

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**5th
PLENARY MEETING**

Saturday, 12 January 1980,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

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

AGENDA ITEM 5

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

1. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic deeply regrets that the reactionary imperialist Powers, led by the United States of America, have managed to impose upon the Security Council, and thereafter upon the General Assembly, the discussion of a question which falls exclusively within the internal competence of an independent, sovereign State, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. This was done against the will of Afghanistan and in disregard of its resolute and categorical protest and is undoubtedly a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. It is quite clear to our delegation that all this unwarranted fuss and the clamorous campaign of propaganda are being made in pursuit of unseemly political, ideological, economic and military imperialist goals, which have nothing to do with the real needs and interests of the Afghan people or with the cause of peace and stability in that area of the world. We believe that such activities are unwarranted and unjust to the Afghan people. None the less, the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic believes that it is necessary to express some considerations on the question.

2. What are the true meaning and substance of this question? Of course it is not what it is represented to be by the imperialist States, led by the United States, which portray themselves as the fervent champions of peace while using the worst methods of the cold-war period. No camouflage can hide the 572 new nuclear missile warheads which the United States intends to place in Western Europe according to its own dictates; nor can it mask the \$157 billion military budget of the United States for the forthcoming year.

3. All the world knows full well whose interests are being defended, and against whom it is intended to use the more than 400 American military bases, the 3,000 other military installations and the half million American servicemen deployed in many countries of the world. It is also well known on whose side the United States is and was in the constant attacks and acts of aggression carried out against the peoples and States which border on South Africa and Israel.

4. The statements of concern over the fate of the Afghan people by the American zealots—and, by the way, the Afghan people did not ask them to show that concern—in the light of the facts which have been brought forward, appear to be the very height of cynicism and hypocrisy.

5. The true essence of the situation in Afghanistan is to be found in the fact that on 27 April 1978—and it is precisely that date which, in our view, is the correct starting point for the chronology of these events—an anti-feudal, national democratic revolution was carried out in Afghanistan, which dealt a crushing blow to the calculations and plans of the imperialists in that region of the world. The process of profound social and democratic transformation which has begun in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the strengthening of the gains of the April revolution have made those plans and calculations of the imperialists hopeless failures. Moreover, the decadent régime of the Shah collapsed and there was a revolution in Iran.

6. The Administration of the United States has taken a decision to stifle the Afghan revolution by any means and methods, including comprehensive backing to internal reaction in that country. Therein lies the meaning and the main cause of the worsening of the situation in Afghanistan.

7. I take the liberty of referring to some United States sources, which in other respects are not very reliable, but in this case quite definitely confirm the conclusions which we have drawn.

8. Just one and a half months after the revolution in Afghanistan, in June 1978, according to *The New York Times*, there was a symposium of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization High Command in Annapolis, Maryland, United States. More than 270 leading generals, admirals, diplomats, scientists and special representatives participated in that symposium. They discussed the democratic transformations taking place in Afghanistan and "their consequences for America and its NATO allies".

9. The *Armed Forces Journal*, reflecting the Pentagon's views with references to officials of that military agency, stated that at the highest governmental levels of the United States they were studying the question of creating a special command for United States armed forces in the Persian Gulf. That command, the *Armed Forces Journal* emphasized, would comprise aviation and naval units of a so-called rapid deployment force that would be intended for use, as everyone knows, to carry out armed intervention in the affairs of the countries of that region and of other regions of the world.

10. The newspaper, the *Los Angeles Times*, wrote that in the last month—I repeat, month—the United States had sent on patrol in the Persian Gulf a naval squadron of 21 naval vessels. Training operations for war action in the Middle East are, even at this moment, going on with the direct participation of five United States aircraft carriers—the *Kitty Hawk*, the *Midway*, the *Nimitz*, the *Forrestal* and the *Coral Sea*.

11. United States politicians at the highest level call that a “peace action”, but what name, then, are we to give to military, economic and political blackmail?

12. On the other hand, imperialism is increasingly active in resorting to its well-trying ploy of relying on internal reaction and counter-revolutionary forces. All of this, once again, is being done openly and cynically. The territory of Pakistan is being used as a basic jumping-off place for the subversive activities against Afghanistan. The so-called “refugee camps” are becoming centres for instructing, arming and resupplying military units, which are being systematically sent into Afghanistan. The bandits are being supplied with abundant weapons, ammunition and money from the United States, from China and from several other countries. The instructors in these operations are representatives of United States secret services, Peking specialists in so-called “guerrilla warfare” operations and others. The United States television company, NBC, broadcast a report from a camp in Pakistan territory. In that camp a military training course is being conducted for thousands of counter-revolutionaries. The months and the days until the fall of the democratic system in Afghanistan are counted. The ringleaders of the bands in Pakistan boasted in an interview with American correspondents that they are preparing for an advance on Kabul and are arming themselves with the necessary ammunition for bloody purges there.

13. The unceasing interference of the imperialist forces in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, the constant armed incursions, the intensifying and increasingly closer alliance that is growing day by day between the internal counter-revolution and foreign reaction are what have created the threat to the security of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and to the revolution’s goals in that country.

14. In 1978-1979, the Afghan Government repeatedly turned to the Soviet Union with requests for support, including the granting of military aid, to counter the armed intervention of the imperialist forces.

15. The situation in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan became critical when reaction found itself an assistant in the very leadership of that country in the person of the traitor, Amin. Through deceit and intrigues he gained control of the main levers of the administration of the State, killed the legitimate President, Noor Mohammad Taraki and destroyed or imprisoned many party officials, military figures, hundreds of Moslem religious figures and other honest Afghan fighters for the revolution.

16. In conditions where outside interference and terror carried out within the country by Amin had created a mortal threat to the democratic system in Afghanistan there were found patriotic forces in that country to get rid

of Amin. True to its treaty obligations, the Soviet Union also gave fraternal good-neighbourly assistance in the struggle against external aggression. The USSR took a decision to grant the repeated requests of the Afghan leadership and sent to Afghanistan a limited military contingent, which is being used only to assist in repelling the armed intervention from outside. Once there no longer exists the reason that necessitated this action, that contingent will be withdrawn from Afghanistan. Soviet assistance and support given to Afghanistan are not intended to change the State structure or political system of that country that was established following the victory of April 1978 nor are they directed against other countries in that region.

17. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, Mr. Shah Mohammad Dost, spoke very convincingly about that in the Security Council and in this General Assembly session.

18. The goodwill of the international community and of all the progressive forces throughout the world should be reflected, not in condemnation of the actions of the Soviet Union, which gave good-neighbourly assistance to the people of Afghanistan as it has given other national liberation movements, fighters for the freedom and independence of their countries, nor in disregard of the new Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in favour of the forces of reaction and imperialism, but, instead, in support for the Afghan people to allow its new Government to carry out successfully its programme of democratic transformations and in support and help for the new Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan to implement the goals it has set for itself. This is the truly noble task of the international community and of the United Nations.

Mr. Varela Quirós (Costa Rica), Vice-President, took the Chair.

19. Mr. AL-HAMZAH (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Democratic Yemen has in the past been quite clear about its attitude regarding the dangers posed by imperialist and Zionist circles aimed at the creation of tension and instability in our region. It has stated its opinion with regard to the increasing political and propaganda campaigns instigated by imperialist forces and their agents and directed against the friendly Afghan people, which was able to crush the attempts of the reactionary-imperialist forces to interfere in its internal affairs. These campaigns are aimed at casting suspicion on the support of the Soviet Union for the progressive régime in Afghanistan. This solidarity between the two countries, based on the pact of friendship signed between them on 5 December 1978, does not violate the principles of international law or the Charter of the United Nations.

20. Democratic Yemen considers that the Soviet Union’s assistance to Afghanistan has not changed the character of that country’s progressive régime, which was chosen freely by the Afghan people after the April revolution. Rather, the problem arises out of the adventures of the imperialist forces aimed at finding new pretexts for launching aggression against the peoples of the region.

21. We had hoped that those political and propaganda campaigns would not have reached our international Organization and involved it in debates that are considered to be in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and to which Afghanistan has objected because they are a flagrant interference in its internal affairs.

22. We are saddened at the campaigns of suspicion repeatedly launched by the imperialist forces and their allies against the patriotic options of the people of Afghanistan and liberation movements and progressive régimes elsewhere. We consider those campaigns as preparations for further plots against our national causes and a new call for flagrant interference in the affairs of the region, particularly since such attempts come at a time when international imperialism, with the United States at the forefront, is escalating its military presence, reinforcing its naval fleet, searching for new bases and combining all of that to strike at the will of the people of the region, impede their march towards the building of their future and prevent them from taking control of their wealth and resources and defending their independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity.

23. All those attempts come at a time when those circles are mobilizing their forces and threatening to seize the sources of Arab oil, conniving against the revolution of the Iranian people and preparing for the implementation of the Camp David plot against the struggle of the Palestinian Arab people and their just cause and against the struggle of other Arab countries to liberate their own territories and defeat the Zionist forces of occupation.

24. We doubt the sincerity of such forces—experience has proven their hostility to the aspirations of our peoples and to the security and stability of the area. We have invariably seen such forces launching acts of aggression, interfering and using force in various areas and staging genocidal wars against many of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, in addition to their military and economic consolidation and their protection of racist régimes which they have imposed by force in Africa and the Middle East.

25. The new dangers, which result from the imperialist moves in the region, call for more vigilance and cohesion to maintain Arab solidarity and the solidarity of the peoples of the area in order to confront and eliminate them. It is important and necessary to maintain the Indian Ocean and its national extensions, such as the Red Sea, the Arab Gulf and the Arabian Sea, as areas of peace and stability in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and the Non-Aligned Movement. Democratic Yemen once again reaffirms its whole-hearted desire to co-operate with the countries of the region in taking a stand against imperialist and Zionist conspiracies and achieving freedom and progress for our peoples.

26. Democratic Yemen has on more than one occasion stated the principles on which it bases itself in its Arab and international relations. Those principles comprise solidarity between nations, peaceful coexistence, respect by States for each other's sovereignty and independence, understanding and joint co-operation and non-interference in internal affairs. On that basis, Democratic Yemen affirms its support of the struggle of the Afghan people and its

progressive régime and calls for international solidarity with that régime, to support it in maintaining its independence and sovereignty and advancing along the progressive path it has chosen.

27. Mr. ELARABY (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The fact that we are meeting in this emergency special session of the General Assembly is the strongest evidence of the gravity of the situation in Afghanistan and its serious implications for international order. What is now taking place in Afghanistan constitutes a direct and explicit threat to international peace and security—one which will certainly undermine the foundations of international order unless the situation of the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan is promptly dealt with and resolved.

28. We are at present witnessing a serious stage in the history of international relations. The judgement of history will be severe and the consequences and repercussions will be disastrous unless the international community strongly and clearly affirms that the main responsibility of the United Nations is to protect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States and affirms their legal right to live in peace and security and to determine their destiny without any outside interference or coercion. The small, non-aligned States have no refuge or shelter other than the Charter of the United Nations. The fundamental principles of the Charter have been expanded and crystallized since the Second World War and today form an imposing cultural structure for the protection of international law.

29. The Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan, which was carried out without any provocation from the people of Afghanistan, is a flagrant breach of fundamental principles. The international community cannot afford the consequences of such a breach of its principles. The prohibition of the use of force in international relations is the basic principle of international law and full respect for that principle is a prerequisite for the protection of all mankind from monstrous evils and threats of war.

30. The use of the veto by the Soviet Union against a draft resolution presented in the Security Council by the non-aligned nations gives rise to a need for the affirmation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their implementation with regard to the steadily deteriorating situation in Afghanistan. The use of the veto in that case should undoubtedly be considered as a stark breach of the Charter. How can we, the non-aligned countries, feel security with regard to our political independence and territorial integrity if a super-Power or its ally trespasses on our territory? That is a legitimate question which confronts all non-aligned countries and which impels them, as a minimum, to support the uniting for peace resolution, in order to protect their independence and territorial integrity. That is necessary especially when the Security Council, the main organ of the United Nations entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, fails to discharge its basic responsibility because of the objection of one of its five permanent members.

31. There is no question but that all the countries of the world, especially the non-aligned countries, now feel a direct threat to their security as a result of the flagrant

military intervention which is taking place in Afghanistan. The responsibility now of the 147 Member States of the United Nations that do not enjoy the right of veto is to face up to this flagrant challenge. It is imperative that we work to unite our efforts and affirm the close ties that link our interests to the rules of international law, the provisions of the Charter and international legitimacy.

32. The convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly has deep significance and far-reaching repercussions, which are evident to everyone, especially following the failure of the Security Council to carry out its fundamental responsibilities with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security. I should like to say here that we in Egypt—like all the peoples of the world—are very concerned about the protection of our security, territorial integrity and political independence. We stand firmly opposed to the use of brutal military force, whatever its source. We constantly seek to maintain and consolidate international security with all peace-loving people and to protect the small countries from military aggression. Over the years we have been subject to many acts of aggression. It is therefore natural that Egypt should always support action to deter aggression and completely to eliminate military intervention, not leaving any loopholes which might allow the aggressor to move into other places. For those reasons, Mr. Mahmoud Fawzi, Vice-President for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic, stated with insight and clarity during the deliberations of the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly that all small countries could be an easy prey to such aggression. At that time he warned that the small peace-loving countries could be victims of military aggression. I wish to quote from his statement of 21 June 1967 in which he warned small countries of military aggression and expressed our very preoccupations:

“You? You? You? In Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Balkans and God knows where else. Who is next in line? In the Middle East, it is our very life which is threatened.”¹

33. When the Egyptian representative spoke at that time, fate had determined that the President of the General Assembly was the eminent representative of Afghanistan, Mr. Abdul Rahman Pazhwak, whose sister country is suffering today from the military intervention waged by a neighbouring super-Power.

34. In my statement I shall not cover all the legal and political aspects of the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. Egypt dealt with those aspects in detail in its statement before the Security Council on 5 January.² I shall confine my remarks to reference to General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), which contains the Definition of Aggression, adopted by the General Assembly on the initiative of the Soviet Union. Article 1 states:

“Aggression is the use of armed force by a State against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political indepen-

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1529th meeting, para. 45 (quoted in English by the speaker).

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year*, 2185th meeting.

dence of another State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations, as set out in this Definition.”

That needs no further comment.

35. Egypt indicated in its statement before the Security Council on 5 January the inconsistency of the Soviet military intervention with the constructive Soviet initiatives, over the past years, initiatives that have been supported by Egypt. I must say, in all fairness and honesty, that those initiatives reflected the principles of the United Nations and the spirit and letter of the Charter.

36. However, we must now wonder about the extent of the practical benefits for the international community of a long series of initiatives and resolutions if such international efforts are only to be flagrantly disregarded. We believe that the criterion is not the enunciation of principles or the adoption of declarations of intention, but rather respect for those principles, their observance and implementation. The final judgement of the policy of any country does not depend on its words but on its deeds.

37. We have to work together to put a stop to the policy of the use of force, whatever its source, to end international polarization and hegemony, to eradicate hotbeds of tension and to strive for respect for the right of peoples to self-determination. Egypt clearly expressed its position concerning the military intervention in Afghanistan in a formal statement issued on 28 December 1979, characterizing the Soviet military intervention as, first, a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, secondly, a fresh attempt to impose a Marxist system on the people of Afghanistan with a view to eradicating its identity and its genuine Islamic character, and, thirdly, an attempt to weaken the Non-Aligned Movement by detaching Afghanistan from that Movement and incorporating it into the Soviet camp. The holy Azhar and the most eminent Moslem scholars in Egypt expressed their view on that position regarding the military intervention in Afghanistan in a statement dated 29 December 1979, which affirmed that aggression against any Islamic country required that Islam unite to confront it.

38. We have listened to the unconvincing and inadmissible explanations to justify what is taking place in Afghanistan. Whatever the motives, they cannot justify what is taking place, and do not change the nature of the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan or its breach of the rules of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the declarations and resolutions adopted by the General Assembly over many years to develop, affirm, promote and protect the security, territorial integrity and political independence of States. Whatever the explanations may be, they cannot refute the established facts, first and foremost of which is that the people of Afghanistan are today fighting scores of thousands of Soviet troops, and that close to half a million Afghans have been rendered homeless and turned into refugees. Can we justify the murder, bloodshed and destruction that have befallen the people of Afghanistan? Can the international community condone what is taking place there?

39. It has become crystal clear from the numerous statements made in the Security Council and the General

Assembly that the international community has been unanimous in opposing this military intervention. The General Assembly should reflect that opinion of the international community in a resolution that safeguards the principles of the Charter. Indeed, the General Assembly is called upon today to reassert most forcefully the necessity of respect for the fundamental principles of the Charter and of a denunciation of all manifestations of the use of force in international relations and all forms of interference in the domestic affairs of States.

40. It is also imperative that there be a call for an immediate, total and unconditional withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan, and that all States and institutions working in the humanitarian field be urged to render all possible aid to the Afghan refugees, help them to return to their homeland, guarantee their security and safety, and give the Afghan people the freedom to determine its political and economic system, free from foreign overt or covert interference, as well as helping Afghanistan to maintain its genuine Islamic character, within the framework of its policy of non-alignment.

41. Egypt has participated with a great number of countries in sponsoring draft resolution A/ES-6/L.1, which we hope will be adopted by a large majority, in keeping with the gravity of the situation in Afghanistan and the seriousness of the threat posed by this situation to international peace and security.

42. Mr. KAMANDA WA KAMANDA (Zaire), (*interpretation from French*): As we already stated in the Security Council,³ we are speaking in this debate for reasons of principle and as a non-aligned country.

43. The USSR is a great Power, one which we respect and one with which many countries, including the Republic of Zaire, have excellent diplomatic and other relations. No one can disregard the contribution of the Soviet Union to the liberation struggle of the third-world countries in general, and of Africa in particular, or its support for the activities of the Organization of African Unity and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. We are therefore grateful to the Soviet Union, but this does not in any way give that country the right to act just as it wishes with our countries on behalf of its own specific interests.

44. We are stating today, just as we have stated to some Western and other countries, our total disapproval of the many forms of co-operation that they entertain with the minority racist régimes of southern Africa. There can be no doubt whatsoever that the situation stemming from the Soviet invasion in Afghanistan is extremely serious and constitutes a threat to international peace and security. The non-aligned countries, including the Republic of Zaire, are resolutely opposed to the balance of terror based on the division of the world into spheres of influence. This division of the world and the balance of terror are undoubtedly the root cause of the establishment, maintenance and heightening of the climate of tension and the cold war, which bear the seeds of serious threats to international peace and security.

³ *Ibid.*, 2190th meeting.

45. The Non-Aligned Movement, established at a time when the colonial system was crumbling and at the height of the cold war, has made itself felt as an essential factor, not only in the process of decolonization but also in the preservation of peace in the world and the establishment of détente.

46. It is thus in spite of the efforts made by the non-aligned countries that, most unfortunately, the division of the world into spheres of influence exists and prevails. It is this division that underlies relations of force and the balance of power, which lead to an unstable and precarious peace.

47. Every super-Power, every politico-military bloc feels it is the sublimation of all values, of all virtues, of all good itself, and that its rival is the incarnation and living manifestation of absolute evil. The blocs lash out with invective, cast anathema on other blocs and feel that anyone not with them is against them. But certain States in the world—no doubt the majority—do not share and are not necessarily part of this Manichean vision that the great Powers have of the affairs of the world.

48. There are many peoples and States that feel that they have their own identity to safeguard and that do not accept the stubborn dogmatism and obtuse intolerance of those who attempt to impose upon others their way of acting, of being, of thinking, of understanding, of loving and of perceiving. The Non-Aligned Movement, in which those States are grouped, wishes to contribute positive and fruitful work to democratic transformations at the world level, to détente, and to the elimination of the cold war and its dangers by refusing to play the game of any given power bloc, by pursuing an independent policy vis-à-vis politico-military blocs, by defusing tension in international relations and by promoting international co-operation with strict respect for the five principles of peaceful coexistence.

49. The Non-Aligned Movement has therefore opted for independent political development and resolutely rejects any polarization of the world on the basis of bloc policies, military alliances or approaches aimed at dividing the world into spheres of influence or imposing any other form of domination.

50. The emergence of this third independent political factor in international relations was based on the following principles: the preservation of the national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of the non-aligned countries; the elimination of interference and foreign intervention in the internal affairs of States; the prohibition of the use or threat of force; the elimination of imperialism, neo-colonialism, colonialism, racism, and all forms of expansionism, foreign occupation, domination and hegemony; the preservation of international peace and security; the relaxing of international tensions everywhere in the world; the dissolution of pacts with the great Powers as well as military alliances and agreements of solidarity stemming from them; the withdrawal of foreign military forces and bases, and so on.

51. All our efforts are aimed at guaranteeing that the already precarious international balance is not endangered to the detriment of international peace and security. In this

context many States reluctantly accepted as a necessary evil the existence of the NATO bloc, on the one hand, and the Warsaw Pact bloc, on the other, and tolerated the idea that each country might within its respective zone do what it deemed fit, while avoiding any threat to world peace and international security. The group of non-aligned States thus emerged as a third independent political factor in international relations contributing to the reduction of tension between the rival blocs and attempting to democratize international relations and establish a new more just and equitable international order.

52. The invasion of Afghanistan has been a grave disappointment to us. The invasions of 1956 and 1968—not to mention those of 1938 and 1939—had been attributed to the theory of the limited sovereignty of States within recognized spheres of influence. Many States of the world, while finding that procedure a bit curious, a bit cavalier and unquestionably out of keeping with certain moral imperatives, confined themselves to mere disapproval, telling themselves that everything that was happening was the private business of the Warsaw Pact countries.

53. But the recent invasion of Afghanistan, a country that is not a member of any political or military bloc, a country that is not a member of the Warsaw Pact or NATO, an underdeveloped non-aligned country, is of particularly serious significance. And that is where the genuine threat to international peace and security resides.

54. In the view of the Zairian delegation, this is clearly an attempt by a politico-military bloc and a super-Power to annex a country or a region at the expense of the non-aligned countries, which follow a neutral policy, and of the other super-Power or the other politico-military bloc, which sees the invasion as a thrust by its rival beyond that rival's boundaries and towards its own sphere of influence.

55. On the one hand, there is the undeniable violation of the neutrality of a non-aligned country and obstruction of its right freely to determine its form of government. On the other hand, there is a deliberate upsetting of the international balance based on the division of the world into spheres of influence. That is where the danger and threat to peace and international security resides, because it is situations of this type, which some of us take lightly, that inevitably lead to war and conflagration. I feel that those are the facts of the problem.

56. In the face of this extremely grave situation, what arguments are put forward by the invaders of Afghanistan? First of all, we are told that this is an internal affair and that, in keeping with Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, the United Nations should not deal with it. That paragraph stipulates that:

“Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter . . .”.

But, if this is an internal affair, then we might ask what the regular foreign troops of the Soviet Union are now doing in Afghanistan.

57. Secondly, we are told that this is a bilateral matter, and that the Afghan authorities, in the face of armed foreign aggression, requested, pursuant to Article 51 of the Charter, the assistance of the Soviet Union, in keeping with the natural right of self-defence. Who among us in recent days had heard of any armed foreign aggression against Afghanistan? The only foreign armed intervention in Afghanistan of which we heard recently is precisely that of the Soviet Union. For some days, Soviet forces have been waging fierce fights against the Afghan people and certain units of the Afghan army. That fact alone establishes the competence of the United Nations, the Security Council or the General Assembly, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 377 A (V), the “Uniting for peace” resolution, to deal with the matter.

58. We might ask which Afghan authorities appealed to the Soviet Union. Was it President Hafizullah Amin, the legal authority of Afghanistan, who was overthrown and summarily executed by the invading troops? Or was it someone else? If, quite reasonably, we discard the hypothesis that President Amin invited the Soviet army to come in and overthrow his régime, then all we have left is the appeal addressed to the Soviet Union by the new authorities of Afghanistan installed by the invading and occupying troops following the overthrow of the Amin régime, and everything would indicate that the foreign armed invasion occurred spontaneously before any appeal from the new Afghan Government, which was constituted only following the Soviet invasion. So this second argument cannot stand up to analysis.

59. Thirdly, we are told that it was by virtue of the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation between the USSR and Afghanistan that the armed invasion was organized. But the Soviet Union cannot find in that Treaty any justification for its intervention. On the contrary, Afghanistan can invoke that Treaty against the Soviet Union because it stipulates that the two parties commit themselves to complying with the principle of mutual respect for independence and sovereignty as well as non-interference in internal affairs. How can we reconcile the present situation, in which the Soviets are fighting against Afghans, with the commitment of the Soviet Union in the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation with Afghanistan to respect the independence and sovereignty of Afghanistan and not interfere in its internal affairs? The Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation and Article 51 of the Charter cannot be invoked by Afghans against Afghans, nor can it be invoked by the Soviet Union against Afghans. It can be invoked only against foreign aggression, and I wonder what foreign aggression might have justified recourse to Article 51 of the Charter.

60. Fourthly, we are told that the present authorities in Afghanistan, installed by the invasion and occupation troops, have protested at the consideration by the United Nations of this question and have stated that it was an internal affair and they welcomed the Soviet assistance in strengthening the April 1978 revolution. I should like to know whether there is really anyone in this room who thinks that the authorities installed by the invasion and occupation troops, under the circumstances of which we are aware, could say anything else? Or do they simply take us all for fools?

61. Fifthly, we are told that the former Amin régime was a bloody dictatorship which was violating human rights and that the Soviet Union went in to help the Afghans to ensure the victory of the April 1978 revolution over the subversive designs of the imperialists and counter-revolutionaries and for the triumph of a truly democratic society. Is that not clear proof of interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan? In this case then, why talk about the Treaty of Friendship and Article 51 of the Charter, as they cannot be invoked against Afghans? Thus in all the arguments put forward, there are absolutely compelling contradictions.

62. It is therefore clear that legal arguments against this invasion abound, that the facts are conclusive and that moral imperatives compel us to denounce the foreign armed invasion of Afghanistan.

63. The reference to Article 51 of the Charter to justify the foreign armed intervention in Afghanistan is an abusive interpretation of the Charter of the United Nations and is absolutely unacceptable from any State, especially a great Power. The invasion of Afghanistan by the regular troops of a great Power is a flagrant and deliberate violation of paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Article 2 of the Charter.

64. In addition to that, this invasion by a great Power and member of the Security Council is a deliberate and flagrant violation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV)*]; of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty [*resolution 2131 (XX)*]; of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625 (XXV)*]; and of resolution 1301 (XIII) on measures aimed at the implementation and promotion of peaceful and neighbourly relations among States, through which the General Assembly urges Member States to live together in keeping with the letter and spirit of the Charter and recognizes that in the observance of the purposes and principles of the United Nations lies the best basis for ensuring the conditions essential for the nations and peoples of the world to live and to assist each other in mutual tolerance and understanding for the peace of all.

65. This invasion is a flagrant violation of resolution 34/103 on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations and of resolution 34/99 concerning the development and strengthening of good neighbourliness, the promotion of understanding and co-operation between States.

66. I should like to stress the striking similarity between the reasons invoked to justify the foreign armed invasion of Afghanistan and those given in 1956 by Mr. Sobolev on behalf of the USSR to justify the invasion of another country. Mr. Sobolev, speaking with regard to the adoption of the provisional agenda, at the 746th meeting of the Security Council, held on Sunday, 28 October 1956, stated:

“The representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and France are proposing the inclusion in the

Security Council’s agenda of an item [concerning] the situation inside a country which is a sovereign State and a Member of the United Nations. The very wording of this item shows in itself that what the United States, the United Kingdom and France have in mind is an attempt, in defiance of the provisions of the United Nations Charter, at gross interference in the domestic affairs of [that Republic].

“Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter states:

“‘Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the . . . Charter . . .’.

“. . . the Government of the [Republic concerned] clearly states, in its declaration of 28 October 1956 . . . that it ‘categorically protests against placing on the agenda the consideration of any question concerning the domestic affairs of [that country]’

“The Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France are making an unprecedented attempt to give United Nations protection to reactionary elements . . . which have come out against the great democratic achievements of the . . . workers.

“In defence of the democratic people’s régime, the [Government of the Republic in question decided] to bring its armed forces into action for the liquidation of the counter-revolutionary uprising, and it appealed to the Government of the Soviet Union for assistance . . .

“. . . these measures taken . . . constitute an infringement of human rights, which are guaranteed under the terms of the Treaty of Peace with [that country].”⁴

67. One might therefore be tempted to believe that the reasons given us today are the traditional, routine reasons in this sort of situation and it has become a habit to support them and prop them up by declarations of protest from régimes set up by the forces of foreign invasion and occupation.

68. The Security Council, where the right of veto can be exercised, did not unite for the maintenance of international peace and security in this Afghanistan affair. It did not do so in October 1956 and we know why. We wonder whether it ever will in the future.

69. But we are all meeting here now in the General Assembly, without the right of veto, for the maintenance of international peace and security. The General Assembly, which in the circumstances seems to be the last resort for States that have not the means to resist the powerful ones, must assume its responsibilities, condemn the violation of the Charter and of the principles of international law and firmly ask the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Eleventh Year*, 746th meeting, paras. 12, 13, 14, 20 and 21.

70. If Soviet troops are fighting today against the Afghan population, who can say that in the future they are not going to renew their exploits against the people of another country of the third world and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries?

71. If we can no longer even sign agreements of friendship and co-operation with other States out of fear that those agreements may be used against us one day, what peace, what international security and what co-operation can we still speak of? Is this a return to the primitive or medieval traditions of the strongest laying down his law in the jungle? Are we going to accept the prevalence of the spirit of domination, the will of power and hegemony and the supremacy of brawn over brain? No.

72. The Republic of Zaire will vote in favour of the draft resolution which asks for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the foreign armed forces of invasion and which reaffirms the right of the people of Afghanistan freely to determine its destiny.

73. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My country's delegation is gratified that Ambassador Salim should be presiding over this sixth emergency special session because the wisdom and expertise displayed by him during his presidency of the thirty-fourth session were duly appreciated by all those who participated in its work.

74. The state of tension at present prevailing in the international political situation not only threatens the foundation of international détente, which was believed to have been laid on the ashes of the cold war, but also presages a military confrontation between the two super-Powers in one of the most dangerous regions of the world so far as strategic and economic interests and their impact on the security, stability and peace of the world are concerned.

75. The question being considered today by the sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly is drastically different from the numerous conventional issues dealt with by the United Nations. This question is closer to being a matter of principle than merely one of a victim and an aggressor. While the international community is expressing itself strongly today in support of the struggling Afghan people and denouncing the foreign aggression against it, at the same time it is trying to maintain the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of international law, of respect for sovereignty and of refraining from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any State, as well as non-interference in the domestic affairs of States and the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, so as to create a climate propitious to peace and international security.

76. The international community is fully aware that the loss of these pledges, covenants and charters, which are the legacy of a noble human experiment, would undermine all its international political work and bring the world once more to the brink of destruction if not into the abyss itself. Moreover, the invasion of a small non-aligned country by the military troops of a super-Power—no matter on what pretext—constitutes a serious threat that the international community should answer at once; to condone it would be

tantamount to perpetuating the violation of the national sovereignty of the Member State, of the Charter and of international law. It would even amount to endorsing the use of force to impose a specific political system on the developing countries in keeping with the will of the stronger country—and that would be the beginning of a return to the law of the jungle.

77. Qatar has denounced the intervention of Soviet troops in Afghanistan. His Excellency, Sheikh Ahmed Bin Saif al-Thani, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, stated the following on 31 December last:

“Qatar is following with extreme concern the recent events in Afghanistan. In denouncing the Soviet intervention in the internal affairs of that neighbouring Moslem country, it bases its position on its belief in the principles of the United Nations, the need for the rule of law to prevail and for adherence to the provisions of international legality. Since it adheres to those principles, it rejects any course that does not take those provisions into consideration. It objects to interference in the domestic affairs of peoples, and asserts their natural right to determine their destiny.”

78. In concluding, I should like to join all those who have called for the immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, for a halt to interference in the domestic affairs of that sister country and for respect for the right of the Afghan people to choose its political, social, economic and cultural systems in all freedom, without any foreign-imposed mandate enforced by military power. In calling for the withdrawal of the aggressors from Afghanistan, we also call on all the major Powers to fulfil their responsibility for the maintenance of international peace, to desist from the use of force either in the settlement of disputes or to promote their political or social systems at the expense of others.

79. There are so many international problems awaiting solution. The developing countries experience enough hardships in the way of development and progress. That is why we appeal to all to return to the rule of law and international legality, and to desist from all forms of conventional confrontation that could lead the world to the threshold of a third world war.

80. Mr. AL-SAFFAR (Bahrain) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My country was one of the States which requested the convening of the Security Council to consider the situation resulting from the military intervention in Afghanistan. That is because of the great concern of my Government for the Security Council's maintenance of peace and consolidation of security in the world and because of the emphasis we place on that activity.

81. Our interest in the current events in Afghanistan and the changed conditions there as a result of foreign military intervention did not come about only because of the religious ties which link our people with the people of Afghanistan and other Islamic countries, ties which constitute a basis for a common way of life for all Moslems in the world, but also because of political considerations based on clear principles governing international relations.

82. Afghanistan is not very far from the area in which we live, which is one of the most sensitive regions of the world owing to the economic, social and political conditions prevailing there.

83. The State of Bahrain, in co-operation with its neighbours, is anxious to maintain the Gulf area removed and free from international competition and rivalry between super-Powers. But military intervention in Afghanistan will involve the region in serious conflict between the super-Powers at a time when we are trying to consolidate stability and security there. The area of the Gulf has, for a number of years, faced risks and dangers similar to these and has been subject to possible foreign intervention.

84. As a small State, Bahrain is fully convinced of the soundness of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which governs relations among States and constitutes a basis for respect for the independence and sovereignty of States and a defence for States against aggression. Intervention in the internal affairs of States, in all its forms and manifestations, for whatever reason and from whatever source, is basically to be rejected.

85. Whatever pretexts have been offered to this Assembly, the military intervention in Afghanistan is a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations, which provide for non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the non-use of force in international relations. It is also against the spirit of the resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations, which was adopted at the last session of the General Assembly [*resolution 34/193*], at the initiative of the Soviet Union.

86. All peoples have the right freely to choose their own social, economic and political systems, without any foreign intervention, direct or indirect. In our view that principle should be respected and all States should abide by it. In the forefront of those States should be the big Powers, which are responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security by virtue of their prerogatives in the Security Council. It was on that basis that the State of Bahrain condemned the military intervention in Afghanistan in the very first hours of that intervention. The following is the text of the statement of the Government of Bahrain:

“The State of Bahrain, as a Member of the United Nations family and being convinced of the principles of that family, condemns all the actions that led to the intervention of a State in the affairs of another independent, sovereign State, the relations between which are governed by the Charter of the United Nations and other charters and covenants internationally adopted.

“Accordingly, the Soviet intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan is a source of concern to the Government of Bahrain, which considers it a vivid example of such military intervention by a big Power in the internal affairs of another country which, in addition to being a Member of the United Nations, is a member of the Asian Group of countries and of the Non-Aligned Group. Consequently, the Government of Bahrain joins the other Governments which have condemned that intervention, which affects security and stability in this region.”

87. The military intervention in Afghanistan has created a serious situation in the region, with unforeseeable consequences. We therefore call for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan, so as to afford to the people of Afghanistan the opportunity of self-determination, to choose the régime they want and that suits them, without foreign intervention from any source.

88. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): The Charter of the United Nations gives permanent members of the Security Council special rights and duties. That privileged position is sustainable only so long as those members respect the principles of the Charter, and act in ways which are consistent with their particular responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and order. This emergency special session of the General Assembly has been called because the Council was prevented by a Soviet veto from carrying out those responsibilities.

89. The present threat to international security comes from Soviet disregard of the fundamental rules of co-existence. By invading Afghanistan it has violated both the basic purposes and principles of the Charter and international law. It has shown total disregard for world opinion.

90. Afghanistan had done the Soviet Union no injury. Its only wrong was to have been going through an internal struggle which took a turn that did not suit the Soviet Union; its misfortune was to share a common border with that great Power. For its own ends, and with contempt for the rights of the Afghan people, the Soviet Union sent its armed forces in to exploit the political instability of its small and defenceless neighbour. The Soviet Union did not act in self-defence; it did not act on behalf of a country the territorial sovereignty of which had been violated; it did not act to maintain regional peace and security. The Soviet Union acted simply to impose on Afghanistan a government with a congenial ideology, subject to Soviet influence and compliant with its will.

91. At the very same time as the Soviet delegation, here in New York, was denouncing hegemonism and the pursuit of spheres of influence, the Soviet Government, in Moscow, was planning the invasion of Afghanistan. Nothing could demonstrate more starkly the Soviet Union's lack of real commitment to those principles of international behaviour which it championed so earnestly at earlier sessions of the Assembly.

92. That invasion, we have been told by the Soviet Union and its allies, involves only limited military contingents. Limited they may be in terms of the military might of the Soviet Union, but compared to the armed forces of Afghanistan or, indeed, of most small countries, they represent an invading force of massive and growing capacity.

93. The Soviet Union and its allies have argued that this attack against a small, powerless and defenceless State is not the business of this Assembly. That is absurd. The protection of small States is pre-eminently the business of this world body and, as others before me have rightly emphasized, the Article of the Charter dealing with

domestic jurisdiction was never intended to protect those who violate the sovereignty and independence of another State.

94. If there has been a common theme in this debate, it is that the only way of preserving international peace and security is through strict observance by all Member States of the principles of the Charter. That surely is something that no one can disagree with. Smaller States, in particular, should be able to rely on the knowledge that established norms of international law and behaviour do not condone systematic disregard of the rights of small countries. We should all insist that these norms must be respected everywhere and at all times.

95. It is sad, therefore, that a few of those who have consistently and rightly emphasized the principles of non-interference and non-use of force should appear to have overlooked the clear relevance of those principles in the present situation.

96. For our part, we believe that the draft resolution before us says what must be said. It contains the elements essential for restoring the rights of the people of Afghanistan and for maintaining international peace and security. We urge the Soviet Union to listen to the appeal being made to it and to comply immediately with the provisions of that resolution. Only in that way can the process of bringing peace, reconciliation and unity to Afghanistan begin again. Only in that way will it be possible to resume the process of détente, to which the Soviet Union has so often and so emphatically pledged its commitment.

97. Mr. CANALES (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I apologize for speaking from my delegation's place, but, as is known, a physical handicap caused by a terrorist attack prevents me from speaking from the rostrum.

98. It is a matter of public knowledge that the Security Council, in spite of the irrefutable evidence of the Soviet Union's military aggression in Afghanistan, was not able to fulfil its primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security, as stipulated in the Charter and General Assembly resolutions, because of the opposition and veto of the aggressor State itself and that, therefore, this very serious problem has been brought to this emergency special session of the Assembly for consideration.

99. Just like the many representatives who spoke in the debates in the Security Council, those of my own country, aware of their responsibilities and out of respect for the law and for the peaceful settlement of disputes, supported at that time the urgent convening of the Security Council, submitted as an official document the statement issued by the Chilean Government on 3 January this year⁵ and joined with the majority that condemned the Soviet aggression in Afghanistan, a Member State of the United Nations and a non-aligned and developing country.

100. In view of the fact that the aforementioned situation still persists and, worse still, is intensifying because of the aggressive presence of a formidable Soviet military contin-

gent in Afghanistan, my delegation once again, in view of the responsibility incumbent upon our Organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, resolutely supported the convening of this sixth emergency special session and the inscription on the agenda of the item that we are discussing at the present time.

101. For years the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression worked to define that truly international crime. Ultimately and with the support of today's aggressor itself, it was defined as follows:

“Aggression is the use of armed force by a State against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of another State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations, as set out in this Definition.” [*General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), annex, article I.*]

102. The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan is without any doubt incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, with its purposes and principles. Indeed, it violates international peace and security; the principles of the peaceful settlement of disputes; the legal equality of States and the self-determination of peoples; respect for fundamental human rights and freedoms; the principle of the sovereign equality of all States; the duty to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State; the fulfilment in good faith of obligations contained in the Charter; and, basically, the principles of non-intervention in the internal affairs of another State.

103. When Afghanistan was militarily occupied, its sovereignty was obliterated, its territorial integrity vanished and the troops of aggression took control of the main cities. Political independence no longer exists. A government has been imposed on the population by the occupiers. In sum, we are faced with events that clearly constitute an aggression in accordance with the aforementioned definition, and showing each and every one of the legal, political and moral characteristics established by that definition.

104. But that is not all. The Soviet aggression undermines all the efforts of the United Nations to maintain the precarious balance of peace, especially in a region which today is in such a state of upheaval and where the wealth of the subsoil is a powerful incentive for this kind of adventure. Certainly, the Soviet action has a geopolitical basis and implications that are obvious.

105. This is not the first time in recent history that we have witnessed such events. The hegemonistic bent of the Soviet Union has assumed the most diverse forms of intervention in various parts of the world. No one should forget the unmistakable Soviet actions carried out by third parties. No one can claim ignorance in the face of the constant and systematic ideological penetration being suffered by numerous countries, developed and developing alike. No one can deny that that action is directed, co-ordinated, instigated and financed by the very aggressor against Afghanistan. Chile cannot forget this.

106. We have said in the Security Council, and we repeat today, that we have sufficient experience of our own to

⁵ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1980*, document S/13728.

denounce them categorically. The Government and the people of Chile are confident and absolutely certain that Soviet designs will never again prosper on our soil.

107. We view with deep concern the virtual collapse of the most basic standards of coexistence among nations. Countless international instruments, United Nations resolutions and repeated declarations of peace and co-operation have been reduced to worthless words. Years of détente and collaboration have been swept aside at the very dawn of a new decade in which the great majority of peoples have placed their hopes for the fulfilment of their just aspirations. Should those aspirations not be met, we shall know who bears the responsibility.

108. At this time, in addition to world peace, the confidence of the international community in the rules of conduct that will be applicable in coming years is at stake. Indeed, in this very forum many delegations have asked whether we are to return to what was known as the cold war? If that does occur, the party responsible has been clearly identified and its action irrefutably denounced in this Assembly.

109. The United Nations has a decisive role to play in restoring the rule of law and the standards unanimously accepted by the international community which have been so seriously violated. If it should fail to play that role, that would be inexcusable irresponsibility to the irreparable discredit of our Organization.

Mr. Matane (Papua New Guinea), Vice-President, took the Chair.

110. To that end, it is essential to stem the aggression in Afghanistan and require the immediate and total withdrawal of the invading troops which are today subjugating a country by force, a country which, because of its strategic location, the Soviet Union wishes to use for its own hegemonistic interests.

111. That is the demand of the overwhelming majority of countries. It is the hope of the peoples of the world. We must not betray them.

112. Mr. TUBMAN (Liberia): Two conflicting views regarding the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of a sovereign State constitute the argument in this debate.

113. The first view is that the armed intervention by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan violates the sovereignty of that State, breaches international law, including the Charter of the United Nations, and threatens international peace and security. The second view is that this emergency special session of the General Assembly is itself a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the sovereignty of Afghanistan.

114. In the view of my delegation, only the first of the two views just described is correct, and in our statement in the Security Council on 6 January⁶ we examined at some

length the legal arguments based on the principle of self-defence contained in Article 51 of the Charter which support our view. Today my delegation will not repeat those legal arguments. Instead, we believe that relating the two contentions in this debate to a test of reality may help to reveal which of them may be a smoke-screen.

115. What consequences in reality have flowed from the armed intervention by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan? The answer to that question has already shocked the world. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was quickly followed by the violent overthrow of the Government of that country and the assassination of its Head of State. Even as we meet here today, Soviet armed forces continue to penetrate all parts of Afghanistan, occupying the main population centres and forcibly crushing the resistance of brave Afghan patriots, whose lives are being lost in the defence of their country. Those events have greatly heightened tensions in the region and pose a grave threat to international peace and security. Therefore, the consequences of the armed intervention by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan have been clear, brutal and alarming.

116. The other contention in this debate, namely, that the debate is itself a violation of Afghanistan's sovereignty, must also be tested against reality. What consequences in reality flow from the consideration of the Afghan question here in the United Nations? In the Security Council—in spite of the clear expression of international opinion, as manifested by the vote there—the Soviet Union used its veto and thereby prevented the Security Council from acting. By the use of its veto the Soviet Union prevented the violation allegedly involved in the discussion of the Afghanistan matter in the United Nations from having any effect upon the Soviet Union or upon Afghanistan. Now we are debating the same Afghanistan question in the General Assembly and again the same argument that this debate is a violation of Afghanistan's sovereignty has been raised by the Soviet Union and by Afghanistan. But quite frankly, why are these countries raising such an argument? If their self-defence action truly rested on Article 51 of the Charter, then that action should have been reported to the Security Council by them as the Charter requires. But perhaps the Soviet Union and Afghanistan are complaining about this debate because they respect the General Assembly and they intend to abide by the decision of the Assembly which will come out of this debate. If they will not abide by that decision, if they will treat the decision of this Assembly with contempt, then why are they complaining?

117. No harmful consequences will befall the Soviet Union or the present Afghan Government as a result of this debate because those Governments will simply disregard the decision of this Assembly if it is not to their liking. That is my delegation's fear, but of course we would be happy to be proved wrong on this point.

118. A strange logic has been heard in this debate. Some speakers have suggested that those small third-world countries that have spoken out against the armed invasion by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan have done so only because they have been prompted and urged to do so by the United States and other Western countries. Why be influenced by the Western countries? Were not such countries, after all,

⁶ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, 2187th meeting.*

once the practitioners or supporters of colonialism? Even now do Western countries not refuse to fight *apartheid* and many of the other wrongs inflicted upon the peoples of the third world? Why therefore do the West the favour of speaking out against an action by the Soviet Union, that great friend of the third world, by which it may be embarrassed? Thus has gone the reasoning.

119. Small and powerless States should not allow themselves to be confused by that kind of logic. When we defend the principles laid down in the Charter, when we speak up to protest against violations of the sovereignty of a small State by a big and powerful State, we do not thereby confer a favour on any big State; we simply protect ourselves. The big Powers can fend for themselves in the world. We small States need and must practise collective security, and the most effective way of doing so in today's world is to defend and uphold the principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations, to which we all subscribe.

120. It is true that in the past certain Western countries have not supported many third-world causes as much as many of us would have wished. But in recent years encouraging developments have taken place regarding African and third-world issues in some Western countries. We must encourage such trends to continue. Perhaps this debate, by showing that third-world countries are capable of greater objectivity in their reaction to international problems than they are often credited with, especially by Western news media, will cause greater understanding of the views of the third-world countries and support for their principled stand in the West than they have heretofore had. In any case, if we small States should make the mistake of consciously applying in our international relations a double standard in our opposition to injustice and aggression, the freedom of our countries would be placed in serious jeopardy—in fact, we might end up losing our greatly valued freedom all over again and it would make no difference, really, whether we acquired new masters or reverted to the old ones; we would be under foreign domination once again.

121. Finally, what are likely to be the consequences of this debate? We are not pessimists but we do not expect that the debate will lead to the prompt withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, even though the Government of Liberia urges such withdrawal in all sincerity and in the interest of world peace. We would be surprised if this debate led to a swift relaxation of the greatly increased international tension, although the world, and particularly the developing countries, sorely need such relaxation. No, we earnestly fear that the resolution which my delegation hopes will be adopted by the Assembly at the conclusion of this debate will be ignored by those to whom it will be addressed. The ignoring of General Assembly resolutions will be nothing new, but each time that happens the authority of this Organization, upon which we small States must rely for our security, suffers serious erosion, and that has ominous implications for world peace.

122. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): Ever since the recent coup d'état in Afghanistan, I have tried to follow events in that non-aligned country as well as in the immediate region.

I have read, studied and analysed all the statements made in the Security Council, in this Assembly and elsewhere.

123. I have come to the conclusion that we cannot afford to wear blinkers and look at the situation in Afghanistan in isolation; rather, we must view it in a global context and in relation to what is actually happening in the world today.

124. It is unfortunate that the clock will not allow me to express all my views relevant to the item of which we are seized during this debate. I shall therefore confine myself to the immediate issue in simple terms.

125. The principles of respect for the sovereignty of States, national independence, territorial integrity, non-interference in their internal affairs and non-use of force in international relations are sacred to Members of the United Nations.

126. Afghanistan counts among the first members of the Non-Aligned Movement, a Movement which comprises almost two thirds of the membership of the United Nations, a movement which comprises all systems of government and ideologies: imperialists, monarchists, capitalists, dictatorships, social-democrats, socialists, communists, and so forth—and not necessarily in that order.

127. Afghanistan has the right to choose its own system of government and way of life, without any external interference. It is for the people of Afghanistan themselves to solve their own problems and decide on their own fate. On the other hand, the Charter of the United Nations provides for the right to individual and collective self-defence. And that is where the crux of the matter lies.

128. The Soviet Union asserts that the military assistance given to Afghanistan at the request of the Government of that country was perfectly compatible with the principles enshrined in our Charter. On the other hand, generally speaking, many non-aligned Members hold the view that the Soviet Union—perhaps the most powerful nation in the world today—has in fact invaded a small neighbouring non-aligned country so as to install a régime of its own liking.

129. It seems true that the Afghan Government first made its request for assistance to the Soviet Union through the late President Amin on 26 December 1979, a request that was repeated after the coup d'état, by President Babrak Karmal on 28 December 1979.

130. It is also true that the Soviet Union has given an assurance that Soviet troops will be withdrawn when a request to that effect is made by the Afghan Government. However, there are many who believe that a large portion of the Soviet troops will remain in Afghanistan for a long time to come—perhaps for the purpose of preventing Pakistan from being used as a spring-board by some other Powers against the Soviet Union or its friends.

131. But then, both Presidents Amin and Babrak Karmal seem to have been helped into power by the Soviet Union. To say the least, the situation is rather complex and confused at this stage.

132. In any case, the Government of Mauritius views with concern and condemns the massive presence of Soviet forces in Afghanistan; but it views with equal concern the further militarization of Diego Garcia by the United States—an action which is dangerous to peace and harmony for Indian Ocean countries. Here I wish to refer this Assembly to the statement I made to the meeting of littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean on Thursday, 5 July 1979.

133. The Government of Mauritius equally deplores the arming of Pakistan, a country with which we enjoy diplomatic, cultural and friendly ties, because such an action is not conducive to peace in the region. I may perhaps add, somewhat humorously, that in such an event, a rustless, stainless steel lady across the border of Pakistan might become restless. I doubt whether she will remain idle. I do not believe that she is exactly friendless. She is certainly not lacking in influence throughout the world. I am of course referring to Srimati Indira Gandhi.

134. Finally, while noting that the draft resolution proposed by Pakistan and other countries [A/ES-6/L.1] refrains from condemning the Soviet Union but rather “strongly deplores the recent armed intervention in Afghanistan”, and further avoids calling the troops Soviet Union troops but prefers the words “the immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of the foreign troops from Afghanistan”—I take this to mean all foreign troops—Mauritius, as a non-aligned country, will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

135. At the beginning of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, I expressed views on the agenda item concerning hegemonism,⁷ as inscribed on the initiative of the Soviet Union. I hope I did not speak in vain. I recognize that the Soviet Union has always been on the side of Africa in its just causes. Towards the end of the last session I expressed the hope and prayer that the decade of the 1980s would be one of peace, security, harmony and happiness. Alas, we seem to have entered the present decade with détente looking like a very sick child, and we must try to secure its recovery. The ratification of SALT II in Washington has now been placed in the freezer. Let us hope it will not remain there for too long. I appeal that no hasty action be taken but that emotions give way to reason, and that restraint be the order of the day and of the decade. Let us avoid conflicts and war, whether cold or hot.

136. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): I spoke in the Security Council on 5 January⁸ to express the attitude of my Government towards the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. For that is what it is: an invasion—not the “sending of a limited military contingent”, or whatever phrase the Soviet Union and its allies have been using. So far as we can judge, the military build up continues. Reliable reports indicate that there are now five Soviet divisions in Afghanistan. They are certainly showing no signs of leaving.

⁷ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, First Committee, 5th meeting.*

⁸ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, 2186th meeting.*

137. Yesterday [2nd meeting] the representative of Italy addressed the Assembly on behalf of the nine member States of the European Economic Community. I shall not repeat what he said, nor shall I reiterate in detail what I said in the Security Council. It is enough to say that my Government strongly condemns the Soviet invasion of a neighbouring, sovereign and independent State. We have not hesitated to join our voice to those of very many others in calling for the immediate withdrawal of the Soviet forces at present in Afghanistan, so that the Afghan people may freely work out their future and freely choose their political leadership. No one can seriously argue that the Afghan people have had that right during the past two years.

138. Three Governments in that country have been overthrown by violent means, with accompanying bloodshed and death. The present régime was installed through the agency of Soviet armed intervention, the previous Government having been liquidated as a consequence of invoking its Treaty of friendship with the Soviet Union.

139. Three themes have dominated the statements of the Soviet delegation and those of its allies in this debate and in the Security Council. The first theme is that successive Afghan Governments have since 1978 made repeated requests to the Soviet Union for military assistance to ward off external armed attack fostered by outside Governments, and that the present intervention was carried out in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. The second theme, as fanciful as the first, is that the strong reaction of the United Nations to the Soviet intervention amounts to interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. The third theme, equally remarkable, is that the response of the world community is some kind of Western plot, a manifestation of the cold war, the object apparently being to frustrate the so-called progressive forces in Afghanistan and—I cannot imagine why—to destroy the spirit of détente.

140. These astonishing allegations impose a severe test on our collective imagination. If Afghanistan had really been under external armed attack since 1978, why did the Government of Afghanistan and its ally the Soviet Union not bring such a serious state of affairs before the United Nations? Would it not have been a suitable subject for discussion in the General Assembly and indeed for action by the Security Council? Why, moreover, did the Soviet Union or the régime in Afghanistan not immediately report the measures taken in the exercise of the right of self-defence—I am referring to the Soviet military invasion—to the Security Council as stipulated in the very Article 51 which they have invoked in a vain attempt to make their action respectable?

141. My delegation believes that the answer to those questions is that the so-called external threat did not exist; that the trouble in Afghanistan was a spontaneous expression of the discontent of the Afghan people with their régime; and that the Soviet military intervention was a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan without any valid pretext of self-defence.

142. The charge of interference by the United Nations in Afghanistan's internal affairs is breath-taking. Which would

appear more to fit the category of interference in Afghan internal affairs—the incursion into that country of five Soviet divisions or the chorus of protest from the world community against that action?

143. Finally, there is the allegation that Western countries are attempting to resurrect the cold war and to destroy détente. Because there was once such a thing as a cold war, are the countries of the West expected to remain silent when the Soviet Union sends its armed forces into other States? Is fear of being accused of reviving the animosities of the past supposed to prevent any Western reaction whatever the Soviet Union does? Because we regard détente as being of universal application, and because we have worked so hard to foster it, are we similarly to remain silent for fear of being accused of damaging this concept when the Soviet Union advances its military forces beyond its frontiers? Is détente to be interpreted as license for the Soviet Union to do whatever it wants to its neighbours? That is decidedly not the view which my Government takes. And I believe that the wide-ranging participation in the Security Council debate and in the debate which we are now holding, with statements being made by delegations drawn from countries from every quarter of the globe, is answer in itself to any bogus charge of Western conspiracy. My delegation has listened with close attention to these many statements. We have gained an indelible impression of an overwhelming consensus against the Soviet action in Afghanistan and in favour of the immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops.

144. The truth is that the Soviet Union has allowed its own concept of Soviet national interest to override its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. The Soviet Union has acted in ruthless disregard of the consequences for international peace and security, for détente between East and West, and, of course, for the rights and wishes of the people of Afghanistan. Only by immediately withdrawing its forces can the Soviet Union right this wrong and restore its standing in the international community.

145. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): My delegation has already publicly expressed its dismay over the introduction of the so-called question on the situation in Afghanistan into the debates of the United Nations and takes this opportunity to express its dissatisfaction at the convening of the present emergency special session of the General Assembly.

146. Our position with respect to the item on the Assembly's agenda has been made clear and I wish resolutely to reiterate here that this question falls within the exclusive competence of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union, the country that rendered assistance to it at the request of its authorities.

147. The Hungarian Government, in its statement of 10 January 1980, condemned the imperialist attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. No country, no international organization, can interfere with the bilateral relations of the two countries concerned. This stance has been made unambiguously clear in the statement made earlier before this Assembly by the representative of the Afghan Government itself [*1st meeting*], and we fully associate ourselves with it.

148. In trying to make their own assessment of the situation in that part of the world, some quarters either let themselves be led astray by tendentious and distorted reports from the cardinal problems of the situation prevailing there or adopt an approach that takes the events in Afghanistan out of their context and puts them in an imaginary vacuum. That is the best way completely to lose sober reasoning, a sense of proportion and contact with reality. In the last few days we have unfortunately witnessed manifestations of such disconcerting behaviour in passionate appeals for the safeguarding of the allegedly threatened sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-aligned status and political, economic, and what is more, monetary independence of Afghanistan.

149. Those who make so much noise about the events in that region of the world are, wittingly or not, extending a helping hand to those circles which behind this salutary smoke-screen want to play down the immense repercussions of their own sabre-rattling in that part of the globe.

150. The continual movement and transfer of huge military forces from one place to another, the unscrupulous involvement of war machinery and the avowed endeavours to expand military bases or to establish new ones: all that is presented by some as measures protecting peace and security, or as aid given to other countries.

151. But when the Soviet Union sends a limited military contingent in response to a request by a friendly Government for support in the struggle against reactionary and external aggressive forces, in defence of a progressive society determined to give the country social justice and democratic transformations suited to the particularities and traditions of the country and its people, that act suddenly becomes an invasion, an aggression, an occupation, and so on. Is that not a hypocritical attitude?

152. There are attempts to drive a wedge between the Soviet Union and the socialist countries on the one hand and the developing countries, particularly the Islamic States, on the other, under the pretext of the events in Afghanistan. For all those who know even a little modern history, those efforts must seem ridiculous and lamentable. The enemies of the Afghan revolution try to resort to all possible means in order to isolate and discredit the new régime, to create confusion and tension between that country and its neighbours and to make the developing world oppose the world of socialism. Though they may try time and again to fish in troubled waters in the hope of a big catch, we are confident that the countries in question understand well where their true interests lie. For is it not strange and suspicious to see the imperialist States coming here one after another, pleased at seeing themselves in the role of defenders of a non-aligned country, when it is well known that the Non-Aligned Movement itself came into being as an anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist association of nations *par excellence*, designed to protect them against exploitation by other countries, usurpation of foreign territory, racial discrimination, *apartheid* and the merciless oppression of national liberation movements?

153. The socialist countries withstood the onslaught of the cold war; they stood firm in their determination to

pursue the policy of détente; and they have rejected attempts at blackmail and compromise on basic principles. That will be true in the future as well.

154. Since the very beginning of the process of relaxation of tension, there have always been elements opposed to détente, peaceful coexistence and normal relations among States. In recent years they have intensified their activities, doing their best not to lose any opportunity to undermine the structure of détente, to sow mistrust and to harm the spirit of Helsinki. They went out of their way to try to reintroduce and reinvigorate the policy of force, of diktat and of pressure on the socialist countries. Their chances today are much slimmer than ever before.

155. Despite the ups and downs of international politics, we have succeeded so far in safeguarding and even widening in some areas the positive achievements made in inter-State relations in recent times. However, the forces opposed to détente have at present unleashed a new campaign, designed this time to deal a heavy blow to all that has been so dear to us and all that we have been dedicating ourselves to, in order to destroy understanding and co-operation among nations and people. The repeated and highly publicized outcries about the beginning of a new era of the cold war are indicative of the state of mind of those who orchestrate such campaigns. That is fundamentally contradictory to the interests of mankind and has already had negative implications on international life.

156. Each and every one of us sitting in this Assembly must realize that the United Nations bears a tremendous responsibility for maintaining peace and security and a sound international environment. We must not allow these harmful repercussions to reach a stage in which our world Organization would actually find itself deprived of its moral and political weight to speak out in defence of détente and against the return of the cold war. We are not yet at that stage I hope, but it is of paramount importance for all of us to be vigilant and conscious of our own actions in order to thwart such machinations in time.

157. In such a vital area as disarmament the pernicious impact of recent developments has already had its effect. Those developments are utilized as a pretext for putting on the shelf a whole complex of disarmament measures—and outstanding among them is ratification of SALT II—or preventing progress on them. The decision to deploy medium-range missiles in Western Europe, the constant increase in military budgets and the bellicose declarations on both sides of the Pacific in the capitalist world make this rather dark picture complete. We must clearly realize that disarmament efforts and measures were not intended as a favour to anyone. To block progress on them is to assume a heavy responsibility and to render a grievous disservice to the whole international community.

158. This emergency special session has been convened in accordance with a resolution of evil memory, dating back to the gloomy years of the cold war. We should not allow the spirit of that period to haunt our Assembly and have access to our deliberations. We utterly disagree with those who have found it advisable to base their political actions in regard to the question on the agenda precisely on the foundation of a text of such a nature. Indeed, we could not

disagree more. That period in the history of the United Nations was characterized by the existence of so-called voting machinery manipulated and abused more than once by one Member State. As a result of those actions, armed forces were sent to a country under the banner of the United Nations and they are still there in 1980, constituting a long-enduring plague and a hotbed of crisis in that part of the world. I wish to emphasize that the international community even today continues to suffer from the consequences of that precipitate and ill-considered action imposed upon the United Nations by a big Power of that time.

159. It is inconceivable that the attitude of certain countries, an attitude that has been further exacerbated by their mass media, could damage the fabric of beneficial relations existing among the members of the international community; endanger—on the basis of their subjective judgements—international détente, co-operation and disarmament; and entangle the United Nations and the whole of mankind in this manoeuvre which is fraught with incalculable consequences. For we all know that there is no alternative to the policy of détente and peaceful co-operation.

160. Hungary, a Central European country, knows especially well the lessons of history, the scourge of war and the benefits of peace. As its statement of 10 January 1980 declares, the Hungarian Government will do all in its power for the defence of the gains of détente and to ensure that détente continues. Consistent with its basic foreign political goals, it will continue to struggle for the preservation of peace. It is its firm conviction that this struggle will ultimately be crowned with success.

161. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): This sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly has been convened because of the failure of the Security Council to discharge its primary obligation of maintaining international peace and security and to call for the termination of Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and the withdrawal of Soviet troops therefrom. As we all know, that failure was the result of the negative vote of the Soviet Union on the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries members of the Security Council, despite the fact that the draft resolution obtained the number of votes necessary for its adoption.

162. As a result of the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 462 (1980) of 9 January 1980, the present session has been convened to consider the recent developments in Afghanistan and their implications for international peace and security.

163. Oman's position on the question before us is clear; it was unambiguously stated by the Foreign Ministry's spokesman after the military intervention in Afghanistan. He said:

“The Sultanate of Oman denounces the Soviet military intervention in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and emphasizes its support for the struggle of the Afghan people against the Soviet military presence in its country. The Soviet aggression against Afghanistan is a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of Afghanistan's non-aligned status and threatens inter-

national peace and security. The Sultanate calls for the withdrawal of Soviet military troops from Afghanistan to enable the Afghan people to build its legal Government. It welcomes the international denunciation of Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. Oman will co-ordinate its efforts with the sister neighbouring States to confront the dangers that will result from Soviet military invasion of the region.”

164. The discussions in the Security Council and during the past few days in the General Assembly reflect the concern about and international denunciation of this intervention in the affairs of a small, non-aligned State by a neighbouring super-Power. That is traumatic for the whole world, but especially for Islamic and other neighbouring States which for centuries have had close historical, cultural and religious ties with that small State. The Afghan people has enriched Arab and Islamic culture; its scholars and other intellectuals have done work that is regarded as authoritative examples of that culture.

165. These unjust acts aimed at the domination of that proud people and at changing its values, traditions, customs and religion by military force are deplorable. Several times during its long history, Afghanistan has resisted attempts to invade and dominate it, and we are very sure that today it will resist the Soviet military intervention, recover its independence and non-aligned status, and thwart any attempts to pull it into the sphere of influence of foreign hegemony.

166. Our condemnation of Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan does not mean that we question the right of the latter, or of any other State for that matter, to resort to any means or action it deems suitable to preserve its interests, independence and territorial integrity. But the recent events in Afghanistan, the facts of the Soviet intervention and the timing of the so-called requests for foreign assistance and aid—which in fact followed the military intervention—refute the attempts that have been made to portray what has happened as consistent with the rules of international relations or treaties of friendship.

167. If today the United Nations fails to adopt a firm resolution consistent with the principles of the Charter and if nations—especially small ones—hesitate to support a resolution condemning the aggression and calling for withdrawal, we shall be establishing a serious international precedent, the consequences of which would be suffered by the small countries, which find their protection in the force of the legitimacy of the Charter and international law.

168. The phenomenon of small countries falling prey to foreign military intervention aiming at coups should be condemned, whether such intervention is carried out directly by a major power or through local puppets or puppets imported from far-away continents. We have begun to witness manifestations of this today on the international scale.

169. The naive attempt to portray our denunciation of the military intervention in Afghanistan as lining up in the struggle of the super-Powers or taking the side of one against the other is reprehensible and doomed to failure. What we denounce today is military intervention by a

major power in the affairs of a small, non-aligned country with a view to destroying its independence—and that is a flagrant violation of all international instruments.

170. What has happened in Afghanistan exceeds all the limits and threatens other countries, especially the rich neighbouring ones. I say this particularly to my colleague who spoke just before me: when the countries of the third world condemn this military intervention they do not do so because they support one camp against another; they do so because their interests and future are at stake.

171. There has been much talk about the cold war and the fear that it may return, and there have been references to the Helsinki Declaration and to détente. But this is a regional, limited perspective on the part of Eastern and Western Europe. These slogans have been repeatedly used by those who long ago introduced the cold war to the third world.

172. Last week Oman joined in calling for the convening of the Security Council and it is a sponsor of the draft resolution that will soon be introduced here. That text constitutes the very least that should be adopted under the circumstances.

173. The peoples of the third world, and especially of the developing world, are looking to this Organization in the hope that it will implement its principles and demand the denunciation of aggression and the preservation of the independence, integrity and non-aligned status of Afghanistan. They call for the immediate withdrawal of the military presence in Afghanistan so that the Afghan people may be enabled to determine its political, social and economic system without any foreign interference or subversion. They also stress the importance of the return of the refugees to their homeland in order that they may be able to exercise their right to self-determination in all freedom.

174. Mr. FUTSCHER PEREIRA (Portugal): The Portuguese delegation has already had the opportunity of pointing out in the Security Council⁹ the serious threat to international peace and security constituted by the aggression carried out against Afghanistan. We therefore see no reason to repeat here the position of the Portuguese Government on that question.

175. The proceedings of the Security Council have shown that the overwhelming majority of the international community shares the same deep concern over the flagrant violation of the most elementary principles of international law that was committed by the Soviet Union and also shares the view that the military intervention in Afghanistan not only affects the fragile balance of international relations in that part of the world but also jeopardizes the whole policy of dialogue and co-operation which we believe to be useful and possible to build and continue in Europe.

176. Such a policy, in order to be consistent, must be indivisible and global. It fundamentally presupposes total respect for the Charter of the United Nations and for the principles on which the Charter is based, that is to say,

⁹ *Ibid.*, 2188th meeting.

respect for the territorial integrity of States, for the inviolability of their borders, for the non-use of threats of force, for non-interference in the internal affairs of States and for the right of States freely to determine their own destiny.

177. The contempt shown by the Soviet Union in regard to the Charter and to those principles, and the absurd and illogical attempts to justify the unjustifiable, led the Security Council to consider a draft resolution, the adoption of which was prevented only by the veto of a permanent member, the Soviet Union itself. The Security Council would therefore be gravely neglecting the obligations contained in the mandate which was given to it by the community of nations under the Charter if it accepted being prevented from acting in the face of what the overwhelming majority of its members perceive as an indisputable violation of international law committed by a great Power against a non-aligned Member State.

178. That is why we have added our voice to the voices of those who believe that it is the duty of the General Assembly to examine this question and to adopt a resolution on it expressing the indignation of the international community and demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Soviet forces from Afghan territory.

179. On the other hand, the drama of the refugees—and the toll seems to be extremely heavy as a result of the current conflict—also deeply preoccupies my Government. We hope that it will be possible to extend to them at the earliest moment all the assistance required to alleviate their hardships.

180. We should like to hope that the Soviet Union, conscious of its serious responsibilities as a member of the community of nations, as a great Power, and as a permanent member of the Security Council, will still be willing fully to assume those responsibilities, to re-examine and reconsider without hesitation the policy that has led it to intervene in Afghanistan.

181. Mr. KOH (Singapore): I have listened carefully to the statements made in this debate by the Soviet Union and by the delegations which support it. In essence, their case is based upon the following four propositions. First, the Soviet forces are in Afghanistan at the invitation of the Government of Afghanistan. Secondly, the Soviet forces played no role in the overthrow and execution of President Hafizullah Amin, which occurred on 27 December 1979. Thirdly, the present debate constitutes an unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and therefore contravenes paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations. Fourthly, the Government of Afghanistan requested military assistance from the Soviet Union and the Government of the Soviet Union agreed to render such assistance in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter.

182. I shall attempt to analyse briefly each of the four arguments adduced by the Soviet Union and its supporters. I shall begin with the first proposition. The Soviet Union says that at all relevant times its armed forces were in Afghanistan at the invitation of the Government of that

country. We know for a fact that on 25 and 26 December 1979 a massive Soviet airlift into Kabul took place. In over 200 flights, approximately 10,000 Soviet troops were transported into Afghanistan. The critical question is: who had invited the Soviet troops to enter Afghanistan on 25, 26 and 27 December, until President Amin was killed and Babrak Karmal was appointed as his successor? The Soviet statement does not make this clear. It cannot be seriously contended that President Amin had invited the entry of Soviet forces in order to depose and kill him. Is it the contention of the Soviet Union that the request for Soviet military assistance had come from Babrak Karmal? If that is the answer, it will not stand up to scrutiny.

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

183. In April 1978 the Government of President Mohammed Daud was overthrown by a coup d'état carried out by communist members of the Afghan armed forces. On 30 April 1978 a new Government was established with Nour Mohammad Taraki as Prime Minister and Babrak Karmal and Hafizullah Amin as Deputy Prime Ministers. Three months later, on 6 July, Babrak Karmal was dismissed from his post as Deputy Prime Minister and sent to Czechoslovakia as the Afghan Ambassador. A few weeks later Babrak Karmal was recalled from Prague by his Government. He refused to return. Instead, he lived in exile in the Soviet Union or in Eastern Europe until the coup against President Amin on 27 December. Therefore, if the Soviet forces has entered Afghanistan between 25 and 27 December at the request of Babrak Karmal, he had no authority to make such a request because he was not the leader or even a member of the Afghan Government at the relevant time.

184. I shall now turn to examine the second question. The Soviet Union has denied that its armed forces either engineered or participated in the coup against President Amin. I find the Soviet denial unconvincing. According to press reports, on the evening of 27 December Soviet troops surrounded the Presidential Palace in Kabul and fighting occurred between Afghan soldiers guarding the palace and the Soviet forces. According to the same reports, the Soviet troops also attacked Afghan forces guarding Radio Afghanistan and other key Government installations and took control of them.

185. The Soviet Union has contended that the present debate constitutes an unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and is contrary to paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations. The validity of that argument depends on whether or not the entry of Soviet forces into Afghanistan since 25 December contravenes the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of that country. If the Soviet forces had been in Afghanistan at the invitation of the Government of that country, then the Soviet contention is valid. It collapses as being without foundation in view of the fact that the Soviet forces entered Afghanistan since 25 December in violation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of that country, and in view of the fact, also, that the Soviet forces either engineered or participated in the overthrow of President Amin.

186. The fourth and final argument of the Soviet Union is that the Government of Afghanistan had requested military assistance from the Soviet Union and the Government of the Soviet Union had agreed to provide such assistance in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. Article 51 states that nothing in the Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member State. The Article requires a Member State exercising this right to report the measures taken by it immediately to the Security Council. In the opinion of my delegation, the Soviet Union has failed to make out a case under Article 51. The Article gives no power to a country, such as the Soviet Union, to send its armed forces into the territory of another country and to overthrow its Government. The facts do not establish that between 25 and 27 December Afghanistan was a victim of an armed attack by a third State and that the Government of Afghanistan had appealed to the Soviet Union for military assistance in order to repel such an armed attack. At the relevant time, Afghanistan was not at war with any foreign Power. There were no foreign soldiers on the territory of Afghanistan other than Soviet soldiers.

187. An analysis of the facts and of the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations has led me to the following conclusions. First, contrary to Soviet contention, Soviet forces entered the territory of Afghanistan without the invitation of the legal Government of that country. Secondly, contrary to Soviet contention, Soviet forces either engineered or at least participated in the overthrow of President Amin. The question whether Amin was a good or bad ruler is irrelevant because, as Ambassador Bishara of Kuwait has explained [*2nd meeting*], the nature of the régime of a country does not justify foreign armed intervention in the internal affairs of that country. Thirdly, the present Government of Afghanistan headed by Babrak Karmal is imposed by the Soviet Union on Afghanistan. Fourthly, the present debate is not an interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and is not contrary to paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter. Fifthly and finally, Article 51 of the Charter cannot be invoked by the Soviet Union to justify its violation of the territorial integrity and political independence of Afghanistan and its interference in the internal affairs of that country.

188. The Soviet actions in Afghanistan have already created several grave consequences for the world. On the international plane, it has created a new climate of fear and anxiety throughout the world. It has put a stop to the process of détente and confidence-building. It has revived the cold war and intensified rivalry between the great Powers. It has undermined the prospects for fruitful negotiations in the field of arms control and disarmament, especially between the two super-Powers.

189. For us in Asia, the Soviet armed intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan is a particularly significant event. It is the first time since the end of the Second World War that the Soviet Union has deployed its armed forces against a country in Asia. It makes many of us in Asia wonder whether the Soviet Union is turning its attention to Asia in view of the relative stability of relations between Eastern and Western Europe. Is Afghanistan an isolated

incident, or is it indicative of Soviet ambitions in Asia? If the latter, who is next, after Afghanistan?

190. My country is a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Nations. Members of our Movement attach the highest importance to the principle that every State should respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every other State; to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States; and to the principle of non-use of force in relations between States. I agreed completely with Ambassador Clark of Nigeria when on 11 January [*ibid.*] he said that we must demonstrate our adherence to those principles by applying them uniformly and consistently to all States, whether they be from the West or from the East or from the Non-Aligned Movement itself. The actions of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan are, in the view of my delegation, in clear contravention of those principles. Therefore, members of the Movement must demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its forces from Afghanistan immediately and unconditionally, that it cease its interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and that all States refrain from interference in the internal affairs of that country, so that the people of Afghanistan will be able to decide their own destiny and choose their own form of government according to their own wishes.

191. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Pakistan to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1.

192. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): I have the honour to submit to the sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1, which has been sponsored up to now by 22 non-aligned and third-world nations.

193. The convening of this emergency special session, which has only a few precedents in the life of our Organization, in itself speaks for the grave nature of the situation in Afghanistan and the threat it poses to international peace and security.

194. The debate in the General Assembly, as well as that in the Security Council which preceded it, has fully revealed the profound concern of the international community over the recent developments in Afghanistan characterized by massive external armed intervention in that country. Participants in the debate have clearly stated their deep apprehensions that this armed intervention, unless it is immediately terminated, will have far-reaching negative consequences for the region and the world and also frustrate the hopes for the building of a world order based on the universally cherished norms and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

195. The non-aligned and third-world nations, which are committed to uphold the principles of peaceful coexistence, including respect for the sovereignty, national independence and territorial integrity of States, non-aggression and non-interference in internal affairs, must view the situation with special concern. A world free of tensions and of rivalries for domination and spheres of influence is regarded by those nations as indispensable for

their independent political existence and continued progress. Hence, we are deeply disturbed by the military interventions and the increased use of force in international relations.

196. This time a massive military intervention has violated the State sovereignty and national independence of a country which was a founding member of the Non-Aligned Movement. A large number of the non-aligned and third-world countries have therefore joined—in the Security Council and now at this emergency special session of the General Assembly—in expressing their grave concern over the situation in Afghanistan.

197. The draft resolution addresses itself to the incontrovertible and basic aspects of the recent developments in Afghanistan. They are, first, that a massive induction of Soviet armed forces into Afghanistan has taken place in contravention of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and in violation of the State sovereignty and national independence of Afghanistan; secondly, that this armed intervention into Afghanistan has endangered international peace and security and that it is bound to increase instability and insecurity in the region and aggravate international tension; thirdly, that the presence of foreign troops would deny the inalienable right of the people of Afghanistan to determine their own destiny and order their internal affairs without foreign interference, coercion or domination; and, fourthly, and lastly, that there has been a large outflow of Afghan refugees, who have fled from their homeland in search of security and are facing great hardships.

198. Those basic elements of the Afghan situation have been fully highlighted in the current debate. Accordingly, they have been reflected in the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1.

199. Under the draft resolution, the Assembly would express its grave concern over the recent developments in Afghanistan and recognize the urgent need for immediate termination of foreign armed intervention in that country; would reaffirm the inalienable right of all peoples, including the people of Afghanistan, to determine their own future and to choose their own form of government free from outside interference or coercion; would express its particular concern at the increased recourse to military intervention in the internal affairs of States and recall the resolutions it unanimously adopted on the strengthening of international security and on the inadmissibility of

intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty. Such military intervention, escalation of tensions and intensification of rivalries are especially detrimental to the interests of the non-aligned and third-world nations.

200. Under the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, the Assembly would reaffirm the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and strongly deplore the recent armed intervention in Afghanistan, which is inconsistent with those principles; would call for the immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of the 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, subversion, coercion or constraint of any kind whatsoever.

201. Under the draft resolution, the Assembly also would appeal to all States to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan and to refrain from any interference in the internal affairs of that country; and would appeal for humanitarian relief assistance with a view to alleviating the hardship of the Afghan refugees and for the creation of conditions necessary for the voluntary return of the refugees to their homes.

202. Under this draft resolution, which reflects the overwhelming sentiments of the international community, and especially of the non-aligned and third-world nations, the Assembly would also underline the abiding commitment of all Member States to uphold the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Respect for those principles is the fundamental prerequisite for ensuring peace and security in the world.

203. The sponsors of this draft resolution are therefore confident that it will receive the unanimous support of the General Assembly. The international community must pronounce its clear verdict on the foreign armed intervention in Afghanistan, which flouts international law, breaches world peace and threatens regional and global security.

204. In conclusion, on behalf of the sponsors, I should like to request a recorded vote on the draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.