shedding crocodile tears at its fate are hoping to profit from troubled situations and achieve their hegemonistic schemes, be they in Africa, the Middle East or elsewhere. It is not to aid and protect peoples from the dangers of Soviet social-imperialism that the United States and China are intensifying their efforts to strengthen their alliance, especially in the military sphere. On the contrary, the intense activities of the imperialist super-Powers at this time make the world situation more explosive and fraught with tension and increase the risks of war and fresh aggression.

22. No people, no country wedded to peace and freedom and justice, no honest person, to be sure, can remain indifferent in the face of Soviet aggression and military occupation in Afghanistan. The Soviet social-imperialists cannot hide the crime that they have perpetrated against that country and its people. No pretexts or excuses can justify the military invasion of an independent State. The Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and the pressures and blackmail practised by the United States against Iran continue to arouse the indignation of the peoples of the world. Those events provide one more opportunity for the peoples of the world to draw the appropriate conclusions

and, above all, to increase their vigilance in the face of the aggressive, hegemonistic policy of the United States, the Soviet Union and China.

23. Now that the freedom fighters in Afghanistan have taken up arms and are fighting valiantly in the mountains and valleys of their country against the Soviet occupiers and their agents, they need the solidarity of peoples and countries wedded to peace, freedom and justice, of honest and progressive peoples the world over. That solidarity will certainly be given them, as it has been given to other peoples committed to the struggle for national liberation. The revolution of the Iranian people also provides important support for the liberation struggle of the Afghan people which will certainly be upheld by Moslem peoples devoted to peace, wherever they may be. The Arab and African peoples in particular, at present more threatened than ever by American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, should express their solidarity with the Iranian revolution and the Afghan insurrection—and that forcefully. It is a time when, as positions are adopted, we can see who are the leaders of the countries that truly defend the national interests of their peoples. It is a time when we must realize even more clearly that every country or State which relies on one or the other of the imperialist super-Powers runs the great risk of becoming a victim of interference and aggression. It is a time when we must loudly demand: “Soviet social-imperialist aggressors get out of Afghanistan!” and “American imperialists, hands off Iran!” For democratic and progressive peoples it will be increasingly necessary and urgent to redouble our vigilance and efforts to oppose the activities and aggressive schemes of the imperialist super-Powers—the United States, the Soviet Union and China—and other reactionary forces which are pushing mankind to the brink of a great and devastating world conflagration.

24. The Albanian people and Government have energetically condemned the aggression of the Soviet Union against Afghanistan. The Albanian people is profoundly convinced that the Afghan people, valiant and firmly attached to its independence and freedom, will take up arms and finish by expelling the invaders.

25. Mr. KLESTIL (Austria): We are meeting today in accordance with a rare and exceptional procedure which in the history of the United Nations has been followed only in very grave circumstances. Very seldom has the membership of the United Nations been called into session in accordance with the “Uniting for peace” resolution. In this resolution, the General Assembly:

“1. *Resolves* that if the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately . . . [in order] to maintain or restore international peace and security”. [*General Assembly resolution 377 A (V)*.]

And, indeed, the situation in Afghanistan that we are called upon to discuss today constitutes, in the opinion of the Austrian delegation, a threat to the stability of the entire

region and could have serious implications for international relations as a whole.

26. The Austrian Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Willibald Pahr, in view of the seriousness of the developments in Afghanistan welcomed the initiative to discuss this matter urgently in the framework of the United Nations. As we all know, the Security Council could not adopt the draft resolution that was submitted to it by its non-aligned members. That situation led to the convening of this emergency special session, where now all Member States are called upon to examine the situation and state their views and concerns on the matter before us.

27. Austria, as a permanently neutral country, has over the past years again and again stressed the fundamental principles of international relations which call for non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, the maintenance of the territorial integrity and political independence of all States and the non-use of force in international relations, in conformity with the purposes of the United Nations. Therefore, Austria could not remain silent in a situation where these fundamental principles are at stake. The Austrian Federal Chancellor, Mr. Bruno Kreisky, has expressed his deep concern over this situation in Afghanistan and has stated that the military intervention in Afghanistan constituted a real danger for the policy of détente which has been painstakingly developed between the world Powers during the past 25 years and that, as a matter of principle, the invasion by an army into a foreign country could not be accepted. The arguments that have been advanced in support of the intervention did not seem to be justified and could be seen only as a pretext for the actions taken.

28. Austria supports the right of every people to self-determination and to the free choice of its own social and political system. We hope that the people of Afghanistan will soon have the possibility of exercising these basic rights. We therefore join in the appeals made by countries from all over the world, both aligned and non-aligned, for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan and consequently we will support the draft resolution that has just been submitted to this Assembly in document A/ES-6/L.1.

29. The present situation in Afghanistan gives us reason for great and serious concern not only for the future of the people of Afghanistan and the stability of the region, but also for the development of international relations on a global level. Austria would have hoped that the new decade would bring about further improvements in the policy of détente, ensuring peace and security in the world and enabling us to concentrate jointly on the solution of urgent global problems that threaten the well-being of the majority of nations. We would also have hoped for progress in the field of arms control and disarmament. Thus we have repeatedly expressed our strong interest in the early ratification of the SALT II treaty and in further steps between the two leading world Powers at least for a reduction in the quantitative and qualitative growth of their deadly nuclear arsenals. We have again and again stressed the need for real progress in negotiations on mutual force reduction and associated measures in Central Europe—negotiations which have been carried out in Vienna over the

past six years. During the last session of the General Assembly, we again joined many other delegations in urging the speedy conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The recent developments in Afghanistan seem to shatter many of these hopes. Progress in all these areas depends upon an undisturbed and fruitful strengthening of détente in international relations. We hope that the necessary pre-conditions for a resumption of this process will soon be re-established.

30. Mr. B. C. MISHRA (India): Recent events in our neighbourhood, and especially in Afghanistan, are of vital concern to us. India has close and friendly relations with the Government and people of Afghanistan. India is deeply concerned and vitally interested in the peace, security, independence and non-alignment of this traditionally friendly neighbour. India cannot look with equanimity on the attempts by some outside Powers to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan by training, arming and encouraging subversive elements to create disturbances inside Afghanistan.

31. We are against the presence of foreign troops and bases in any country. However, the Soviet Government has assured our Government that its troops went to Afghanistan at the request of the Afghan Government, a request that was first made by President Amin on 26 December 1979 and repeated by his successor on 28 December 1979, and we have been further assured that the Soviet troops will be withdrawn when requested to do so by the Afghan Government. We have no reason to doubt such assurances, particularly from a friendly country like the Soviet Union, with which we have many close ties.

32. Afghanistan has every right to safeguard its sovereignty, integrity and independence. India hopes that the people of Afghanistan will be able to resolve their internal problems themselves without any interference from outside. India hopes that the Soviet Union will not violate the independence of Afghanistan and that Soviet forces will not remain there a day longer than necessary.

33. The discussion in the General Assembly of this question, which relates to the sovereign right of the Government and people of Afghanistan to safeguard their sovereignty and independence, does not help to restore peace in the region; it may well lead to the intensification of the cold war and threaten the peace and security of the region.

34. Recent developments in the Asian region, including the Indian Ocean, have already been a source of grave concern to us. Building bases, pumping arms to small and medium-sized countries and interfering in the internal affairs of nations with a view to isolating and dividing non-aligned countries are activities that pose a threat even to our own security.

35. Mr. THIEMELE (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President the delegation of the Ivory Coast is pleased to see you presiding over the work of this emergency special session of the General Assembly convened pursuant to the provisions of resolution 377 A (V), of 3 November 1950. This is so particularly since you represent a small country which has undergone colonization

and domination and has fought bravely to regain its independence and freedom. Unfortunately, such is not the case with all Member States of our Organization.

36. While most of us, for decades, had our very physical, cultural and social existence flouted, some of the founders of the United Nations have never known foreign subjugation, the denial of their very being or the situation of the dominated with no other right than that of submission, because history has spared them such an experience and also because their size guarantees them greater ease of resistance. That is the tragedy of our Organization, whose Charter proclaims the sovereign equality of all its Members, and whose *raison d'être* is the maintenance of international peace and security through effective collective measures to prevent and remove threats to the peace and to repress any act of aggression or other breach of the peace. Moreover, it also has the task of developing friendly relations among nations on the basis of the principle of equal rights of peoples and their right to self-determination.

37. Is there not therein a solemn undertaking by all States to respect one another and to settle by universally accepted rules any problems that may arise among them? Is that not why all newly independent States, whatever their size, above all seek admission to the United Nations, which is the keystone of the edifice of our civilized world built after the Second World War which saw the collapse of the barbarous Nazi régime?

38. The issue before us today, in its brutality, seems to us to be shaking the foundations of our present-day civilization. We feel there are several reasons for this, but here are the two main ones, as we see them.

39. First of all, contrary to all provisions of the Charter, a great country—to say the least—has sent entire divisions of its powerful army to occupy a neighbouring country that shares 2,000 kilometres of common border with it, that has only a tenth of its population and a hundredth of its wealth, that boasts an age-old civilization, and whose entire population practises the Moslem religion, and to install there a hand-picked régime that is to impose on that people, which has always lived in freedom, a socio-political system that denies its ancestral values. And that great country has the gall to proclaim before our Organization, three quarters of whose Members resemble that crushed neighbour, that it went there at the request of the overthrown Government. Indeed, it invokes Article 51 of the Charter to justify its action—Article 51, which relates to the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if a Member of the United Nations is the victim of armed aggression. Those are the words of the Charter. Article 51, the representative of the new régime reminded us, specifically requires that “Measures taken by Member in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council . . .”. But, since 5 January, those who uphold that thesis have been tirelessly repeating that the consideration of the situation in Afghanistan, first by the Security Council, and then by the General Assembly, is gross interference in the internal affairs of a State which itself declares that it is the victim of foreign armed aggression. Let him understand that who can.

40. The second reason for our concern is even more serious, because it relates to one of the principles set forth

in Article 2 of the Charter—namely, the duty of Member States to “fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the . . . Charter”.

41. Indeed, how could we not be disturbed when the country whose soldiers are today encamped on foreign soil is the very one which has always, convincingly and eloquently, proclaimed its mission to establish egalitarian, democratic and peaceful international relations oriented towards co-operation. That great country, whose representative stated not long ago that “from the very early days of its existence [it has] . . . always been against . . . the subjugation of States by others”,² has with striking persistence led our great Organization to draft a series of texts whose very existence in itself constitutes unprecedented progress in law-making. I will mention only some of the most significant among them: the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty [*General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX)*], the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*]; the draft World Treaty on the Non-Use of Force in International Relations; the Declaration on the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente [*resolution 32/155*]; and, finally, resolution 34/103, entitled “Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations”.

42. Is it not the country which initiated all those texts that, notwithstanding its statements, is today violating the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Afghanistan? Is it not that same country which has set its army to install a government in a sovereign country, without regard for the wishes of the people of that country?

43. Manifestly, that act constitutes the use of force by a more powerful country to impose its presence on a weaker one, and hence is an example of hegemonism over a neighbour. One is entitled to wonder whether this is not duplicity on the part of that great country whose international credibility has so long resided in the revolutionary generosity which it so often proclaims both at home and abroad.

44. Détente, which is the new name for peaceful coexistence, and whose most skilful advocates we know, has been mercilessly breached, and the rules of good neighbourliness and the principle of the sovereign equality of States have been arrogantly ignored.

45. Those two essential facts—namely, the rejection of the rules of good neighbourliness and the apparent duplicity shown by the aggressor in this instance—to which we might add the constant aggressive policy followed by that country throughout the continents, whether directly or through the use of allies—amply justify the present debate in this august Assembly.

46. What remains after this blatant occupation of a country? There remains a people subjected, flouted—another one, observers will say, that will not soon recover

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 103rd meeting

from this misdeed. There also remains a great Power with more than 85,000 of its troops in a neighbouring country that does not have as many, and that Power's own public opinion is not aware that those troops are there. It will find it very difficult to stop now that the going is good, especially since the neighbourhood is in an uproar and like a powder keg.

47. However, this Organization must not acquiesce in the actions of the great Powers without reacting. It must not enshrine in its records the impunity of greater Powers that can impose rules on the smaller and weaker ones, while they themselves blithely ignore them. The United Nations must not encourage the use of force in international relations, whether it be by a great, medium-sized or small Power, lest it destroy all international morality.

48. The Ivory Coast, which has always worked to establish peaceful relations among States, whichever they may be, cannot endorse the policy of diktat, which denies the right of peoples to self-determination and to choose their own political systems and leaders.

49. It wishes to reaffirm its deep conviction that only consultation and continual dialogue must be used by States to settle disputes that may arise among them. It wishes also to advocate, as it has always done, that the policy of non-alignment—a corner-stone of the modern world—must be adapted to a policy of genuine neutrality, making it possible for countries practising it to safeguard their independence and freedom in peace and justice. Thus, on 7 December last President Felix Houphouët-Boigny once again drew the attention of the people of the Ivory Coast to “the sufferings of a country when its weakness and divisions, by opening it up to foreign intrigues, make of it a permanent battleground”.

50. My country will maintain this attitude everywhere and with regard to all peoples, particularly the weakest which must be able to enjoy the protection of the principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations and the freely accepted rules of international law. That is why we support any action within this Organization aimed at the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops at present in Afghanistan and the halting of all foreign interference in that country, so that it will be able, as before, to decide on its own destiny in full freedom, full independence and full sovereignty, without any outside interference. The existence of the United Nations and the maintenance of a peaceful international order depend on that.

51. Mr. HA VAN LAU (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): During the debate in the Security Council on the problem of the situation in Afghanistan, I had occasion to set forth the position of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam on the matter.³ I deeply regret that the Security Council, notwithstanding the strong reiterated opposition of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the objections expressed by many countries, unjustifiably basing its action on an artificial issue, has once again decided to convene an emergency special session of the General Assembly, the sixth such session, to deal with the matter.

52. As is indicated in the telegram of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan addressed on 3 January 1980 to the Security Council,⁴ the fact that the Security Council has considered and, today, the General Assembly of the United Nations is considering the question of the situation in Afghanistan, in spite of the protests of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, is a direct and clear interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

53. My delegation once again expresses its strong disapproval of this arbitrary practice in the conduct of the work of the United Nations, a practice which perhaps shows less concern for the safeguarding of international peace and security than an intention to foster an international political and diplomatic campaign for the covert aims of certain great Powers.

54. I should like at this time warmly to welcome the presence in our Assembly of His Excellency Mr. Mohammad Dost, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Together we have closely followed his important statement, which was a highly valued contribution to an understanding of the situation in his country and the just position of his Government. At this stage in our work, after having listened to the statements of many colleagues who preceded me and who referred to the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations—principles which none here would think of denying—it seems to me that we shall find the key to the problem we have to settle in order to draw a conclusion one way or the other by ascertaining who are the true friends of the Afghan people, who are its unrelenting enemies and who are the legitimate and authentic representatives of that people.

55. To reply to such a question, it is not enough merely to undertake an objective consideration of the facts in their complete historical context and in the chronological unfolding of events, from cause to effect. We must also and above all show a spirit of justice and scrupulous respect, as is right, for the sovereign and inalienable rights of the Afghan people.

56. At the meetings of the Security Council last week, as well as in the General Assembly, more than one speaker criticized the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, without, however, saying one word on the reason for their arrival. Now, we would be surprised if anyone from this rostrum could deny the success of the April 1978 revolution that the Afghan people carried out to free itself from the tyranny of a medieval régime linked to imperialism, with the aim of removing feudal relations and the consequences of the economic and social backwardness of its country, we would be surprised if anyone could deny that there has been an organized conspiracy by foreign forces, that there have been numerous subversive activities and plots carried out through armed attacks and infiltration by the reactionary elements of the fallen régime leading to the shooting of President Mohammad Taraki and to the loss of thousands of innocent lives. When the international media, including the American press, have together provided an

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, 2188th meeting.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1980*, document S/13725.

abundance of irrefutable details, could anyone venture to deny the fact that those plots are hatched by the agents of American imperialism and those of Chinese expansionism based in many sanctuaries on the territories of countries neighbouring Afghanistan?

Mr. Tómasson (Iceland), Vice-President, took the Chair.

57. The concrete facts of the subversive and aggressive activities of Washington and Peking against the Afghan revolution were amply set forth in the statement made this morning [2nd meeting] by Ambassador Troyanovsky, representative of the Soviet Union, to the General Assembly. To systematically disregard those facts, which come within the framework of the manoeuvres of imperialism and international reaction against the right to self-determination of the people of Afghanistan, and to concentrate unjustifiable attacks on the appropriate, legal and necessary assistance given by the Soviet Union to a friendly country that had asked for it, is to deliberately close one's eyes to the objective reality of the situation in Afghanistan and to let oneself get bogged down in the hysterical propaganda of the enemies of the Afghan revolution and the adversaries of the traditional friendship prevailing between the Afghan and Soviet peoples. Similarly, that would represent a lack of political vigilance in the face of the dangerous strategic plan of American imperialism, in collusion with Chinese expansionism, to intensify their military and political holds in various areas of the world, vis-à-vis non-aligned and third-world countries.

58. As for the relations of peace and good neighbourliness between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union, which have lasted 62 years, history recalls for those who might wish to dispute it that at the beginning of its independence Afghanistan benefited from Soviet military assistance when it found itself threatened by British colonialists. Is it anything out of the ordinary if in our time Afghanistan looks to its northern friends and neighbour when it feels that its independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity are threatened by a serious foreign armed attack, especially if its urgent request is fully in conformity with the provisions of the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation signed between the two countries in December 1978, and with Article 51 of the Charter?

59. It is at the very least surprising to note that some circles are shocked that the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan can exercise its right as a sovereign country to choose its friends and effectively organize individual and collective defence. It should be pointed out that they are the very ones who have instigated special meetings of the Security Council and the General Assembly, under the pretext of maintaining international peace and security and defending the right to self-determination of the Afghan people; they are the very forces that have for a long time now been flouting the sovereign rights of the Afghan people.

60. In this noisy campaign, imperialism and international reaction do not hesitate to use any strategy in order to sow confusion regarding cause and effect, the form and substance of this problem, in order to mislead public opinion on a matter of principle that is of crucial importance to the struggling peoples.

61. Nevertheless, oppressed peoples the world over, including the people of Viet Nam, have at the cost of their blood learned to distinguish between those who are their friends and those who are their executioners. At this very moment, not only in Afghanistan but in many areas of the world, the countries that parade slogans in defence of international peace and security are in fact the very ones that are supplying large quantities of the most sophisticated arms to the Zionist forces in Israel to massacre Arab peoples and to perpetuate the exile of the Palestinian people as a whole. They are the ones who are openly helping the racists in Pretoria and Salisbury in their criminal policy of *apartheid* against the people of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa.

62. It is superfluous to recall who are the active allies of the forces of aggression against the front-line States. Who had President Salvador Allende assassinated and thereby destroyed the democratic régime of Chile? Who is protecting the tyrants Pahlavi, Somoza and Pol Pot? Who is using napalm, B-52s and incendiary bombs to subjugate the peoples of Indo-China? Who is organizing and inciting crimes of genocide against 3 million innocent Kampuchean? What country is using its great human potential to occupy hundreds of thousands of square miles of neighbouring countries? What hypocrisy it is when the country that noisily calls for the defence of international peace and security is the country that less than a year ago sent 600,000 troops for a criminal aggression against Viet Nam; the country that is now massing more than 20 divisions of its troops on the borders of neighbouring countries to the south in order to maintain much weaker peoples, numerically speaking, in a constant state of fear of war. The same country that is preaching international peace and security in Afghanistan is supporting training centres for commandos and spies and subversive elements on its own territory and using colonies of its people abroad as a fifth column or a force for the destabilization of other countries under its sway.

63. In recent times there has been a rapprochement, especially in the military sphere, between these forces of expansion in Washington and Peking—these makers of war—which is now aggravating the danger of war that has been hanging over South-East Asia for some time now.

64. In the circumstances, can we take seriously all these words about peace and security used by these forces of imperialism and reaction? Have those who have sown death and desolation for the Vietnamese, Laotian and Kampuchean peoples, who are supporting Zionism against the Arab and Palestinian peoples, suddenly become the saviours of the people? How can they serve international peace and security when they pit peoples one against the other in the Asian subcontinent and provide them with arms?

65. As for the intention of certain circles to distort the role of the Soviet Union and the political, moral, material and military assistance it is according the Afghan people in the face of the danger of the total destruction of the Afghan revolution, I deem it necessary to recall certain episodes of modern history.

66. In recent decades, when the colonial peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America achieved their independence

through a baptism of fire and blood, what fate did colonialism and imperialism reserve for those struggling peoples, if not the guillotine, prison, and napalm? When their imperialist enemies were prepared to wipe them off the map of the world, what would have been the outcome of the struggle of such peoples if moral, material and political assistance from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries had been lacking?

67. It is in the crucible of the struggle for emancipation that the peoples of the third world have realized the incomparable contribution of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries in assisting national liberation movements. The true active and dynamic friendship of these forces, which do everything possible to ensure the victory of the oppressed peoples, is an effective defence against imperialism, neo-colonialism, racism, Zionism and expansionism. That is one of the characteristics of our time, an objective reality of modern history that any person of conscience must acknowledge.

68. That explains why imperialism and its reactionary allies attempt to attack the Soviet Union, to slander its actions of international solidarity with struggling peoples, so as to isolate those peoples from the socialist community, to cut off helpful assistance to them and to reduce their capacity to react, thereby making them more vulnerable and easier to crush. That is the true reason for this campaign of political pressure waged against the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, under the deceptive guise of the defence of peace and international security.

69. The second, unavowed objective of those who promote this campaign is to use it as a pretext to revive the cold war and the arms race. For them this is an unhopd-for opportunity to win over the forces of opposition to a policy of war, to justify the strengthening of so-called anti-Soviet defence forces in South-West Asia, the Persian Gulf, the Horn of Africa and the Indian Ocean.

70. On 9 January last, Agence France Presse reported that the American President stated to American congressmen on 8 January that the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan was "the greatest threat to peace since the Second World War". That remark would suggest that its author knows nothing whatsoever about the war of aggression of unparalleled brutality waged by his country itself, which caused the death of many million innocent people—not only people of the Indo-Chinese peninsula but also Americans themselves and their allies.

71. According to the same agency, diplomatic circles in Washington agree that the statement of the American President shows his concern over the forthcoming election, along with his plan to mobilize the international community against the Soviet Union and to dissuade his still hesitant allies from accepting without reaction the changes which have taken place in Kabul.

72. In the light of such information, it is difficult to say that the campaign in the United Nations on the situation in Afghanistan was not trumped up to create internal and external pressures necessary for the achievement of those strategic objectives.

73. Those revealing facts suffice to demonstrate to us that the unacknowledged objective of this campaign against a legal act of collective self-defence by sovereign countries in accordance with regular international instruments has nothing to do with international peace and security or the peace and security of the Asian subcontinent.

74. Before concluding, I should like to make a statement of principle on the shocking attitude of some countries towards the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and its Government.

75. Some countries have ventured to challenge, in the Security Council, the legality and authenticity of the present Government of the valiant Afghan people. Allow me to express the wish that such arrogance may no longer be tolerated in international relations. For if we were consistent with the principles of the Charter, to which we all subscribe, how could we allow ourselves to prefer one direction pursued by the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan to another? What right have we to speak on behalf of the Afghan people? Although certain countries wish not to accept the edifying reality of the historical changes of our time and try desperately to cling to the old established order, sooner or later they will have to go back on their illogical positions. We have seen examples of this in our Organization on more than one occasion.

76. To our minds, one fact is undeniable: whatever the cost, the progress of peoples is irreversible. Peoples which respect each other and which defend the right of each nation freely to choose the mode of development which it prefers are in duty bound to support the inalienable rights of the Afghan people and of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan

77. For its part, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam firmly supports the position of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the measures which the latter deems appropriate to its interests. That position was expressed in the statement of its President Babrak Karmal in the following words:

"The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan will not allow anyone to infringe the inalienable rights of the Afghan people or its right to defend by all means the achievements of the April revolution, the territorial integrity and the national independence of the country. Nothing can deprive this sovereign State of the right to self-defence, set forth in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, and of its right to request necessary assistance from countries with which it has signed international treaties. The Government and people of Afghanistan believe that the campaign waged against them constitutes interference in their internal affairs and an attempt to prevent them from following the course laid down by the April revolution."

78. We warmly welcome the victories of the Afghan people which has just returned the Afghan revolution to the right path. We join the people and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in paying a tribute to the Government of the Soviet Union for the political, moral, material and military assistance it has furnished to Afghanistan. That assistance was also helpful and decisive for the people of

Viet Nam and other oppressed and struggling people. At present, when the dangers of war, of destruction and of destabilization at the hands of imperialism and expansionism still exist and hang like the sword of Damocles over the heads of peoples, we should reflect seriously and avoid rash actions.

79. With regard to draft resolution A/ES-6/L.1, now before us, I believe that its objective and its contents do not accord with the reality of the facts or the aspirations of the peoples, whether in Afghanistan or elsewhere in the world. It can only serve the campaign to revive the cold war launched by militaristic circles. My delegation believes it to be contrary to the true interests of international peace and security and an interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and I can in no way support it.

80. Whatever the result of the vote which will close our debate on this problem, the Afghan revolution and oppressed peoples will nevertheless continue to press forward irreversibly. At the same time, it is sincerely to be desired that in their aspirations for peace, freedom, justice and progress they will achieve success with the support rather than in spite of the United Nations.

81. Mr. NAVA CARRILLO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I had occasion, as the representative of Venezuela, to state in the Security Council⁵ my country's position on the question which is today before the General Assembly at this, its sixth special emergency session. This session was convened because the Security Council, which has primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace, was prevented from exercising its responsibility, which is directly linked to the fulfilment of one of the purposes of the United Nations, in connexion with an inherently grave matter which infringes, flouts and thereby damages principles as essential as the equality of rights of nations and the self-determination of peoples.

82. Venezuela was a signatory of the letter dated 3 January 1980 to the President of the Security Council calling for the convening of the Council,⁶ since we were fully convinced that the intervention in Afghanistan made it necessary for the international community to speak out and adopt provisions to protect the force of the commitment stemming from the Charter and the various decisions of the General Assembly.

83. I should like to repeat on this occasion, on behalf of the people and Government of Venezuela, the urgent and indispensable need for the United Nations to guarantee the right of all peoples freely to choose their own destiny and to select their own ways and means of development, without foreign interference, free from pressure obstructions or outside interference, solely limited by the rule of law, both nationally and in their international activities, in the elements which are essentially inherent—in other words, the maintenance of peace and security, mutual respect among States, equal rights and the non-use of force with respect to the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. Only the unrestricted observance of this

system of values of international order can guarantee the development and maintenance of friendly relations and international co-operation among States. This concept and this system are vital for all the members of the international community and, in particular, for the future of the developing countries, since it is a part of their life and of their orderly, reasonable and independent survival.

84. We see this indispensable need as being linked to total respect for the principle of non-intervention, as defined in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. As we stated in the Security Council, Venezuela is firm in its adherence to this fundamental principle, based on our regional convictions and as a result of our continental and international commitments.

85. Also vitally necessary is the correct use of the inherent right of individual and collective self-defence in the case of armed attack against a Member of the Organization, as set out in Article 51 of the Charter, whose clear provisions should not be distorted or become the subject of circumstantial interpretations.

86. We believe that the objective aspect is clear and that discussions of interpretation should not lead to the abandonment, weakening or subordination of obligations clearly founded on ethics and law, nor should they weaken the force of the Charter, since the commitment of States in this area cannot affect the notion and the requirement of the compatibility of the obligations imposed by the Charter on all Member countries.

87. Venezuela has no intention of speaking on or describing the internal situation in Afghanistan either before 1978 or afterwards. That is the responsibility of the Afghan people. Similarly, we cannot agree that the internal political events experienced by that people, in their search for their own political, economic and social destiny, should be an excuse for foreign interference, such as the massive military presence now in Afghanistan, or the use of methods, however sophisticated these may be, which violate the normal process whereby a people chooses its political régime or the ideological structure on which it prefers to base that.

88. When we consider the references to previous acts of aggression and foreign intervention, we are bound to say, as we said in the Security Council, that in such an attitude we see an attempt to distort reality, and we wonder: If there had been such acts of aggression and intervention, why were they not denounced in due course in this Organization? Do States not have available to them the valuable assistance of General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) to help determine whether acts of aggression have been committed—and particularly article 3, subparagraphs (a) and (g), of the Definition of Aggression, annexed to that resolutions?

89. But this situation which we are considering today contains additional factors and suggests that there may be serious repercussions for the future of our countries, which base their tranquillity and their right to comprehensive development on the force of the international legal order. Moreover, the lack of moderation by the great Powers in the past led to the establishment of a new form of

⁵ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fifth Year*, 2188th meeting.

⁶ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1980*, document S/13724 and Add 1 and 2.

protection, namely, non-alignment. Both means of protection, legal and political, are today undoubtedly threatened, and we believe that it will not be possible to look to the future with confidence if we are not also convinced that it will only be promising if all members of the international community commit themselves by collective action, with joint will, and if the future reposes on exclusively legal tutelage, which would prevent attempts and actions aimed at breaching our national identity and establishing relationships of domination or dependence.

90. The United Nations and its Members have written a striking chapter in the struggle for the self-determination of peoples. No less relevant were its efforts in the economic and social fields. That was possible because of the credibility of the purposes and principles of the United Nations, which today is suddenly called on to consider situations which, quite frankly, are surprising in their untimeliness, and are incomprehensible because they are opposed to all efforts to develop an order of peace and security, for which we are called upon each year to give our blessing and which appears to be only pious words.

91. Our statements and our position are not prompted by anyone. The seriousness of our commitments to the international community and our membership in the United Nations are the inspiration and form the exclusive foundation for our attitude. We believe that the process, which is so costly, of reducing international tension and eliminating economic and social inequalities is being interrupted.

92. In regard to the deployment of military forces on the continent, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Venezuela stated before the most important Latin American regional body that it seems unfortunate to us because it has the effect of presenting those countries before the eyes of the world as being subject to military tutelage, which has the effect of driving countries in the area towards polarization, which they themselves do not wish, and because that demonstration of force threatens the credibility of countries which have immense responsibility for the maintenance of world peace.

93. We greatly appreciate the importance of the fact that the General Assembly today is exercising its responsibilities to achieve the elimination of the causes of the disturbing situation in Afghanistan and to promote the restoration of confidence—if not unlimited—in respect for the principles of the Charter. Obviously there must once again begin a new process of slow recovery—at least of the tranquillity which can result from the reasonable exercise of moderation.

94. In conclusion we should like to state that in our view the General Assembly must call for a halt to interference in matters which pertain to the internal jurisdiction of Afghanistan and which are solely and exclusively the preserve of its nationals. It must call for the withdrawal of foreign troops from its territory and remind the Security Council of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security. In doing that the General Assembly will be assuming its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations.

95. Mr. ANDERSON (Australia): This is an historic meeting of the General Assembly. Since the adoption of resolution 377 (V) in 1950, the “Uniting for peace” procedures have been used sparingly, the most recent occasion being in 1971 in relation to the situation in the Indo-Pakistani sub-continent. We are thus meeting under carefully conserved procedures in the face of a situation of clear and present danger to international stability and security. It is worth recalling that in the debate prior to the adoption of resolution 377 (V), a number of speakers rightly pointed to the historical perspective of the failure of the League of Nations, in the face of aggression in Asia, Africa and Europe, and to the scourge of world war which then ensued from those tragically unchecked actions. Our Organization must, on this occasion ensure that all responsible Members respond effectively to the common challenge that confronts us all.

96. Previous speakers both in this debate and in the Security Council have examined at length the course and the character of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The chronology of events is clear, including the significant and ominous fact that the invasion was launched three days before a request for Soviet military assistance was made by the present authorities in Kabul. It is now patently clear that that request was not made by the late President Amin or his Government. Attempts by the Soviet Union and its allies to justify or rationalize the invasion have been exposed and rebutted conclusively by many previous speakers.

97. One of the most telling indictments of the Soviet action was the statement made to the press on 4 January by Ambassador Abdul Tabibi, a one-time Minister of Justice of Afghanistan, who resigned his post here as Deputy Permanent Representative of Afghanistan to the United Nations in protest against, as he put it, “. . . the violations of the sovereignty and independence of my country by our neighbour, the Soviet Union”.

98. Ambassador Tabibi recalled that Afghanistan was the first country to recognize the Bolshevik revolution and that thereafter it maintained uninterrupted friendly relations with the Soviet Union. “It is indeed shocking and unbelievable to our people”, Ambassador Tabibi said, “to see the answer to all these warm and cordial relations a massive intervention by Soviet armed forces against our Islamic and freedom-loving people”.

99. The Soviet action also appears deeply ironic when we recall the statements made in this very hall by Soviet representatives, who have pledged support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of other States, for the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other States, and who have spoken out against hegemonism.

100. The Australian Prime Minister and Foreign Minister have condemned the invasion of Afghanistan as totally without justification, as a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and indeed of everything the United Nations stands for, and as a mode of behaviour which would make normal relationships between nations totally impossible. The Australian Government has accordingly taken a number of decisions in the context of its bilateral relations with the Soviet Union which are designed to demonstrate

its deep concern and to register the strongest possible opposition to the Soviet Union's action.

101. In this Assembly, Australia joins the overwhelming majority of delegations in calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of foreign forces from Afghanistan and for the restoration of conditions in which the Afghan people can choose their own Government freely and without external interference of any kind. We call upon the Soviet Union to heed the expressions of concern that have been voiced here by so many delegations. No one can mistake the urgency of that call. No one can mistake the fact that the smaller and non-aligned countries among us view with alarm the implications for their own peace and security of the brutal action taken by one of the great Powers, a permanent member of the Security Council, against Afghanistan.

102. But it is not just the survival of Afghanistan and other small nations—vital as they are—that is at stake. The whole system of international relationships is at issue also, and the prospects for effective co-operation among countries of different social systems in the great world tasks of arms control, international economic co-operation and development that face us in this new decade. The heightening of international tensions likewise carries implications for continuing co-operation in the scientific, technological, cultural and sporting fields.

103. My Government has noted statements by the Soviet Union and others to the effect that Soviet forces will not stay in Afghanistan any longer than is necessary. While in our view their presence was at no time necessary or justifiable, we call on the Soviet Union to honour those assurances and to expedite the withdrawal of its forces without further delay, so that the world community may return as soon as possible to the paths and patterns of international co-operation and broader understanding.

104. From what I have said, it will be clear that my delegation will support the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1. sponsored by 22 non-aligned and third-world delegations. We join those delegations in deeply deploring the recent Soviet armed intervention. We support their appeal for full respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan. We join their call for the immediate unconditional and total withdrawal of foreign troops. The Australian Government is likewise deeply concerned by the hardships being suffered by several hundreds of thousands of Afghan refugees and we support the appeals made in the draft resolution for relief assistance for those refugees and for action to establish the necessary conditions in which they may eventually return to their homes. My delegation will vote accordingly in favour of that draft resolution.

105. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): France voted in favour of the motion to bring before the General Assembly the serious situation resulting from the events that recently occurred in Kabul and in the rest of Afghanistan. It was quite right that from 5 to 7 January the Security Council should have debated the threat to international peace and security caused by the use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of a State Member of our Organization. In

these circumstances, France regrets that the recommendations which most members of the Security Council proposed to adopt were not unanimously agreed to. It is for the Assembly to express, by the required two-thirds majority on this question as serious as the concern it arouses, its determination to put an end to the situation that is dragging on in Afghanistan.

106. In a statement published on 9 January 1980, the French Government once again expressed its serious concern at the intervention of Soviet forces in Afghanistan, as follows:

“The events occurring in that country are in contradiction with the basic principles governing international life and the policy of France.”

107. Pursuant to our Charter, each State has the right to respect for its sovereignty and independence, the right to determine, free from any outside interference, its political and social options and, finally, the right to full recognition for its people of their identity and legitimate aspirations.

108. None of the information that has leaked out over the borders of Afghanistan entitles us to think that those rights are being respected. To the contrary, it was confirmed during the recent debates of the Security Council that the Government which had determined Afghanistan's fate up to 24 December 1979 had been eliminated after the arrival of foreign troops. This means that the intervention of those troops could not be justified by the application of the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation signed between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan on 5 December 1978 or by the application of Article 51 of the Charter. France has too much respect for the Afghan people, its dignity, its courage, its devotion to its Moslem faith and its national traditions to believe that one can advance any sort of legal argument to cover up the blow just dealt it.

109. The events which have taken place and are continuing to take place in Afghanistan have harmed the policy of détente, a policy to which France is sincerely but not unconditionally attached, as was stated by the French Government in its communiqué of 9 January. Everyone here knows that, having taken the initiative for this policy of détente as early as 1965, France has striven to achieve its effective implementation with determination and steadfastness. In this connexion, the joint statement of 22 June 1977 by the Soviet Union and France on international détente constituted an important stage in a process which can develop only with mutual trust. That statement stipulates especially that the Soviet Union and France feel it absolutely necessary that there be a continuation and intensification by all States of efforts for détente “through the adaptation to the needs of this détente of their activities vis-à-vis all States and in all regions of the earth”.

110. The activities of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan are not in conformity with that solemn declaration. To re-establish the confidence necessary for the pursuit of détente, France appeals once again for observance of Afghanistan's independence and for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country, so that it will be able to regain freedom, peace and its right to determine its destiny for itself.

111. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The international community has before it a topic of the utmost seriousness and gravity. Since the recent events that took place and are continuing to take place in Afghanistan are not related only to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent State but also concern the Western Asian region which constitutes a sensitive and most important area both for the peoples that live there and for the world in its entirety, the Government of Saudi Arabia considers the flagrant aggression against Afghanistan as an aggression against a sister country to which it is tied by bonds in matters of religion, tradition, culture and common interests. Therefore, the Government of my country hastened to condemn that brutal aggression and to associate itself with the request submitted to the President of the Security Council, in a letter dated 3 January 1980, for the convening of the Security Council with a view to the adoption of urgent and effective measures for the termination of that aggression and the withdrawal of the foreign military troops from Afghan territory.

112. Fifty-two States submitted the above-mentioned letter. That number exceeds one third of the membership of the United Nations. My Government is aware that the great majority of the international community supported that request.

113. The result of the vote on the draft resolution considered in the Security Council with regard to this matter⁷ was 13 votes in favour and 2 against. One of the negative votes was that of the aggressor, one of the five permanent members of the Security Council; so that amounted to a veto which alone prevented the adoption of that draft resolution, the sole aim of which was the preservation of international peace and security in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

114. In my statement before the Security Council,⁸ I mentioned that responsibility for the preservation of peace and security is shouldered as much by the major Powers as it is by the small Powers. The big Powers, however, bear a greater responsibility because they possess the weapons, equipment and means of destruction and devastation. This strength is obviously accompanied by a greater awareness of the enormous dangers that may occur in case of a breach of peace and security.

115. What did the draft resolution stipulate? The sponsors of the draft resolution were careful to avoid confrontation, provocation and embarrassment, so they formulated it in a manner to confine it to the assertion of the right of all peoples to self-determination and their right to choose their own form of government free from outside influence or pressure.

116. The draft resolution also affirmed the obligation of States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. Without mentioning the Soviet Union, the draft resolution deplored the recent

armed intervention in Afghanistan, which is inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. The draft resolution called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan in order to enable its people to determine their own form of government and choose their economic, political and social systems free from outside intervention, coercion or constraint of any kind whatsoever.

117. It would have behooved a major State like the Soviet Union to comply with international public opinion and accept immediate withdrawal from the land of Afghanistan because such a withdrawal could not threaten the peace or security of that super-Power, whereas perseverance in the invasion and the use of armies, tanks, planes and every other means of devastation and destruction against the peaceful people of a small neighbouring country constitute a grave danger not only for Afghanistan, but also for the peoples and States neighbouring Afghanistan, with which they have ties of religion, customs, traditions and political, economic and social systems. Indeed, I can affirm that the non-compliance of the Soviet Union with the principles of the Charter and with the simplest rules of international law, and especially its insensitivity to the feelings of the Moslem and peace-loving peoples and its persistence in aggression, expansion and imperialism at the expense of a peaceful country, may constitute a real danger to the security of the Soviet people themselves because no country can build its policy on the basis of aggression and a challenge to the majority of the international community, regardless of its military might. History is replete with such examples.

118. There can be no argument about what took place in Afghanistan. A coup d'état took place in April 1978. President Noor Mohammad Taraki took over. This coup was carried out by certain Afghan elements despite differences in their beliefs or political aims. This was followed by another coup d'état carried out by Hafizullah Amin. It seems from the information available that resistance to the imposed régime continued because the régime of Hafizullah Amin was no different from its predecessor's and it was a result of a takeover by force. But only the Afghan people have the right to resist that régime or to change it, and the ruler or government cannot be imposed by another country by means of invasion, occupation, armies, tanks, weapons, planes or bombs wreaking destruction and devastation. That has led and is still leading to the death of thousands of peaceful citizens, who are rendered homeless and become refugees, fleeing across the borders to the neighbouring countries.

119. The Soviet Union claims that its military invasion was carried out at the request of the present legally constituted authority and that any objection to its intervention should be considered as interference in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan. That is nonsense. Nobody can believe it. The recent developments are entirely inconsistent with these claims because the Government that was in power when the Soviet armies ravaged Afghanistan was that of Hafizullah Amin. He may have asked for a Soviet armed intervention, yet the first task achieved by the Soviet army was that of ending his rule and installing another ruler in whom the Soviet Government had greater confidence than did the Afghan people.

⁷ *Ibid.*, document S/13729.

⁸ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fifth Year*, 2186th meeting.

120. The claims of the Soviet Union are legally in dispute because its military intervention, although it may have been based on an invitation from Hafizullah Amin, became null and without foundation upon the death of Hafizullah Amin, who was in power during the Soviet military intervention.

121. The Soviet Government claims even indirectly that Soviet forces invaded Afghanistan in a limited and temporary assignment aimed at protecting the independence of Afghanistan from imperialist aggression. Did Afghanistan really suffer from imperialist aggression and did the Soviet troops come to Afghanistan to protect it from an imperialist invasion? The Soviet Union has not given any proof of the presence of foreign armies or troops in Afghanistan. The only foreign troops in Afghanistan are those of the Soviet Union. It has not presented a single shred of evidence that national resistance to the present rule in Afghanistan was beyond the capacity of the Afghan army and thus justified intervention on the part of a super-Power like the Soviet Union.

122. Actually, the Soviet invasion does not represent anything but imperialist expansion aimed at establishing and consolidating a communist rule against the will of the peaceful Moslem Afghan people. The expanding numbers of Soviet troops in Afghanistan are but the means of protecting the Government imposed by the Soviet Union and preventing any national resistance to its rule. When it proved impossible for the present national Government to protect itself because it lacked national support, Soviet troops invaded the country to put an end to national resistance.

123. What the Soviet Union has done is contrary to and inconsistent with the simplest principles of the Charter of the United Nations as well as the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which are two declarations adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session [*resolutions 2625 (XXV) and 2734 (XXV)*], and is clearly in violation of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 32/153 concerning non-interference in the internal affairs of States, and resolution 34/103, concerning the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations. The latter resolution was the result of a Soviet initiative.

124. The Government of Saudi Arabia cannot condone the Soviet invasion of a sister country with which we have close relations of religion and traditions. My country condemns this flagrant aggression committed against a sister peaceful State and it rejects the pretexts of the Soviet Union. It considers that the rule imposed by the Soviet Union on Afghanistan is inconsistent with and foreign to the will of the Afghan people and to the simplest rule of self-determination. Foreign occupation is nothing else in this case but Soviet occupation and expansion that may seriously endanger the whole region. My country calls on the General Assembly to deplore and denounce the Soviet intervention and to exert pressure on the aggressor to withdraw immediately its troops from the country and give back to the Afghan people the freedom to choose their

government without any outside intervention, constraint, coercion or foreign threat. The Government of my country appeals to all the non-aligned and Moslem countries and to all peace-loving countries to support any resolution or measure that would guarantee the prompt withdrawal of the Soviet military troops from the land of Afghanistan and would restore to the Afghan people, which alone has the right to its self-determination, the freedom to choose its own government.

125. Mr. MATANE (Papua New Guinea): The international community experienced and witnessed many serious problems, particularly economic, social and political, in the last decade, the worst year of which was probably 1979. At the end of that decade it would have been better for the world community to say, "We have had enough. We are going to try and do better for ourselves during the next decade. We are going to concentrate on doing more by helping our own people to live the secure and free life that we are all entitled to have." But we did not say that. Instead, we moved straight into the 1980s with the same problems. We even started something new.

126. My delegation, considering what happened in the past, sees a grim picture of the 1980s. That decade will not only be bad; it will definitely be worse. Our future generations, if they are to come at all, will probably not forgive us for the problems that we, the people of this generation, have created and will leave behind. However, by our joint efforts and with our eyes in the right direction, we can change this troubled world for the better.

127. We are assembled here today because we are concerned about one of those problems. We are not only concerned; we are here to find a solution to the problems in Afghanistan.

128. Afghanistan, a small developing nation with a proud people, has had a long history of cultural, religious and political independence. Afghanistan has experienced a series of Governments in the last couple of years. The latest was that of President Hafizullah Amin. President Amin might not have been the best president for his people, but the fact that he was president of a sovereign nation is a matter of importance. If his people were not satisfied with him as their leader, they should, as a civilized people, have replaced him through constitutional means.

129. It was learned from the press that on 25 and 26 December 1979, the Soviet Union airlifted about 10,000 troops to Kabul, the capital city of Afghanistan. On 27 December the Soviet troops participated in a coup against President Amin. The President was not only overthrown; he was killed.

130. After the killing, more Soviet troops arrived in Afghanistan—this time by land—as reinforcements for approximately 50,000 troops. The latest indication is that there are now well over 85,000 Soviet troops in Afghanistan. They are there to support and protect an Afghan, Mr. Karmal, whom the Soviets brought in from exile outside Afghanistan. They even made him President of Afghanistan.

131. It has been argued by those who defend the action taken by the Soviets that the Soviet troops are in

Afghanistan because they were invited by the Afghan Government. Should we accept the argument, then, that President Amin invited the Soviet troops to overthrow his own Government and eventually kill him? My delegation finds this hard to believe.

132. The Soviet Union is a super-Power. It has many things in its favour: military superiority, high technology and a strong economy. It has privilege and prestige as a permanent member of the Security Council with veto power and as a Founding Member of the United Nations. It also has a responsibility. My delegation would have thought that, in view of that responsibility, the Soviet Union would abide by the various principles of the Charter of the United Nations. I would refer particularly to resolution 2625 (XXV), unanimously adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, containing the Declaration on the Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Sadly, the Soviet Union has violated those principles. It has interfered with the internal affairs of another State—in this case, Afghanistan. It has used force against the political independence of Afghanistan. It definitely has no right, in the words of the aforementioned resolution, “to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal . . . affairs of any . . . State”. It should also “refrain from any forcible action which deprives peoples . . . of their right to self-determination and freedom and independence”. It should not “organize . . . armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the régime of another State.”

133. My delegation views the Soviet action in Afghanistan with grave concern and disappointment. The Soviet action has added to the already existing political and economic instability in South-West Asia, the Asian continent and the world at large.

134. I should like to refer to agenda item 126 of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, entitled “Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations”. The resolution on that item [34/103], adopted on 14 December 1979 by a large majority of Member States, was championed by the Soviet Union. Speaking in explanation of his vote, the Soviet Union’s representative to the United Nations said in part:

“ . . . the General Assembly has taken another important step towards strengthening international peace and security and ensuring the sovereign equality of States and the independence and freedom of peoples.”⁹

He went on to say:

“The representatives of many countries emphasized the danger posed to the cause of peace by the form of hegemonism constituted by the striving for military superiority, which whips up the arms race and increases military arsenals.”⁹

Towards the end of his explanation, he nicely said that his State:

“ . . . has from the very early days of its existence staunchly advocated the reaffirmation in international relations of the principle of the equality of States and peoples. We have always been against hegemonism and the subjugation of States by others. True to that ideal of the October Revolution, and consistently pursuing a policy of peace, the Soviet Union will continue staunchly to counteract hegemonistic ambitions wherever they may emerge.”⁹

135. Are we to assume, then, that the condemnation of all forms of hegemonism was just a mouthful of beautiful words without any deeds? Why has there been a sudden reversal? It is sad but fair to say that the Soviet Union’s credibility as a champion of world peace and a strong supporter of the basic purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations is obviously questionable. In order for that credibility to be salvaged and for stability to return to that region, the Soviet Union must adhere to the principles enshrined in our Charter. It must immediately and unconditionally withdraw its forces from Afghanistan. It must cease interfering in the internal affairs of that small independent nation. And it must respect that country’s territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence.

136. Mr. DE FIGUEIREDO (Angola): We are all gathered here today in the exercise of our mandate, a mandate to debate and resolve and, hence, ultimately to shape history; but a mandate without a mission results in empty rhetoric, mere posturing and meaningless resolutions. It is a mission that gives a mandate meaning, that justifies it; in fact, it necessitates it. And our mission is peace and all the components of peace, not the least of which are respect for the sovereignty of independent States and non-interference in their internal affairs.

137. Since when does international law or the Charter of the United Nations forbid the seeking of assistance from another friendly nation? And since when does international law allow rebel groups to be armed, trained, based abroad and infiltrated into sovereign territory to carry out acts of sabotage and subversion against a sovereign Government and people? Since when does the international community sanction the flow of military equipment and money from Western imperialist Governments and their regional allies to arm and train insurgents for the express purpose of destabilizing a sovereign Government and terrorizing a nation?

138. What has happened in that part of Asia in recent weeks is a matter that concerns the Government and the people of Afghanistan alone. The Kabul Government made a request to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for assistance against threats orchestrated from abroad.

139. Ever since its own glorious October Revolution the USSR has been a friend and ally to all genuine liberation movements and all progressive forces involved in the continuing struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism.

140. As His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan informed the Security Council in his statement

⁹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 103rd meeting

of 5 January 1980,¹⁰ the events that had occurred in Afghanistan, his own country, are an internal domestic matter.

141. My Government is in full solidarity with the Government and the people of the fraternal State of Afghanistan. We believe that this debate is a gross interference in the internal affairs of an independent country and, that being so, it is the prerogative of that Government alone to bring national matters to an international forum if it so desires. We also believe that, if the Assembly has to deal with all the events in that area, then we should hear other details as well.

142. For example, we want to hear about the attempts since 1978 of the imperialist and reactionary forces to undermine the Afghan revolution. We should be informed about the unceasing provocations that have been directed against the Afghan Government. We should like more details about the imperialist quest for military bases and the rapid deployment force which is being prepared to carry out the twentieth-century equivalent of gunboat diplomacy.

143. I sincerely hope that those questions, which have so far been obscured and buried under the hysterical charges of intervention, will be addressed. I also hope that that hysteria will not rob all of us of our sense of history, for, if we stop for one moment, we must all realize that the forces that now cry intervention have in fact been the masters of such actions. Did we hear an outcry or a call for an emergency special session of the General Assembly when the human rights of the Nicaraguan people were being violently trampled on? Did we hear an outcry when bombs showered down on the Vietnamese people mercilessly and with impunity? Today, do we hear an outcry from them, or do we not rather see continued support of the racist régime in South Africa?

144. Imperialism and military adventurism are still alive and well. The real value of this international Organization lies in its ability to provide a forum for communication and resolution. We the Members of the once dispossessed world demand that it serve our needs and imperatives as well, not the least important of which are international safeguards for the preservation of territorial integrity and sovereignty. Let us begin the new year with the application of those principles to the independent and sovereign State of Afghanistan.

145. Mr. SALLAH (Gambia): On 25 December 1979 the Soviet Union began a massive airlift of military equipment and personnel into Kabul, the capital of Afghanistan, on the pretext of having been invited by the Afghan Government to help in warding off an unidentified external threat. Two days later the Head of State of that country, President Hafizullah Amin, was deposed and subsequently executed with members of his family in a bloody coup d'état staged almost entirely by the 50,000 Soviet military forces that had forcefully crossed the border and blatantly invaded the independent State of Afghanistan.

146. A pro-Soviet régime, dependent for its survival on the Soviet armed forces that have invaded Afghanistan and headed by Barak Karmal, a former exile, has been imposed on the people of Afghanistan, and it is now estimated that a total of 80,000 Soviet forces are firmly installed in various parts of the country to suppress the people of Afghanistan, which, in defence of its sovereignty and independence, has taken up arms against the invading forces.

147. The Gambian Government and people have naturally been closely following with great concern and dismay the developments that have culminated in the extremely grave and intolerable situation in Afghanistan. The naked act of aggression launched by the Soviet Union against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent Afghanistan not only constitutes a flagrant violation of the fundamental rights of the people of that country and a serious violation of the Charter of the United Nations but also contravenes a basic tenet of international law and poses a direct threat to international peace and security.

148. In consonance with its firm commitment to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of independent sovereign States, the Gambian Government joins the rest of the international community in condemning this act of aggression and in expressing total solidarity with the people of Afghanistan in their valiant struggle.

149. Furthermore, my Government has decided to suspend, with immediate effect, the Agreement on Cultural and Scientific Co-operation between the Gambia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics until such time as all Soviet military forces and installations are withdrawn from Afghanistan and the right climate for a democratically constituted Government is restored. We are also supporting the proposal by Bangladesh to convene an extraordinary meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the member States of the Organization of the Islamic Conference in Islamabad on 26 January 1980 to examine the explosive situation in Afghanistan.

150. Mr. PALMA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation is pleased to see Ambassador Salim filling the presidency of this sixth emergency session of the General Assembly. We reiterate our offer to extend to him our fullest co-operation.

151. Our country has followed with concern developments in Afghanistan and, like many other States, it considers that they can endanger international peace and security in Central Asia and throughout the entire world.

152. Those events were discussed at length in the Security Council a few days ago, and because of the negative vote of one of the permanent members the Council was unable to deal with the substantive matters that had been brought before it. That led to the decision—a wise and timely one, we feel—to convene the General Assembly to consider and deal with the question as a matter of urgency.

153. Information available on the events in Afghanistan—information that the great majority of the international community agrees is correct—suggests a situation in the face of which it is necessary repeatedly to reaffirm basic principles of the Charter.

¹⁰ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, 2185th meeting.*

154. Afghanistan is a non-aligned developing country, as is Peru. For that reason, and because substantive questions related to the maintenance of international peace and security are involved, we consider it our duty to emphasize that full respect for the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-aligned status of Afghanistan must be fully safeguarded.

155. On the other hand, events in Afghanistan are creating a new flow of refugees, which the international community must provide with urgent humanitarian assistance. To that end, the speedy and total withdrawal of the foreign military forces now occupying Afghanistan is an essential prerequisite.

156. My country's foreign policy is one of clear support for the defence of and respect for the principles of international law, and in particular those of non-intervention, the self-determination of peoples, the non-use of force in international relations, the sovereignty of States and their territorial integrity. Those principles are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and that of the Organization of American States, and they are essential principles freely accepted by the Non-Aligned Movement. We therefore call for the withdrawal of the foreign military forces now in Afghanistan so that the Afghan people may decide for itself and without any form of interference its own destiny and organize its own system of government.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.