



*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 (*concluded*) (A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1)

1. Mr. ESQUEA GUERRERO (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again the General Assembly is meeting in an emergency special session in accordance with the provisions of its resolution 377 A (V), this time in order to deal with the aggression to which one of the States Members of this Organization has been subjected.

2. The violation of the sovereignty of a country ought to be a matter of the deepest concern to all the peoples of the world. In addition to that, the fact that this action against the independence and self-determination of a country comes precisely from one of those countries that were represented at San Francisco and signed the Charter there, a country that is also a permanent member of the Security Council, is a scandal of incalculable dimensions, which should lead us to give serious thought to the validity we ascribe to the principles and rules of peaceful coexistence that we have all undertaken to observe and respect.

3. It is deplorable, and indeed paradoxical, that just a few weeks ago it was that very Power that has now committed aggression against the sister country of Afghanistan that introduced a draft resolution to prohibit hegemonism in international relations. Today we see that that initiative was nothing but sheer hypocrisy, with absolutely nothing of substance behind it.

4. The Dominican Republic has twice in this century suffered the violation of its sovereignty by foreign troops, but it has been able to re-establish its rights. Accordingly, perhaps our country is in the strongest position morally to condemn the invasion perpetrated by Soviet troops against the sister country of Afghanistan and to call for their immediate withdrawal from the territory of Afghanistan.

5. There can be no possible explanation or justification for this disgraceful act, which is shocking to the whole world. Sovereignty, independence and self-determination are principles that cannot suffer even the slightest infringement. It is only thus that we will be able to guarantee a stable and lasting peace throughout the world.

6. We are sure that faced with this diabolical action there will be no half-hearted approaches to this situation and that the countries that respect the Charter of this Organization

and truly desire universal peace will reject with their vote this ominous act which has been carried out against mankind.

7. This sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly should be baptized the emergency special session against hegemonism, because there can be no other possible motive for this indescribable action. It is the desire to acquire territory in order to become the masters of the human race that leads hegemonistic countries to commit this type of abuse against lesser peoples and this is, indeed, what happened in Afghanistan. It is a clear-cut example of an outrageous and disgraceful policy.

8. This debate provides us with an opportunity to stress once again how frustrating for the small countries of the world is the existence of the veto in the Security Council. How is it possible that we could have been so naive as to allow a country to be at one and the same time judge and party to a case that concerns the maintenance of international peace? Would it be sensible to believe that the Soviet Union would vote against a draft resolution that was directed against something that it had itself done? Once and for all, there should be a change in the veto system in the Security Council, because otherwise we will never be able to ensure respect for the principles on which this Organization is based.

9. However, as is noted in resolution 377 A (V), the fact that the Security Council was not able to discharge the responsibility incumbent on it does not prevent this Assembly from taking a forceful and consistent position in accordance with the mandate granted it under the Charter to watch over the maintenance of international peace and security. We will not allow any boycotting of this sacred duty, because to do so would simply be opening the way for the disintegration of this Organization. The time has come for all peoples that truly love peace to take firm positions, to react with due forcefulness against those that take account only of their own interests and reject the right of others and of peaceful coexistence.

10. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Israel joins all those nations from every corner of the globe that have condemned unambiguously the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan. We cannot accept the explanations offered by the Soviet Union for its actions, which, as has been pointed out time and again in this debate and in the earlier deliberations of the Security Council, violate common sense, not to speak of the fundamental norms of international law, as reflected in the Charter of the United Nations.

11. Israel shares the apprehensions expressed by the majority of the States Members of this international

Organization over the military intervention of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. This massive and naked aggression has far-reaching implications which threaten the fundamental balance of the international system. Beyond that, Israel's concerns are even more immediate, specific and concrete, for we are part of the geographical region into which the Soviet Union has marched so rudely and so brutally.

12. We are part of a region that has been vulnerable for decades to the expansionist designs of the Soviet Union. Our region has witnessed the brutality and callousness of the Soviet Union as it seeks to further its expansionist aims. Experience shows that, when it suits it, the Soviet Union does not hesitate to violate the most elementary norms of conduct among nations or to place twisted and arbitrary constructions on the Charter of the United Nations and its Purposes and Principles. Where the Soviet Union's imperialistic and hegemonistic ambitions are concerned, it is prepared to ride shamelessly and roughshod over any State that is in its way.

13. Several participants in this debate, including the Soviet Union, have tried to divert attention from the issue before us, but their diversionary tactics will be of no avail. We all know that the sole issue before us in this debate is the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan.

14. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan gives particular grounds for international concern because we are confronted here with an act of blatant aggression by a super-Power. The security of the Soviet Union and its military might are based on a vast army and a gigantic arsenal of ultra-sophisticated weapons, backed up by extraordinary strategic depth.

15. Many States here would be content if they had a small fraction of the security enjoyed by the Soviet Union, but the Soviet Union, after decades of expansionism and consolidation, is still not satisfied with its power and is apparently still bent on buttressing itself with a ring of satellites and puppets. It seems to matter little to the Soviet Union if in the process it crushes the independence of States, the freedom of nations and the human rights of their peoples. Similarly, it seems to matter little if it undermines the very basis of the international system that has been built up so laboriously and at such great cost in terms of human and other resources since the end of the Second World War.

16. Certain States among us have very concrete reasons to fear external threats of a military nature. For these States the problems of self-defence and security are real and grave. By comparison, who and what has the Soviet Union to fear? Who would challenge the security, the sovereignty, the territorial integrity of a global power such as the Soviet Union? It has at its disposal not only a military deterrent capacity of huge dimensions but also a vast array of political and diplomatic means to make its weight felt.

17. The Soviet Union has been accorded within this Organization a special responsibility for the preservation of international peace and security. A corollary of that responsibility is found in the special rights conferred on the Soviet Union as a permanent member of the Security

Council. But these privileges surely do not entitle the Soviet Union to trample underfoot the rights of other States.

18. As we have been reminded by various speakers, it is the Soviet Union that has over the years launched numerous initiatives in this Organization against intervention in the internal affairs of other States and against the use of force in international relations. The sheer hypocrisy and cynicism of the Soviet Union's pontificating and posturing have again been exposed by its naked aggression against Afghanistan. The principles it has so piously preached at others count for nothing when the leaders of the Kremlin decide to impose their will and grip on other States.

19. Some participants in this emergency special session have recalled the Soviet actions in Hungary and Czechoslovakia in 1956 and 1968 respectively. The analogy is not complete. Until recently Afghanistan was an independent, non-aligned nation. It first fell victim to Soviet subversion and was then overrun by tens of thousands of Soviet forces laden with tanks and guns and backed up by airborne support units and logistics. This most recent manifestation of Soviet aggression and expansionism, coupled with the arrogance flaunted by the Soviet Union in the face of the international community, necessarily raises the question of what country is next on the Soviet Union's list.

20. In this day and age, independence and liberty are indivisible. Every State which cherishes its sovereignty must speak out. Each country must raise its voice in protest. In the 1930s the world stood idly by when the aggressors of another age swallowed up one small State after another. The entire world paid a heavy price for its complacency, its passivity and its acquiescence in the acts of the aggressors. We must not repeat that mistake. The nations of the world must act to check aggression and to ensure that that terrible price is not paid again.

21. Mr. ROA KOURI (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly has been convened under the dubious sign of a pre-arranged fuss. The United States rulers do their utmost to demand before international public opinion respect for institutions which traditionally have been violated by armed interventions or conspiracies plotted by United States administrations since the turn of the century.

22. The Yankee chorus has been joined by the Pinochets, guilty of the genocide of their peoples; by the traitors of Peking, who recently shed the blood of heroic Viet Nam; and by others of the same ilk, well known for their reactionary and pro-imperialist stand. There are also, of course, those—among them highly esteemed friends that follow an unquestionably progressive policy—who honestly believe that this exercise is concerned with matters which are really pertinent to the sovereignty and independence of peoples; they do not perceive the duplicity of imperialist deception.

23. Israel's acts of aggression against Lebanon and the almost daily bombings of Palestinian refugee camps have not prompted the concern of the United States rulers; neither, for that matter, have the attacks on Angola, Mozambique, Zambia and Botswana by racist South Africa and Rhodesia.

24. The United States leaders have on numerous occasions threatened the oil-producing Arab States with military aggression and even referred to the creation of special intervention forces and the establishment of military bases in the Middle East and the Arab Gulf to fill the role of gendarme that had been assigned to the Shah of Iran upon his reinstatement by the Central Intelligence Agency, after deposing Mossadegh's nationalist Government. Thus the present statements of American rulers, disguised as champions of what they have never respected and have repeatedly violated, are repugnant.

25. The Government of the United States, which advocates intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and is intent on reimposing on the countries of that region the status of pawns of its imperialist policies, requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council and has launched a formidable, drum-rolling propaganda campaign about a new cold war and threats to another State Member of the United Nations.

26. For Cuba, this debate implies the need to take a definite stand before an historical dilemma. The uncouth manipulation by the United States imperialists of events in Afghanistan, their attempt to profit from what took place in that country as a means to disguise their cynical support for the worst international forces, to promote their bellicose policy and to draw a smoke-screen over their political and moral crisis while once more projecting their primitive hatred of socialism, leaves no margin for nuances.

27. It is not the right of peoples to their sovereignty which is at stake in the present debate. Cuba will always uphold that right, as it has done at the cost of its own blood. But when it is sought, in the name of that right, to show the validity of a sinister imperialism which has brought death, oppression, backwardness, hunger, illness and ignorance to humanity, Cuba says "No". We shall never carry water to the mill of reaction and imperialism. We shall never align ourselves with the perpetrators of genocide in Viet Nam, with those who invaded Mexico and robbed it of a considerable part of its territory, with those who landed in Central America, Haiti and Santo Domingo to defend the interests of their monopolies and who returned to the Dominican Republic a few years ago to prevent the people of that country from attaining democracy.

28. We shall not vote against socialism and with the accomplices of Zionism, which murders the Palestinians and aims at dismembering the Arab nation. We refuse to be counted among the supporters of South Africa and with those who would install 572 new, additional atomic missiles directed against the Soviet Union. Because we are deeply convinced of the meaning of socialism and that of imperialism, because we know the historic role of the Soviet Union and of United States imperialism, we shall vote today against that imperialism and against its policy; and, in so doing, we shall reaffirm our unshakable faith in the right of peoples to their sovereignty, in internationalism and in socialism, the true and definitive future of mankind.

29. Mr. PALACIOS DE VIZZIO (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, my delegation would like to congratulate you on your presidency of this sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly.

30. Recent developments in Afghanistan constitute a clear threat to the maintenance of international peace and security. Regrettably, the Security Council, as the paramount and principal body responsible for such matters, has not been able to take action because of the veto cast by one of its permanent members, despite the fact that the relevant draft resolution, which was introduced by the non-aligned countries, received 13 affirmative votes. Accordingly, Bolivia feels that the convening of this emergency special session was a timely and fully justified move.

31. The principles of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, respect for the self-determination of peoples, and non-resort to the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of States are all principles which derive from the oldest rules of organized international life. Those principles are enshrined in the relevant articles of our Charter, in many declarations and resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, in the charter of the Organization of American States and in the instruments of other regional bodies. Equally, we can say that those principles have been reiterated in the Political Declaration adopted by the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana in 1979,<sup>1</sup> which very clearly affirmed the validity of those principles as the basic elements of non-alignment. Thus, the violation of those principles is not only a brutal flouting of the most elementary rules of peaceful coexistence among States, but also a serious attack against the very foundations of the United Nations.

32. This means that, in view of what has happened in Afghanistan, the international community, and particularly the overwhelming majority of States that believe in the rule of law as the only civilized means of international coexistence, should make its position known firmly and unanimously.

33. Bolivia, as the country most seriously affected in the western hemisphere by aggression which was a violation of the above-mentioned principles, cannot but fully support this draft resolution, which is an appeal for respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Afghanistan and which calls for the immediate, unconditional and complete withdrawal of foreign troops from that country.

34. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): The Yugoslav delegation clearly stated in the Security Council on 7 January 1980,<sup>2</sup> in the course of the debate on the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security, the position of Yugoslavia concerning the inadmissibility of foreign intervention by armed force or any other means, as well as the unacceptability of any form of imposition of alien will upon sovereign countries and peoples.

35. We are deeply concerned at the deterioration of the international situation, the most acute manifestations of which are the failure to solve crises or the aggravation of old crises and the outbreak or instigation of new crises; the

<sup>1</sup> See A/34/542, sect. I.

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year*, 2189th meeting.

ever more frequent recourse to the threat or use of force in various parts of the world; and the serious undermining of the process of relaxation of tensions that hamper the solution of crucial international issues, lead to a revival of the cold war and threaten international peace and security. Intensified rivalry between blocs and great Powers, the policy of spheres of interest and the arms race, as well as the ever more widespread use of force, are the root causes of such a situation in international relations.

36. More recently, we have witnessed the ever more frequent practice of interference in internal affairs and military interventions aimed at thwarting the independent development of peoples, especially of non-aligned countries.

37. There have been a number of successive interventions in the world. That does not, of course, mean that one intervention can be justified by another one. Unfortunately, the world is constantly threatened with a series of such crises, which reflects the continued tendency to impose force and diktat as a code of conduct in international relations. It is therefore imperative to oppose and condemn any intervention or use of force that jeopardizes the process of détente and leads the world to the brink of global armed conflicts. The crisis in Afghanistan is a serious symptom and warning.

38. In this connexion, also, we cannot shut our eyes to the toleration of Israeli aggression in the Middle East and the brutal aggressive expeditions of racist régimes in southern Africa against the independence and freedom of the peoples of that region, from where we receive disquieting news about attempts to circumvent the agreement on Rhodesia and to prolong the stationing of South African troops in that country. Furthermore, we cannot but draw attention to the grave crisis in South-East Asia which threatens the independence of non-aligned countries.

39. All this intervention, pressure and use of force is an expression not only of the policy of domination and hegemony on the regional level but also of bloc confrontations on the world plane. Unless such a course of events is arrested, we could be confronted with unforeseeable dangers for the peaceful progress of mankind. As a non-aligned country, Yugoslavia deems it indispensable to fight energetically in the General Assembly, and together with all the non-aligned countries, against bloc policies, against the use of force, the division and expansion of spheres of interest and, in short, against all forms of dependence and subjugation. All peoples must have the right and duty to determine their own destiny. We cannot accept any reason that would justify depriving peoples of their sovereign right to determine their own internal development and foreign policy, as every Member State of the world Organization has assumed the obligation to respect this right as a generally accepted norm of international relations.

40. The world Organization should exert maximum efforts to ensure that the principles of national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, equal rights and free national and social development should be strictly observed and applied in international relations. Unless that is done, the very principles on which the United Nations is founded

could be jeopardized. This should be the concern of all the members of the international community without exception, and especially the obligation of the great Powers, upon which the Charter has conferred primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The violation of these principles is, as reaffirmed at the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned countries, "incompatible with the obligations assumed by United Nations Members under the Charter of the United Nations".<sup>3</sup>

41. The growing threats to peace and security and the independent development of countries make it incumbent upon the international community to strive to transform détente into a universal process encompassing all regions of the world and ensuring the participation, on equal terms, of all countries in the solution of major problems. If we fail to achieve this, détente will be transformed into a screen for concealing bloc rivalries, to the detriment primarily of non-aligned countries, instead of becoming a component of efforts exerted by the whole international community for building a new international order.

42. We must become active subjects in the struggle for a concept of détente that will contribute towards normalizing the current tense situation with a view to ensuring the peaceful, independent and secure development of every country. This moment requires that we should all be imbued with a high sense of responsibility towards mankind and peace, and therefore that all of our acts should be in harmony with that responsibility.

43. The current discussion in the General Assembly and the debate that was held in the Security Council, as well as all the earlier situations involving the infringement of these rights throughout the world, show that the primary objective of non-alignment is the struggle for international peace and security, international relations based on equal rights and establishment of a new international political and economic order founded on equality, and mutual esteem and respect for all countries of the world, regardless of their size, ideological orientation or geographical position.

44. On that basis, the non-aligned countries have constantly strengthened and asserted their independent and anti-bloc character. The Non-Aligned Movement has always proceeded from the position that, without the independence of countries, there can be neither peace nor progress in the world. For that reason, the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana, determined that the primary objectives of the policy of non-alignment are: preservation of the national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of non-aligned countries; elimination of foreign interference and intervention in the internal and external affairs of States and the use or the threat of force; strengthening of non-alignment as an independent non-bloc factor and the further spread of non-alignment in the world; elimination of colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, including Zionism, and support of national liberation movements struggling against colonial and alien domination and foreign occupation; elimination of imperialistic and hegemonistic policies and of all other forms of expan-

<sup>3</sup> See A/34/542, sect. I, para. 245.

sionism and foreign domination; safeguarding of international peace and security and the universalization of the relaxation of international tensions.

45. Those objectives derive from the fundamental principles of the policy of non-alignment, such as respect for national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference and non-intervention, the freedom of all States to determine their political systems, the struggle against all forms of domination, the indivisibility of peace and security, and so on. Those very principles have made it possible for the policy and movement of non-alignment to provide an appropriate platform and to initiate decisive actions for the solution of crucial world problems and for promoting equitable international co-operation. We wish to reiterate here, too, that this has been manifested recently in the region of South-West Asia, through the disintegration of the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) Pact and the adherence of Iran and Pakistan to the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which has considerably reduced bloc rivalry aimed at establishing spheres of influence and has created favourable conditions for co-operation among the States of that region.

46. We believe, therefore, that the influence and action of non-aligned countries should be felt more strongly in international relations in defence of the principles of the Charter and the policy of non-alignment, which are of universal importance for relations among all countries, regardless of their size, level of development or social system. Consequently, it is an imperative of our time to implement these principles, to check the use of force, to prevent any encroachment upon the independence and freedom of peoples and countries and to guarantee the inalienable right of every people to free development.

47. In that regard, the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Colombo in 1976, emphasized that the non-aligned commitment to the principle of the true independence of States, as distinct from merely formal sovereignty, means that the non-aligned are opposed to any form of interference in the internal affairs of States and resolutely reject any attempts to justify foreign interference under any pretext whatsoever, from any source.

48. As we did in the Security Council recently, and as we have always done in all similar situations, we support the basic provisions of a draft resolution recognizing the right of the people of Afghanistan to free and independent development and reaffirming the fundamental principles of the Charter. In this sense, we also support the demand for the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan and the need for all countries to refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of that non-aligned country. That would pave the way towards stability in Afghanistan and would greatly contribute to promoting the process of relaxation of international tensions and the establishment of peace in the region and in the world at large.

49. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): We proceed from the position that the General Assembly, in considering the situation in Afghanistan, is acting within its competence to maintain international peace and security when the Se-

curity Council, either through neglect, inability or unwillingness on the part of its members, has been unable to fulfil its international obligations as the primary custodian responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security.

50. Mr. President, we share the perception you demonstrated when, in opening this session, you declared that a threat to peace and security in any part of the world had a direct bearing on universal peace and security, and that no nation or group of nations could claim immunity from such developments.

51. Unfortunately, the present situation in Afghanistan is not isolated. Within the past year, the moral and legal foundations of our Organization have been tested, and international peace and security shaken. Armed conflicts, battles and bloodshed have continued uninterrupted.

52. The Charter of this Organization, which is avowedly designed to preserve peace among members of the international community, has on several occasions been flagrantly violated, with serious consequences for world peace. We are indeed in a downward trend, and the irony is that our age, during which the overriding concern has been the attainment of peace, has had to endure so many violent conflicts. Such is the situation in Afghanistan today, a situation fraught with danger to world peace.

53. Sierra Leone's position on this question is not animated by a desire to recriminate or to condemn any Member of this Organization. We do not share a common platform with those who would wish to see a rejuvenation of the cold war in order to vindicate their Jeremiahan thesis. Nor do we share a platform with those who are selective in their condemnation of great-Power military intervention. We are imbued with a desire to uphold and defend the principles of our Organization. We are motivated by the desire that Afghanistan, a third-world, non-aligned country that poses a threat to no one, should be able to preserve its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and that its people should be left alone to determine their own destiny.

54. It is a fact of life that if the people of Afghanistan refuse to accept subjugation their conquest will remain tenuous and temporary, but their resistance will cause instability in the area. We do not and cannot accept that super-Power rivalry is sufficient reason for a small and defenceless country to be eviscerated and made to lose its independence.

55. The situation in Afghanistan throws the principles of our Organization into sharp relief, and it is against that background that it must be viewed. The pre-eminent principle of the Charter is maintenance of international peace and security. The Charter also prohibits the use of force in international relations and embodies respect for State sovereignty, territorial integrity, sovereign equality and non-interference in internal affairs. International peace and security cannot, therefore, be maintained in situations where one State has used its armed forces to carry out military intervention against another. It is therefore inadmissible for any Member State of this Organization, or any sovereign State for that matter, to impose itself upon

another, irrespective of its geographic or political status. The principle of non-interference forbids any one State to impose its political or social system upon any other State. All States Members of this Organization assume the foregoing obligations.

56. The Sierra Leonean delegation therefore joins in the appeal to all States for respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan and for the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from its soil. A positive response to this appeal by those concerned will go a long way in restoring the confidence and gratitude they have earned from nations that have fought for and won their independence and freedom. At the same time, if Afghanistan and its people are to be able to live in peace it is imperative that there should be no interference in its domestic affairs from any quarter. Any such interference would in our view not serve the best interests of the Afghan people but would make them pawns in super-Power rivalry and confrontation.

57. While on this crucial question of foreign military occupation, I should like to refer to the presence of South African troops on the territory of Zimbabwe under the pretext of defensive frontiers. The arrogant claim by the leader of the régime in Pretoria that South Africa will not accept, after the February general elections, the emergence of a Government in Zimbabwe that is not to its liking carries with it a very grave implication. If free and fair elections are to be held in Zimbabwe and the efforts at the Lancaster House Conference<sup>4</sup> are to be realized, it is imperative that South African troops should withdraw from Rhodesia forthwith, notwithstanding the alleged pressure that is being brought to bear on Lord Soames by the henchmen of Ian Smith for the continued occupation of Zimbabwe. In this way, the call for troops to be withdrawn from Afghanistan will not sound hollow and selective.

58. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization. I call upon him on the basis of General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974.

59. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Mr. President, once again it gives us great reassurance and pride to see a son of Africa, a citizen of a State member of the Non-Aligned Movement, a great person who proved his great merits in steering the work of the regular session of the General Assembly, presiding over this emergency special session at a most critical and crucial time. We are confident that your prudence and experience will help lead the Assembly towards reassertion of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

60. When we inscribed the name of the Palestine Liberation Organization on the speakers' list, many friends who have proved their support for, nay their identification with, the just cause and the just struggle of the Palestinian people expressed some surprise. Let me make it clear from the outset that our motive is to express our concern about the fate of the United Nations and its effectiveness and the need to maintain and consolidate faith and credibility in the Organization. After many years of suffering and

neglect, the Palestinian people have found in the United Nations a refuge and a resort for seeking justice. The liberation of scores of peoples from colonial and racist rule, the independence of many nations and their joining the United Nations resulted in the present structure, which reflects the universality of the Organization and, more important yet, its image and its noble purposes and principles.

61. The first words of the Charter are:

“We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small . . .”.

For the Palestinian man and woman, that is at best an understatement. The inalienable rights of the Palestinian, including the right to life, have been trampled on for a period exceeding three decades. The sorrow, the misery, the inhumanity, the barbarous and criminal campaigns to eliminate the Palestinian, including physical elimination, still continue. I must admit here that a number of States that supported the first move that resulted in that visitation and suffering—and I am certain they were not fully conscious of or cognizant of the inherent aims and nature of Zionism—have since reviewed their stands and positions and in some cases are now identifying with our just cause. I am referring especially to the socialist countries in Europe, Asia and elsewhere; I am referring also to our colleagues the members of the Non-Aligned Movement. I am proud to state that the Moslem countries have from the very beginning taken a firm stand and have militantly opposed the designs of the Zionists.

62. In addition to their designs to expel the Palestinian people from Palestine after invading and occupying the country, the Zionists aimed at the creation of war conditions, as has been proved during the last three decades. Such conditions of aggression and war have been encouraged and financed by the Government of the United States of America. That does not call for any evidence; it is very well known that billions of dollars go from the Treasury of the United States of America to the war machinery of Israel.

63. In a sense we note with satisfaction that some Members have resorted to this Organization in an endeavour to solve problems by peaceful means and we note that the item under consideration deals not only with the “situation in Afghanistan”, but also with “its implications for international peace and security”. One would infer that the real concern is the “implications for international peace and security”.

64. We had hoped for a debate that would guide the steps and actions of the Member States, a debate that would exhaust all possible approaches and means before a decision or decisions are taken. But now it has become clear that one Member, namely the United States of America, is attempting to use the Assembly as a vehicle of convenience in its search for *ex post facto* recognition by the General

<sup>4</sup> Held at London between 10 September and 15 December 1979.

Assembly of the unilateral measures taken by the Government of the United States and support for those measures. The Government of the United States has in fact adopted unilateral measures and is currently in the process of enlisting more help and support from other States, even before this Assembly takes any decision. Those measures, I might add, are tantamount to economic sanctions or even an undeclared war. Refusal to permit a scheduled civilian aircraft to land and the denial of airport facilities after many hours of flying across the Atlantic, thus forcing the diversion of that aircraft carrying civilian passengers to a neighbouring country, which proved, in this case, to be more reasonable and humane, is just one example. I shall not refer to the measures adopted by the United States leading to the suspension of food shipments, whether for animals or humans.

65. Frankly, we are concerned about the future of the United Nations. Again it is the implications for international peace and security that really worry us. Relations among States, especially the big and possibly great ones, must be governed by the noble principles of the Charter. It is very important that we should not be selective on vital and serious issues. The Assembly today is convened to consider a situation in Afghanistan. Such a matter cannot be considered in isolation. It is not an analogy that I am making, nor an attempt at rationalization. The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Belgrade in July 1978, condemned “the establishment, maintenance and expansion of foreign military bases and installations in the region of the Indian Ocean such as Diego Garcia, which constitutes a direct threat to the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and peaceful development of the States of the region”<sup>5</sup> and “noted with deep concern the statements issued by colonialist and imperialist circles which threaten the resort to using force against oil-producing countries, particularly those lying in the Arab region. They also [condemned] any preparations made to implement such threats.”<sup>6</sup>

66. Those statements were not accidental. There was an invasion of the waters of the Indian Ocean and the Arabian Sea. As we all know, the General Assembly in 1971 declared the Indian Ocean a zone of peace [*resolution 2832 (XXVI)*]. Yet despite that, the United States decided to invade the Indian Ocean and establish mobile aggressive military bases known as aircraft carriers equipped with nuclear warheads in waters thousands of miles away from the United States. Likewise, there were preparations and incitement in the United States to prepare a strike force of 110,000 combatants, whose mission was described as “seizure and protection” of the oil fields. Those were cases of direct threats to international peace and security and in our opinion would have justified the convening of the Security Council to request the dismantling of such aggressive military bases, or rather the immediate withdrawal of the aircraft carriers.

67. A new element emerged in the area with the glorious popular Islamic revolution of Iran. The “Washington school” and designers for world domination were caught unawares: the Pax Americana was no longer safe and the oil

fields were “threatened”. Arnold Toynbee, the great historian, once noted that the pincers gripping and nipping the Arab world with its oil had Israel and Riza Pahlavi’s Iran as their pivotal parts. After the revolution of the Iranian people the pincers could no longer grip nor nip, and Iran had to be brought back to the helm, maybe through military intervention. The deployment of aircraft carriers was just one indication of this—a resort to gunboat diplomacy—but in the meanwhile, a floating mobile base had to be the substitute for Iran. At the same time, the United States proceeded to strengthen the other part; it annexed the current Government of Egypt to Israel and lavished on them billions of dollars worth of modernized, advanced, sophisticated and lethal weapons. It is not surprising that in the latest part of the Sadat-Begin tragedy, announced as an attempt to settle their differences on how to deal blows to the Palestinian people and to trample further on its rights, the two spent most of their time on joint plans against the peoples of the Middle East, particularly Iran and Afghanistan and on how best to serve their master, the United States, and save the Pax Americana.

68. But the United States seems to forget that the heroic Iranian people has liberated itself and has no intention of abandoning its independence, either political or economic. Iran is now a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and no longer a part of the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). No matter how hard the United States tries to provoke the heroic Iranian people, it will not succeed, through sanctions or otherwise, nor will it be able to create a pretext for resorting to aggressive military or economic action.

69. The history of the United States in the United Nations is replete with instances of the United States obstructing the work of this Organization. The vetoes cast by the United States to protect and defend the racist régime of Pretoria, both on Namibia and on *apartheid*, demonstrate the true American concept of this United Nations.

70. The question of Palestine, which lies at the heart of the conflict in the Middle East, the Arab-Zionist conflict, has been on the agenda of the United Nations for more than 33 years. The United States did in fact support—and in some cases initiated—some resolutions, but how far did the United States go to secure the implementation of the resolutions on the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return to the homes and property from which they had been expelled and the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty in Palestine? The United States vetoed draft resolutions on that matter in the Security Council on several occasions and threatened to use its veto only last August, and when this Assembly resolved to call for a conference that would lead to a just peace through a comprehensive settlement on the basis of the attainment and exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights as affirmed in resolution 3236 (XXIX), the United States encouraged, or who knows, maybe engineered the bilateral approach resulting in the Camp David accords which, I am happy to say, have been declared invalid by this General Assembly. The United States has flouted and actively conspired to undermine the resolutions of the United Nations.

<sup>5</sup> See A/33/206, annex I, para 139.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 54



71. And what about the position of the United States of America on the matter of the holy sanctuaries and shrines, both Christian and Moslem, in the Holy City of Jerusalem and the fate of the living temples of God—the worshippers, both Christian and Moslem? On all those issues the United States of America is still encouraging and financing the Israeli Zionist designs.

72. The Tenth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, held at Fez, Kingdom of Morocco, in May 1979, “condemned the continued annexation and Judaization measures and forcible seizure of land in [Jerusalem] and the continued desecration of the holy Aqsa and Al Ibrahim Mosques and other holy places in Palestine.”<sup>7</sup> The Conference, furthermore, “denounced the position of the countries which provide Israel with assistance and weapons”.<sup>8</sup> What was denounced were the billions of United States dollars poured from the United States Treasury only to encourage Israel to pursue its Zionist plans. And let me say it very clearly here: the Moslems all over the world know their friends very well and are mature enough to identify them and to know who are not their friends.

73. The Government of the United States of America flouts not only the decisions of the United Nations but also its bilateral commitments. As an example, on 1 October 1977, the United States and the USSR issued a joint statement on the Middle East. The Palestine Liberation Organization immediately declared that the statement included positive elements and in more than one way welcomed the initiative; but, to our dismay, the United States of America flouted the statement—and that took place within hours. So I appeal to the United States of America: “Please, do not use the United Nations as a vehicle of convenience to further your aggressive aims. If you expect justice from the international community, you too should be consistent with moral values and principles of justice, without discrimination. Do not only sound nice, but let your actions decide our view of you and your policy. Sweet words alone will not help; it is acts, action and commitment that will count in the final analysis.”

74. Finally, in September 1979 in Havana, Cuba, the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries reaffirmed their adherence to the principles of the Movement. The Palestine Liberation Organization takes this opportunity to affirm its adherence to the said principles, particularly to the following:

“National independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, sovereign equality, and the free social development of all countries; independence of non-aligned countries from great-Power or bloc rivalries and influences and opposition to participation in military pacts and alliances arising therefrom; the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism including Zionism, and all forms of expansionism, foreign occupation and domination and hegemony . . .”<sup>9</sup>

75. We trust that this Assembly will deal with the item and that the concern over international peace and security, which is indivisible, will be reflected in its decisions.

<sup>7</sup> See A/34/389, annex I, p. 19.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>9</sup> See A/34/542, sect. I, para. 13.

76. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item.

77. Before we take up the draft resolution, I wish to inform the General Assembly that, as indicated in document A/ES-6/2/Add.2, the Congo has made the necessary payment to reduce its arrears below the amount specified in Article 19 of the Charter.

78. The Assembly will now proceed to consideration of the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1. I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote. In this connexion, I should like to remind them of the decision taken by the Assembly to impose a 10-minute limit on such explanations and that representatives should make them from their seats.

79. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): The agenda states that this sixth emergency special session has before it the item entitled “Question considered by the Security Council at its 2185th to 2190th meetings, from 5 to 9 January 1980”.

80. Of the several statements made at the 2185th meeting of the Council, we note in particular that of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan who opposed the convening of the Security Council and consequently maintained that any attempts to lead the United Nations to discuss the situation in Afghanistan and its relations with a friendly country were contrary to the letter and spirit of the Charter.

81. That position, which was not taken into consideration by the Council, was confirmed at the beginning of this session by the same speaker [*1st meeting*]. The Assembly, taking an open approach without any prejudice, should have considered the protests by the representative of the Government, the revolution and the people of Afghanistan and taken the consequent decision to halt the procedure set in motion against the will of the country concerned. However, the Assembly neglected any such action and has thus made this debate a kind of intervention by the United Nations in the internal affairs of a sovereign State. This seems to us to be a clear contradiction between the expression of concern to defend the sovereignty and independence of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, and the deliberate failure to take into consideration the perfectly legitimate objections raised by the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan to the holding of this session.

82. The delegation of Madagascar has a second comment to make concerning the fact that recourse was had to rule 8(b) of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly: here I would just stress the point that this would have been much better applied to the context of the struggle against *apartheid* and colonialism in southern Africa, particularly in connexion with the flagrant acts of aggression by South Africa against its neighbours and in Southern Rhodesia.

83. We recognize that under the Charter the Security Council is entitled to call for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly. If it had convened this session under rule 8(a) of the rules of procedure, the Member States would have been able to take a position in a



much clearer manner on the implications of the convening of the session and on the responsibilities of the General Assembly. Having recourse to rule 8 (b) of the rules of procedure could only give rise to apprehensions which, unfortunately, seem to be perfectly justified when we look at draft resolution A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1.

84. At the outset, I would say that there cannot be any ambiguity about my delegation's position on some of the provisions of this draft. My delegation also notes that reference is made in the draft to some principles of non-alignment which are perfectly valid; however, they are carefully selected, and to apply them to the situation in Afghanistan would, to say the very least, involve a rather tortuous approach. Moreover, there are some operative paragraphs with which we can in no way associate ourselves, particularly since the draft resolution is placed within the context of General Assembly resolution 377 A (V), better known as the "Uniting for peace" resolution. As everybody knows, the "Uniting for peace" resolution opens up the possibility for intervention by the United Nations and, in this particular case, that would be extremely inadvisable in view of the position taken by the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

85. To give one example, the draft resolution contains some provisions about refugees. So long as it is a question of humanitarian assistance, there seems to be a universal consensus amongst us here to do everything possible to alleviate the very distressing and painful situation of refugees, not only from Afghanistan but also throughout the world. However, the draft resolution goes further; in operative paragraph 5 all parties concerned are urged to assist in bringing about conditions necessary for the voluntary return of the Afghan refugees to their homes.

86. Who are the parties concerned? What kind of assistance is envisaged? What are the conditions to be brought about? And why, in addition to paragraph 6, which deals with humanitarian assistance, was it felt necessary to appeal to the parties concerned, who are not identified, to provide assistance which is not described, to bring about conditions which the Assembly has sought neither to discuss nor to define?

87. There is a danger here of misinterpretation of the draft resolution. We would recall that in July 1950 American military assistance was granted to one of the parties under cover of an authorization for global assistance; the Security Council had authorized the sending of military contingent to Korea *ex post facto*.

88. If the sponsors wished, under the "Uniting for peace" resolution, to organize a collective operation in Afghanistan, then they should have told us what would be its nature, forms and conditions, and the United Nations could have taken a decision with a full knowledge of the facts and ensured some kind of supervision over the operation.

89. However, it seems to me that that is not the purpose of operative paragraph 5, which, rather slyly, authorizes any party that feels itself concerned to take action in Afghanistan as it sees fit, without any supervision at all by the United Nations, simply by invoking the present draft resolution.

90. Since there is certainly no lack of opponents of the April revolution who would very happily go beyond mere political debates in the United Nations, the reference to the "Uniting for peace" resolution could serve as a rather convenient pretext for intervention—open intervention, this time—in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

91. We would not wish to encourage or tolerate such a possibility.

92. As for the substance of the matter, we note that the present debate is proceeding as if the representative of the Government concerned had not given in this Assembly the requested clarifications on the facts of the situation in his country. Once again, therefore, we see that preconceived judgements are hardly hampered by the facts of the case.

93. It is not reasonable to try to deal with history piecemeal, to try to consider the current situation in Afghanistan in complete isolation, without taking into account the external and internal developments that caused it.

94. Nobody can question the fact that there were violent reactions on the part of interests which were challenged by the April 1978 revolution. We know that Afghanistan is involved in a process of consolidation and we know also that the instability in that part of Asia has opened up very dangerous prospects, aggravated by the manoeuvres of the imperialists and their preparations for open intervention. That is demonstrated by the imperialists' search for new bases, in contravention of General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) on the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

95. Of course the leaders of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan were certainly free to do nothing, to let themselves be swept away by the inevitable chain reaction. There are perhaps some here who would have welcomed that.

96. As far as we are concerned, while we share the concern that has been expressed about respect for the inalienable right of the people of Afghanistan to sovereignty and independence and freely to determine its own political, social and economic system, we recognize and support the right of that people to defend and consolidate what they achieved by their revolution and to take the measures necessary to eliminate any threats to the cohesion or the very existence of the Afghan nation.

97. As has been recognized by the General Assembly, the Afghan people, like all other peoples, is entitled to appeal for assistance to any friendly country or group of countries whenever its sovereignty or territorial integrity is endangered. As was the case in Angola in 1975, the people of Afghanistan should today be allowed to exercise that right. We do not believe that the non-aligned countries, as a group or individually, have abandoned their determination to defend those rights and those principles which are the very basis of their security. We object to the insinuations made during this debate that the Government of Afghanistan should have given up any of its rights. Unfortunately, the denial of those rights of the Afghan people seems to be

reflected in draft resolution A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1, which my delegation cannot support for all the reasons I have just set forth.

98. Before concluding, I should like to try to clear up a misunderstanding on the part of the Western regional press. It is true that some of the sponsors of the draft resolution are members of the Non-Aligned Movement. But it is also true that the Non-Aligned Group has never met to study the draft or to endorse it. The Non-Aligned Group has mandated no country or group of countries to act on its behalf. Accordingly, draft resolution A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1 cannot be regarded as a draft of the non-aligned countries as a whole.

99. This attitude of the media is certainly part of the campaign which is being orchestrated by certain Western circles. It is a campaign against any kind of revolution to liberate peoples and promote social progress, particularly in developing countries that refuse to remain exploited vassals. It is a campaign against the cohesiveness of the Non-Aligned Movement, an attempt to involve it in a false, non-problem by means of the very principles of non-alignment, which just a few years ago were being damned by the Western Powers. It is a campaign against the determination of the non-aligned countries to struggle effectively against imperialism, using the means which seem to them the most appropriate.

100. Those very circles are only too happy to see the non-aligned countries and their principles—the mission of which is to work ceaselessly against any deterioration in the world situation—used to fan the embers of the cold war, thus letting them assume, in a partisan way, the heavy responsibility for the confrontation which reactionary circles have reopened between East and West.

101. As far as the Democratic Republic of Madagascar is concerned, we refuse to lend ourselves to this cynical and irresponsible game.

102. Mr. TINOCO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Nicaragua to the United Nations has been witnessing the complex events in South Asia with growing concern. Peace in the world has been threatened by the conflict in Iran, the attitude of international reaction to Afghanistan, the presence of Soviet forces in that country, the manoeuvres by American naval forces in the area, the dangers inherent in the recent supplying of weapons to Pakistan, and in general the postponement of the adoption of the SALT II treaties.

103. As a member of the Non-Aligned Movement, Nicaragua reiterates its support for the principle of non-intervention. We believe that no decision can be reached on proposals which do not reflect the interests of the non-aligned countries, and that a partial approach to the problem does not represent a solution.

104. We call for calm, consistent reflection by those who today have the security of the world in their hands. It is urgent that a dialogue without conditions be undertaken,

one which will guide through normal channels current efforts towards disarmament and a lasting peace in the world.

*Mr. Mavrommatis (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

105. Mr. CASTILLO-ARRIOLA (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Guatemala did not participate in the general debate on item 5 of the agenda of the sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly. That is why we should like to explain our vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1 on the situation in Afghanistan and its consequences for international peace and security, which has been introduced by 24 Member States.

106. The debate has proved that serious concern has been aroused in the international juridical community by the invasion, occupation and armed aggression that Afghanistan has undergone. There has been no legitimate justification for this; the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of that Member State have been transgressed. In addition, that country's right to determine its own future and the form and composition of its Government, free of armed coercion or interference, has been destroyed.

107. The Republic of Guatemala condemns these events, which have taken place in open contradiction to the rules of the Charter of the United Nations. They have also constituted violations of fundamental resolutions, multilateral treaties and the basic principles of international law.

108. We the peoples of the United Nations, as the Preamble to the Charter states, set for ourselves the goal of establishing "conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained," and, to achieve that goal, we pledged solemnly "to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest . . .".

109. Aggression against Afghanistan is a clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and is an example of a failure to abide by the obligations entered into; it is a violation of the principle of the non-use of force for hegemonic purposes, which is at variance with the principle of the common interest.

110. We recognize that the maintenance of international peace and security is a responsibility that the United Nations cannot shirk. The General Assembly shares this responsibility for the maintenance of peace in general, and in particular it has that responsibility when the Security Council cannot fulfil its responsibilities because of a lack of agreement among the five major Powers, when they arbitrarily immobilize the Council and prevent action by it.

111. For that reason the delegation of Guatemala supports action by the General Assembly in the adoption of the draft resolution to be voted upon at this session. We believe that the exercise of the veto by major Powers is not legitimate when it is done to prevent corrective action to

deal with acts of armed force that have been committed in a manner inconsistent with rules and obligations that must be respected.

112. Guatemala reiterates its faith in the principles of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States and the need for international protection of the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of States, principles that underlie the conduct of my Government in international affairs.

113. For all those reasons we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution, convinced as we are that it will contribute, albeit morally, to the restoration of peace and international security, which have been seriously threatened by the situation in Afghanistan.

114. Mr. KATAPODIS (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): The invasion of Afghanistan by Soviet troops is a development that entails serious consequences and constitutes a violation of the fundamental principles of the Charter. Greece, which has had to repel several acts of foreign aggression throughout its long history, cannot but be seriously concerned over this event. As Prime Minister Karamanlis stated in the Chamber of Deputies on 9 January:

“The events in Afghanistan endanger peace in that part of the world, at the very least. The Soviet Union invaded that country without even keeping up appearances. The explanations it has given can convince no one that it has acted to prevent any kind of danger. Détente has been seriously damaged by this invasion. We should like to hope that it will be possible to settle the problem so as to prevent greater dangers of unpredictable dimensions.”

115. This condemnation is painful for us because we have friendly relations with the Soviet Union, relations which have even been improving. However, it is consistent with the foreign policy that Greece has constantly followed, which is opposed to any foreign intervention or threat of intervention in the internal affairs of any sovereign State, no matter what the source. It is a principle that we have applied in all cases—and regrettably there have been many since the end of the Second World War—where powerful countries have violated the independence and territorial integrity of small countries.

116. For those reasons we shall vote in favour of draft resolution A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1, in the hope that the Soviet Union will heed the appeal of the great majority of the States Members of our Organization and withdraw its troops from Afghanistan immediately and unconditionally, thereby making it possible for that proud nation to solve its internal problems in accordance with the will of its people.

117. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My country was one of the 52 Members of the United Nations that called for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in Afghanistan and its consequences for international peace and security.

118. Once again we must say that we regret that the exercise of the veto by one of the permanent members of the Security Council has paralysed the Council, preventing

action by it, notwithstanding the affirmative votes of 13 of the 15 members on a draft resolution condemning the barbaric violations of the rights of a country that was one of the founders of the Non-Aligned Group.

119. El Salvador, a small Latin American country, throughout its history—especially and significantly in 1928 at the Sixth Inter-American Conference, held in the capital of Cuba—has had to confront no less a Power than the United States, one of the ardent defenders of the principle of non-interference in the internal or external affairs of other States. After major efforts, that principle was finally embodied as a positive rule in the Charter of the United Nations, in the charter of the Organization of American States and in many other international instruments.

120. The attempt at justification which the representative of the Soviet Union made on 11 January [*2nd meeting*] in this Assembly is an unparalleled example of how a Government that is responsible for a scandalous violation of the rules of international law and, in particular, of the purposes and principles of the United Nations can distort and misrepresent well-known facts and give arbitrary versions, in an endeavour to have not only the Members of this General Assembly but also world public opinion believe him. But that attempt at justification has been quite fruitless. The statements of nearly all the members of the Security Council when it considered the matter, and those we have heard during the debate in this Assembly from an impressive majority of its Members, are the best proof that the international community will not be misled by the concoctions that have been offered in this forum.

121. For our delegation, as for so many others, there is not the least doubt that one of the two super-Powers—the same super-Power that, paradoxically, at the recent regular session of the General Assembly proposed the consideration of the item on hegemonistic tendencies of some States—has committed, and indeed continues to commit, illegal actions which indicate that it does have hegemonistic designs towards an important region of the world as part of its general ambition eventually to achieve world-wide hegemony.

122. The ambition of that super-Power is one that other countries have entertained when guided by blind leaders, but their efforts have always encountered the firm, coordinated resistance of the other members of the international community—with the exception, of course, of those that did not have the good sense, fortitude and courage not to allow themselves to be subjugated.

123. There is no code of international penal law. However, we can invoke in this case, by irrefutable analogy, certain circumstances of criminal responsibility referred to in domestic penal laws, such as breach of trust and the use of excess power, circumstances which, it would seem, coincide with actions taken with overweening pride and cruelty against a relatively weak and small country—especially when they are the actions of one of the giants of our times.

124. The conscience of mankind has been aroused by such actions and is awaiting the result of our deliberations. As in past critical times, the present situation of the martyred people of Afghanistan is a test for the United Nations.

125. We are confident that not only two thirds of the members of this Assembly but many more will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1, which, in our view, is couched in excessively moderate terms. We do not mean that to be taken as criticism of the sponsors, for we recognize that this is the only way to achieve the required majority and to discourage a considerable number of abstentions.

126. Mr. EMMANUEL (Grenada): My delegation will vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1 because, first of all, we remain convinced that the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan is clearly in keeping with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter relating to “the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence”.

127. Secondly, the Afghan-Soviet Treaty of 1978 bears testimony to this inherent right of sovereign, independent States, which, in our opinion, nullifies any charge of the violation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the country concerned. At the request of the Government of Afghanistan, the Soviet Union responded to assist it to deal with acts of subversion. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan, Mr. Shah Mohammad Dost, pointed out [*1st meeting*], such acts of subversion were designed to turn back the progressive revolutionary policies and programmes of the Government of Afghanistan.

128. Thirdly, my delegation is convinced that current events in Afghanistan have not constituted and still do not constitute a threat to international peace and security, save in the eyes of those States determined to orchestrate in a hysterical manner a return to the worst features of the cold war.

129. We therefore gladly associate ourselves with the Afghan Government and with those States that have criticized the introduction of this draft resolution.

130. Finally, my delegation wishes to express its condemnation of the hypocrisy of certain Western States Members of this Organization whose forces have in the past rushed to the defence of Governments to stifle the genuine anti-imperialist aspirations of the people and keep backward Governments in power in certain areas of the third world. In their eyes, those acts never represented a threat to international peace. We know that progressive Members of this Organization will vote against the draft resolution.

131. Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic objects to any interference in the internal affairs of a State Member of the United Nations. Draft resolution A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1 is designed to help to continue the slanderous campaign launched against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the USSR and the interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. Practically speaking, this draft resolution is an attempt to render the Afghan people defenceless against imperialist machinations. Furthermore, my delegation deems it appropriate to call attention to the fact that the last preambular paragraph of that draft resolution contains reference to a General Assembly resolution which was thrown together by imperialist circles in the

darkest times of the cold war in order to justify the sending of interventionist troops to fight against the Korean people.

132. My delegation is convinced that the draft resolution is not conducive to promoting the cause of peace but carries the danger of aggravating confrontation. Therefore, the German Democratic Republic will vote against that draft resolution.

133. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution now before us, for two reasons. First, at the political level, the text is in keeping with the concerns which have been expressed by the French Government and which I myself stated in the Security Council<sup>10</sup> and also in this emergency special session of the General Assembly [*3rd meeting*]. Secondly, the provisions which we shall be adopting are based on the powers that the Charter gives the General Assembly.

134. In those circumstances, my delegation only regrets all the more that the last paragraph of the preamble refers quite pointlessly to General Assembly resolution 377 A (V), which, as members know, we regard as illegal because it changes the rules regarding competence which are set out in our Charter. Accordingly, my delegation, which for that reason was unable to sponsor the draft resolution, would like to repeat very clearly the formal reservations that we have always had and continue to have in this regard.

135. Mr. HEIDWEILLER (Suriname): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1 because it regards the military intervention of a super-Power in the internal affairs of a developing non-aligned country not only as a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations but also as a most serious assault on the basic principles of the Non-Aligned Movement. The action taken by the super-Power in question is also in conflict with relevant General Assembly resolutions, in particular those adopted on the principle of the non-use of force.

136. My delegation cannot accept the contention that the interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan was the result of repeated appeals to that end by the now extinct Government of the late President Amin.

137. In casting its affirmative vote for the draft resolution, my delegation joins all those who have urged the Soviet Union to cease its military intervention in Afghanistan and withdraw its armed forces from that country forthwith.

138. Mr. AUGUSTE (Saint Lucia): My country joined with some 51 other Member States to request a meeting of the Security Council on the question of the intrusion of extraneous forces into Afghanistan. We felt, and still feel, that the Security Council is the organ within the United Nations entrusted with the primary responsibility for international peace and security, however unsatisfactorily that organ may appear to operate, from time to time, in discharging its responsibilities.

<sup>10</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, 2190th meeting.*

139. This present exercise of the veto by the Soviet Union does not remove that responsibility; nor does it mean, or should it mean, that any other organ may now usurp this responsibility or has an overriding duty or an extra obligation, as a result of this impasse, to pursue in its own right the role of maintainer of international peace and security. The rights which the General Assembly may relate to and/or claim are already accounted for in Article 10 of the Charter of the United Nations, as conditioned by Article 12 of that Charter. The exercise of the veto by the Soviet Union simply indicates that the Security Council, which was seized of a situation that it was mandatorily expected to consider—and, it was hoped, to solve—is now caught up in the web of its own procedures, and therein rendered immobile. This present discharge of its duty, however important, is signalled by a resultant inefficacy expressed in that form—and only in that form; it does not preclude the continuing examination by the Security Council of the situation from another perspective, if that is pertinent and judicious.

140. The question then rests on whether the General Assembly, which is primarily not responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, has a supplemental and complementary duty and interest in preserving and maintaining that peace. My delegation is convinced that that complementary responsibility exists. It is not a usurped responsibility but one which has always been in existence; however, it is activated only when the organ that is primarily responsible cannot completely fulfil its obligations in the manner in which it was originally perceived to act. This responsibility is discharged in different guises, of a supporting and complementary nature, which the General Assembly displays in keeping with the articles of the Charter of the United Nations, and encompassing the interests of the Organization as a whole. That is why, when the Security Council approaches this kind of impasse in its supervisory and regulatory responsibilities, the General Assembly, impliedly and in a real sense mandatorily, is bound to come to its assistance, if even in no more decisive a manner than in a moral and deliberative sense. The moral and conscientious force of our deliberations have an impetus, considering the make-up of the membership of this institution, more decisive than the resolutions of the Council in instances when those resolutions cannot be adopted, or, even less, implemented, although they are submitted in the proper and appropriate circumstance.

141. A little over three months ago my country was admitted to this Assembly. In taking our seat, my Foreign Minister stated in his inaugural address what he thought were the guidelines and objectives of his State. I think it is appropriate to mention his words at this juncture. He said:

“We are aware of the obligations and responsibilities that are attendant on membership and are fully committed to upholding the ideals of the United Nations and are pledged to continuing to foster the spirit of good neighbourliness and international co-operation in a peaceful world for the betterment of the peoples of the international community.”<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1st meeting, para. 152.

He went on to say:

“Peace is vital to our economic existence, to our development, to our progress . . . Therefore my delegation and the people it represents are consciously and vitally concerned with maintaining peace in the world.”<sup>12</sup>

142. We have re-echoed those sentiments in every other forum which has called for an expression of my State's position towards the question of international peace. We have stated that the principles that determine our existence, and in a sense survival, are preceded by the realization and maintenance of international peace. Every step that a State like mine takes is predetermined by its ability to continue to proceed within an environment that is both peaceful and equitable. If the determinants for proper, unhindered, international intercourse are not presupposed within a climate of peace, then all meaningful progression is stultified.

143. One of the major objectives of a small State in acquiring United Nations membership is to feel and to know that the protection, in security terms, that it cannot afford—and will never be able to afford—is taken care of by this institution. When this institution fails to take minimal effective action that is designed to protect not only the protagonists from themselves, but every State that may become the victim of predatory action, then all is lost. A small State, particularly the kind of small State that is totally vulnerable, must rely on this institution as its principal and proper guardian, the only consideration that places its survival in proper perspective.

144. It relies, in the first place, on the action of the entrusted organs, and then, if that fails or is in need of support, upon the deliberative organs. But its reliance is total. Should the State, in view of situations of this nature, turn and depend on bilateral arrangements and all that that signifies? The answer is no. The State must explore, in conjunction with other Member States, every possibility, including a rehabilitation of the pertinent organs of the United Nations system if that is what is needed to give the institution adequate force and efficacy in the event of a circumstance of this nature.

145. My country is not in possession of all the facts, which are absolutely necessary if we are to pass value judgements. Our concern is not to apportion blame. Our concern is that the meaningfulness of the concepts of non-alignment, non-interference in the internal affairs of a State, non-use of force in international relations—concepts which we are pledged to observe and honour—must not be compromised and/or jeopardized. These concepts have a particular and pertinent importance for us; without them we are at the mercy of every plunderer and predator, whether coming as a result of convenience or vested interest, or in terms of objectives that do not concern us but embroil our areas. That is precisely why the Organization must be adjusted to protect our sovereignty, which may not be institutionally important to the larger States but is vital to the survival of the small States.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 153.

146. My delegation supports the draft resolution, which, we recognize, can have little more than moral value in this issue. But we hope—and I think we share the aspirations and objectives of the other small States—that this issue sets in relief the continuing existence, effectiveness and meaningfulness of this Organization. If the draft resolution can reawaken and redefine the tenets that relate to the development of proper and peaceful intercourse among States, if it can set out the standards of behaviour that each State must legitimately follow in its relations with other States, then it will have done a service to small countries like mine and cemented the Organization from which it emanates.

147. Mr. MAINA (Kenya): My delegation has followed with keen interest the debates on this item, both in the General Assembly and, earlier, in the Security Council. We have taken careful note of the objections raised by the delegations of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union to the discussion of this subject on the grounds that it amounts to interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. We listened intently to the evidence brought forward to support that contention. We could not find substance in the claim that the Soviet forces entered the territory of Afghanistan at the invitation of the Government of Afghanistan in accordance with the provisions of the treaty governing the bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan. If that had been the case, it would have been unthinkable for the Soviet Union and the delegation of Afghanistan to denounce, in these public forums, the Head of that Government which had invited the Government of the Soviet Union to send military forces into Afghanistan. It is too much to ask us to believe that the Soviet Union sent its forces to Afghanistan at the invitation of the Afghan Government. We simply cannot believe that.

148. Similarly, an attempt has been made to explain the circumstances that made the Government of Afghanistan request military assistance from the Soviet Union. It has also been disappointing to listen to the evidence produced to support this claim. A military operation against Afghanistan necessitating such a large military force from the Soviet Union could not be introduced into Afghanistan without the operation becoming public knowledge. We do not therefore believe their story.

149. It is for these reasons, among others, that the Government of Kenya issued the following statement on the matter on 9 January 1980:

“1. The Kenyan Government unequivocally believes in the cardinal principles of non-interference in internal affairs of States, and strict respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States.

“2. In accordance with these principles, therefore, the people of Afghanistan have the inalienable right to determine their own internal affairs without any form of pressure or threat from outside.

“3. Accordingly, the Kenyan Government calls for an immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of the Republic of Afghanistan.

“4. The Kenyan Government further urges all the countries within the region to respect the non-aligned status of the Republic of Afghanistan and to promote the principle of good neighbourliness in the whole area.”

150. The draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1 is in line with the views of my Government, and therefore my delegation will cast an affirmative vote on that draft resolution.

151. Mr. CAMILLERI (Malta): My Government has for some time been following with concern the events which have been reported to be taking place in Afghanistan and, more generally, in the surrounding region. According to these reports, the super-Powers have been guilty of various forms of colonial interference in the internal affairs of other countries. This dangerous meddling has reached a climax with the armed intervention by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, a non-aligned country. This threatens not only the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of that State, but also the peace and security of a vast region.

152. Our loyalty to the Charter of the United Nations, and our firm belief in the principles on which this institution is founded, are unshakable. We therefore condemn any violation of those principles, on any pretext whatsoever, even where such a violation is the result of provocation by other States.

153. For those reasons my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution, and urges the immediate withdrawal of all foreign armed forces from Afghanistan.

154. Mr. LOBO (Mozambique): From the very beginning of this session, the delegation of the People's Republic of Mozambique has expressed its disapproval over the calling of this emergency special session. We consider that the holding of an emergency special session constitutes direct interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. It is a manoeuvre to turn the attention of the international community away from the many real problems that confront humanity at this moment. Not even the South African invasion of the People's Republic of Angola, at a time that was most crucial in the consolidation of their independence, merited the calling of a special session of the General Assembly.

155. Why did we not see similar concern regarding the solution of the problem of East Timor, a Portuguese colony that was militarily invaded and later annexed by Indonesia? Why did we not see similar apprehension when part of Mayotte was being occupied by the French? Why did we not have an emergency special session every time certain countries vetoed draft resolutions that had something to do with the situation in southern Africa? Why did nobody suggest a single emergency special session all this time when people were being massacred and their countries were being occupied, in Angola, Mozambique, Botswana, Zimbabwe and Namibia?

156. If I may ask yet another question, when will those same people become disturbed by the British invitation to the South African forces to remain in Zimbabwe, placing in constant danger the peace and security of the countries of that region?

157. It is our understanding that the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is a sovereign and independent State. We believe also that the Government of Afghanistan has every right to ask of any country whatever help it deems necessary to defend its sovereignty and independence. That is the right of all Members and all States recognized by our Organization. Therefore my delegation does not regard the help extended by the Soviet Union to the people of Afghanistan as a violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Mr. Shah Mohammad Dost has steadfastly reaffirmed that his Government requested assistance from the Soviet Union.

158. For all those reasons, and because of our repugnance to the hypocrisy exhibited on this question of Afghanistan, my delegation will vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1. We very much doubt the intentions of the people orchestrating this campaign.

159. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In connexion with statements made by several delegations at this session of the General Assembly, and in connexion with the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1, the delegation of the Soviet Union finds it necessary to reiterate the position of principle taken by the Soviet Union in respect of events in Afghanistan. That position was set forth in a statement by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, which was published on 13 January 1980. We should like to draw attention to the following relevant parts of that statement.

160. As our Head of State stressed, discussion of the so-called question of Afghanistan at the United Nations, despite objections by the Government of Afghanistan "cannot be described otherwise than as a rude flouting of the sovereign rights of the Afghan State".

161. The statement continues:

"Today, the opponents of peace and détente are trying to speculate on the events in Afghanistan. Mountains of lies are being built up around these events and a shameless anti-Soviet campaign is being mounted. What has really happened in Afghanistan?"

"A revolution took place there in April 1978. The Afghan people took its destiny into its hands and embarked on the road to independence and freedom. As always in history, the forces of the past ganged up against the revolution. The people of Afghanistan, of course, could have coped with them itself. But from the very first days of the revolution it encountered an external aggression, rude interference from outside in its internal affairs.

"...

"The unceasing armed intervention, the well-advanced plot by external forces of reaction created a real threat that Afghanistan would lose its independence and be turned into an imperialist military bridgehead on our country's southern border. In other words, the time came

when we could no longer not respond to the request of the Government of friendly Afghanistan. To have acted otherwise... allowing the aggressive forces to repeat in that country what they had succeeded in doing, for instance, in Chile... would have meant to watch passively the origination on our southern border of a seat of serious danger to the security of the Soviet State.

"...

"It was no simple decision for us to send Soviet military contingents to Afghanistan. But the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government acted in full awareness of their responsibility and took into account the sum total of circumstances. The only task set for the Soviet contingents is to assist the Afghans in repelling the aggression from outside. They will be fully withdrawn from Afghanistan once the causes that made the Afghan leadership request their introduction disappear."

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

The Brezhnev statement continues:

"Imperialist and also Peking propaganda deliberately and unscrupulously distort the Soviet Union's role in Afghan affairs."

In this connexion he went on to stress that:

"The national interests or security of the United States of America and other States are not affected in any way by the events in Afghanistan. All attempts to portray matters otherwise are sheer nonsense. These attempts are being made with ill intent, with the aim of making easier the fulfilment of their own imperialist plans.

"Also absolutely false are the allegations that the Soviet Union has some expansionist plans in respect of Pakistan, Iran or other countries of that area. The policy and psychology of colonialists is alien to us. We are not coveting the lands or wealth of others. It is the colonialists who are attracted by the smell of oil..."

"Meantime, under cover of the clamour, assistance is being increased to those elements that are intruding into Afghanistan, perpetrating aggressive actions against the legitimate Government. The White House recently openly announced its decision to expand the supply to these elements of military equipment and everything necessary for hostile activities. The Western press reports that during his talks in Peking the United States Secretary of Defense colluded with the Chinese leadership on the co-ordination of such actions."

162. Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev gave an extremely important assessment of the contemporary international situation which has very great significance in the light of the discussion which has just been held in the General Assembly. He noted that "at this time when the decade of the seventies has ended and the decade of the eighties is beginning, the international situation is unfortunately clearly becoming more complex and difficult". He stressed



that the blame for that “lies with the imperialist forces, primarily certain circles in the United States of America”. He added:

“The blame is on all those who see in relaxation of tension an obstacle to their aggressive plans, to whipping up militaristic psychosis, to interference in the internal affairs of other peoples. The blame is on those who have a deeply ingrained habit of behaving in a cavalier manner with other States, of acting in the international arena in a way as though everything is permitted them.

“... the events in Afghanistan are not the true cause of the present complication of the international situation. If there were no Afghanistan, certain circles in the United States and in NATO would have surely found another pretext to aggravate the situation in the world.

“Finally, the sum total of the American Administration’s steps in connexion with the events in Afghanistan—the freezing of the SALT II treaty, refusal to deliver to the USSR a large number of commodities, including grain, in accordance with some already concluded contracts, the termination of talks with the Soviet Union on a number of questions of bilateral relations, and so on, shows that Washington again, like decades ago, is trying to speak with us in the language of the cold war. In this the Carter Administration is displaying contempt for important inter-State documents and is disrupting established ties in the field of science, culture and human contacts.

“It is difficult even to enumerate the number of treaties, inter-governmental agreements, accords and understandings reached between our two countries on questions of mutual relations in various fields that have been arbitrarily and unilaterally violated lately by the Government of President Carter. Of course, we will manage without these or those ties with the United States. In fact, we never sought these ties as some sort of a favour to us, believing that this is a mutually advantageous matter meeting the mutual interests of the peoples of our countries, and first of all in the context of strengthening peace.

“But the arrogation by Washington to itself of some sort of a ‘right’ to ‘reward’ or ‘punish’ independent sovereign States raises a question of a principled character. In effect, by such actions the United States Government deals a blow at the orderly international law system of relations among States.

“As a result of the Carter Administration’s actions the impression is increasingly forming in the world of the United States as an absolutely unreliable partner in inter-State ties, as a State whose leadership, prompted by some whim, caprice or emotional outbursts, or by considerations of narrowly understood immediate advantage, is capable at any moment of violating its international obligations and cancelling treaties and agreements signed by it. There is hardly any need to explain what a dangerous destabilizing impact this has on the entire international situation, the more so that this is the behaviour of the leadership of a big, influential Power from which the peoples have the right to expect a well-considered and responsible policy . . .

“We can regard the actions of the American Administration only as a poorly weighed attempt to use the events in Afghanistan for blocking international efforts to lessen the military danger, to strengthen peace, to restrict the arms race, in short for blocking the attainment of aims in which mankind is vitally interested.

“The unilateral measures taken by the United States are tantamount to serious miscalculations in politics. Like a boomerang, they will hit back at their initiators, if not today then tomorrow . . .

“We understand that the deliberate aggravation of the international situation by American imperialism expresses that country’s displeasure at the consolidation of the positions of socialism, the upsurge of the national liberation movement, the strengthening of forces coming out for détente and peace. We know that the will of the peoples has cleared through all obstacles a road for the positive direction in world affairs that is well expressed by the word ‘détente’. This policy has deep roots. It is supported by mighty forces and has every chance to remain the leading tendency in relations between States.”

163. From the statements made by a number of delegations at this session of the General Assembly, it can be seen that there are many who do understand the real meaning of the events that have recently occurred in and around Afghanistan. Some delegations have clearly deliberately distorted the nature of those events; others obviously have not been able to grasp their true significance. However, history shows that in the end truth will out and justice will triumph.

164. In view of what has been stated, the Soviet delegation will naturally vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1, which is impermissible intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and also a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

165. Mr. DOUGLAS (Guyana): My Government has been closely following the unfolding situation in the non-aligned nation of Afghanistan and is deeply concerned at the serious implications the situation in that country could have for international peace and security.

166. In determining its position on the question before the Assembly, my Government has been guided by certain fundamental principles. These include respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State; the right of every State to choose freely its own political, economic and social system; the right of every State to seek assistance whenever it feels threatened, particularly through interference in its internal affairs; and full respect for the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. In this regard it will be recalled that at the thirty-fourth session Guyana presented for early adoption a draft resolution on non-interference in the internal affairs of States.<sup>13</sup>

167. It is on the basis of those cardinal principles that Guyana, after a very careful study of all aspects of the

<sup>13</sup> Adopted as resolution 34/101.

question before the Assembly, has decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution on the situation in Afghanistan.

168. The potentially far-reaching implications of recent events in Afghanistan and of reactions to those events led my Government to express its disquiet in a statement issued on 12 January. In concluding, I should like to quote the final paragraph of that statement:

“The Government of Guyana is concerned lest further developments with regard to the situation lead to an escalation of tension in Asia and beyond. It therefore urges all States to exercise restraint and to take such steps as would lead to an easing of the present state of tension and the creation of conditions conducive to stable and harmonious relations.”

169. Mr. KAMANDA WA KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): We have listened with close attention to all the speakers who have taken part in this debate and should like to say that Zaire will vote in favour of draft resolution A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1 which is now before us. In spite of the forced attempts at an explanation that have been offered, no reason put forward can stand up to legal or political analysis, nor has any explanation convinced us.

170. The draft resolution very clearly and appropriately explains the principles on which the Non-Aligned Movement, as also the foreign policy of the Republic of Zaire, is based.

171. We refuse to be a pawn in the hands of any power bloc. We feel that principles are at issue here and we do not want our attention diverted. We think that it is an insult to the countries of the third world to insinuate that we are incapable of assessing events in the world except in terms of the positions of the major Powers. We say that world affairs are our affairs and that we are quite capable of mature judgement when it comes to assessing the world's problems, in the light of our freedom of judgement, our own interests and political choices.

172. We shall therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

173. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1, entitled “The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security”. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman,

Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

*Against:* Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

*Abstaining:* Algeria, Benin, Burundi, Congo, Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea,<sup>14</sup> Finland, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Madagascar, Mali, Nicaragua, Sao Tome and Principe, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 104 votes to 18, with 18 abstentions (resolution ES-6/2).*

174. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

175. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The situation that has arisen in Afghanistan has caused great concern among the peoples of the world and is a serious threat to peace and the continuation of the policy of détente.

176. Consistent with the policy of the Socialist Republic of Romania, in accordance with which we advocate the peaceful settlement of disputes by negotiations, rule out military intervention and any interference in the internal affairs of other States and starting from the need for the withdrawal of all foreign forces, the Romanian delegation held talks with the sponsors of the draft resolution and many other delegations in an effort to agree on a resolution capable of contributing to a positive solution of the problems now being considered at this emergency special session of the General Assembly so as to ensure respect for the independence and sovereignty of Afghanistan and to prevent the deterioration of international relations and any encroachment on détente and co-operation in the world.

177. In its approach to the agenda item, Romania bases its unabated position on unshakable respect for the principles of independence and national sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs, and the right of every people to be master of its own destiny, on its concern to strengthen peace, security and co-operation throughout the world, and on the imperative need to eliminate force and the threat of the use of force in international relations and to settle disputes among States exclusively by peaceful means.

178. In this spirit, in keeping with the mandate that we have received from the Romanian Government, my delega-

<sup>14</sup> The delegation of Equatorial Guinea subsequently stated that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

tion has worked for a solution that would lead to the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Afghanistan and for measures guaranteeing that no State will intervene in any manner in Afghanistan's internal affairs, or give assistance to the anti-Government forces of that country. At the same time, there must be secured the observance by all States of the independence and sovereignty of Afghanistan and of the right of the Afghan people to choose their own path to development without any foreign interference.

179. Romania, like the whole of the international community, is interested in the normalization of the situation in Afghanistan so that it does not worsen the international situation in which developments have been complex and contradictory and burdened by numerous states of tension and conflict, which are a real danger to peace, stability and the security of peoples. It is in this spirit that the Romanian delegation has pressed for a solution in keeping with the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations, one that can give firm guarantees to the Afghan people that they will be able to determine their own future without any outside interference and at the same time prevent the heightening of international tension, ensuring that the process of détente, understanding and co-operation of the peoples of the world will not be adversely affected. Inasmuch as such a solution has not been agreed to, Romania has decided not to participate in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-6/L.1 and Add.1.

180. We believe that in the present situation it is necessary that all States demonstrate a high sense of responsibility in the interests of peace, security and international co-operation, that they do their utmost to avoid the poisoning of international relations or the use of a policy of force and pressure, so as to ensure firm respect for national independence and rule out interference of any kind in the internal affairs of other States. It is also necessary that the problems of all countries be solved by internal political forces, by the people themselves, without any foreign intervention.

181. Romania is prepared to contribute further on, with other States, to the maintenance of an atmosphere of understanding, respect and mutual confidence, to efforts aimed at removing states of tension and of conflict in the area in question and other areas of the world by peaceful means, through negotiation. Romania is prepared too, as in the past, to work for strict respect for the independence and national sovereignty of States by all and in all circumstances, for the complete elimination of all interference in the internal affairs of States, for the achievement of the inalienable right of all peoples to determine the path of their development in independence, in accordance with their own interests and aspirations, and for the continuation of the general policy of peace, détente and international co-operation.

182. Mr. BAFI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The most eloquent expression of the explicit and unequivocal position of Iraq concerning the current events in Afghanistan was made by Mr. Saddam Hussain, President of Iraq, in his statement on 6 January, on the anniversary of the establishment of the Iraqi army. He said:

“The foreign intervention in Afghanistan is a grievous phenomenon for which no justification or pretext should

be given. It is a wrong-headed and unjustified act, which has aroused anxiety and resentment among all peoples devoted to freedom and independence that are fighting for the assertion of their sovereignty and free will.

“While stressing these principles, to which we are deeply and firmly dedicated, at the same time we warn against the exploitation of the foreign intervention in Afghanistan to justify other foreign intervention in one or another of the countries of the region. We are most forcefully opposed to any attempts aimed at turning the area into an arena of rivalry between the big Powers for the sake of achieving their ambitions and carrying out their strategic schemes at the expense of the independence, sovereignty and security of the countries in the area. We call on all the peoples of the region to take an explicit and resolute stand against all forms of foreign intervention and we also call on the big Powers to understand the aspirations of the peoples for freedom, independence and the consolidation of their sovereignty, and to desist from any aggressive or irresponsible act which might threaten the security and interests of peoples or constitute meddling in their internal affairs. The effect of any act of that type will not be confined to this sensitive area of the world, but will endanger international peace and stability.

“We call on all the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement to reflect on these events and to make an objective assessment of them in the light of the principles of non-alignment. We also call on them to be united and cohesive on the basis of their well-known principles and not to become enmeshed in the schemes of international forces which are aimed at endangering the unity of the non-aligned countries.”

183. The course of the deplorable events taking place in Afghanistan today should not allow us to forget that the United States has constantly sought to undermine the Arab liberation movements and to overthrow the progressive and national régimes in the Arab area and to dominate them with a view to imposing on them reconciliation with and capitulation to the Zionist enemy. It had designs to use Camp David as an important step in the achievement of that goal. Moreover, the United States has tried to benefit from certain wrong practices and from serious developments which have taken place in some States in the region, to attempt seriously to enter the area and to manipulate it in the furtherance of its imperialist goals.

184. Unfortunately, the recent events in Afghanistan have been used by American imperialism as a further justification for intervention in the domestic affairs of the area. In this regard, the President of Iraq stated:

“Recent events in Afghanistan gave imperialism a further pretext for intervention in the area and the jeopardizing of its freedom, sovereignty and wealth.”

185. In the light of these principles and ideas, and proceeding from the position of Iraq's commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of non-alignment, and its deep respect for the right of nations to choose their social, economic and political way of life, Iraq disapproves of any foreign intervention in the affairs of

any country in the world that loves peace and independence. It also disapproves of intervention such as that which took place recently in Afghanistan.

186. For all the above reasons, the delegation of Iraq voted in favour of the draft resolution.

187. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly has just adopted the resolution entitled "The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security". The Albanian delegation would like to explain its vote in favour of that draft resolution by making the following remarks.

188. In a statement in this Assembly on 11 January [*3rd meeting*], the representative of Albania stated that the Albanian people and Government energetically condemned the aggression of the Soviet Union against Afghanistan and that the time had come to call aloud for the withdrawal of the Soviet social-imperialist aggressor from Afghanistan.

189. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania has always condemned and will continue to condemn any imperialist aggression launched by the American imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists, the Chinese social-imperialists or other imperialists.

190. It goes without saying that the duty of the General Assembly, convened in this emergency special session, can only be to support the victim of aggression, to condemn without hesitation or equivocation the act of aggression and to call for the withdrawal of the occupying troops. In our view, this should have been done in a particularly determined and clear fashion. The text of the resolution which we have just adopted suffers from certain weaknesses in that regard. It does not specifically and firmly condemn the aggression of the Soviet Union against Afghanistan and it does not name the aggressor. But given that the resolution does contain elements which convey condemnation of the aggression of the Soviet social-imperialists and that it calls for the withdrawal of the foreign troops from Afghanistan—meaning thereby the Soviet occupying force—the Albanian delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution.

191. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): As the debate has shown, there is wide agreement in this Assembly, which my Government fully shares, that the principles of territorial integrity, the inviolability of frontiers and national self-determination must be strictly respected by all. It is deplorable that the question of the implementation of these principles as far as the situation in Afghanistan is concerned has caused division and discord in this Assembly, in particular among the great Powers. The ensuing international tension has already reached dangerous proportions.

192. In the view of the Finnish Government it is important that normal conditions should be restored in Afghanistan as soon as possible and that the foreign troops should be withdrawn as envisaged.

193. Finland's policy of neutrality enjoins us to refrain from taking sides in disputes between the great Powers while it enables us to maintain friendly relations with all States. This is the line of conduct that we have consistently followed at the United Nations. It has impelled us to abstain in the vote just taken.

194. The Government of Finland has already expressed its deep anxiety over tendencies which at present seem to put at peril the peaceful conduct of relations between nations. We have emphasized that the Members of the United Nations, and the permanent members of the Security Council in particular, share the responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and for evolution towards a peaceful world order. It is the view of my Government that the policies of détente and disarmament remain the best instrument for achieving this end.

195. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. In doing so, I wish to remind them of the Assembly's decision that such statements should be limited to 10 minutes and that representatives should make them from their seats.

196. Mr. SHARIF (Somalia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): This morning [*6th meeting*] the representative of Ethiopia spoke and referred to what he called the Soviet Union's assistance to his country's efforts to repel the aggression of which it had been the victim. He meant by this the pitiless war that occurred in the Horn of Africa. What is happening there? Everybody knows that Ethiopia was made up of a racist empire, which extended its hegemony and control over peoples that were unconnected with Ethiopia, in other words, peoples which had no relationship with Ethiopia and which differed from it culturally, linguistically and historically, as well as in terms of their destiny. The imperialist feudalism of Ethiopia brought this about by joining with white colonialism in dividing the African continent, thanks to the support it received from European countries to repress the national liberation movements.

197. Everybody knows and history testifies to the fact that Ethiopia extended its control over western Somalia towards the end of the nineteenth century, in 1886. The worst forms of colonialism are those in which it is imposed on a people totally different from the colonizing people. To resist foreign colonialism, as is right, and to strengthen its dignity, national identity and legality, the people of western Somalia rose up to affirm its national identity, which is its sacrosanct right and one that is recognized in all international conventions, above all in the Charter of the United Nations. The situation is as follows. Foreign colonialism and occupation have been imposed by violence and aggression. This occupation is maintained through repression and violence so as to efface all the political, social and cultural values of the occupied people.

198. What do international conventions say in this regard? They say that resistance to foreign occupation and colonialism is a legitimate right. This is the background of the struggle in the Horn of Africa and in western Somalia.

199. As regards Eritrea, the events do not differ much from those that occurred in western Somalia. The General Assembly adopted a resolution on the self-determination of the former Italian colonies of Libya, Eritrea and Somalia, giving Somalia and Libya their independence after a short period of trusteeship [*resolution 289 (IV)*].

200. Eritrea bears no relation to Ethiopia save that of being a neighbour. Despite the resistance of the people

concerned, the General Assembly decided to create a federation of Eritrea and Ethiopia [*resolution 390 (V)*] so that each of the parties should have an independent internal system with co-operation only in foreign policy and defence. Haile Selassie completely ignored this resolution in 1962 and Eritrea was annexed to Ethiopia by force of arms. Since then the Eritrean people have risen, affirming their right to self-determination and to their own independent national identity and existence, including the right to exist as an independent State.

201. Resistance to occupation does not constitute aggression, but self-defence against aggression. The representative of Ethiopia described as aggression what was merely resistance on the part of the Eritrean people against Haile Selassie's violation of the United Nations resolution. The Eritrean people, struggling for their right to self-determination, are fighting to affirm their national identity.

202. We know that the war of extermination waged by Ethiopia against the peoples in the regions surrounding Somalia affects Somalia and its sovereignty and independence, because those imperialists exercise the right of hot pursuit, as do the Israelis in the Middle East. From time to time they launch brutal attacks on the cities of the Republic, its villages, its farms and its population centres, thereby attempting to convince international public opinion that national resistance has been encouraged by Somalia. Not satisfied with this, they have begun burning down towns and villages in western Somalia, using napalm bombs and chemical weapons, and compelling the inhabitants to leave their homeland and seek refuge in Somalia. The number of refugees now in Somalia totals 1 million. This has been confirmed by impartial sources.

203. The Ethiopian representative spoke of his attitude towards resistance. He neglected to mention what is actually taking place, because what is being discussed is the armed Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. The Ethiopian Empire, which is faced with all forms of national revolutions among the peoples, can only defend itself with sophisticated Soviet weapons and the presence of Soviet troops on its soil. That is why Soviet troops are perpetrating acts of repression and extermination in our region and shedding the blood of innocents, thus threatening security and stability in our area.

204. The presence of Soviet forces is the only thing hindering the achievement of African aspirations, and what is happening in the Horn of Africa is exactly the same as what is happening in Afghanistan and Kampuchea, namely the expansion of Russian hegemonism. Given that goal, all principles and all values are to be flouted, including those on which the Soviet State itself is founded.

205. Without the direct intervention by the Soviet Union, the peoples of the area could well have found the path of mutual understanding and solutions to their outstanding problems. But the strategic interests of that major Power make it seek control of the area and of the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean so as to be able to pursue a policy of international hegemonism aimed at preventing any understanding between the peoples of the area, since such understanding might threaten its presence there.

206. The Soviets occupied the Horn of Africa and then Kampuchea, and today we see their troops occupying Afghanistan. It is high time that we understood the nature of Soviet hegemonism and opposed it.

207. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): In the statement I made this morning to this Assembly, I referred to the blatant aggression that has been perpetrated against my country, Ethiopia. Heeding the appeal of the President, and in order to avoid unnecessary acrimony, I cautiously avoided identifying the aggressor. However, for reasons best known to itself, the Somali ruling clan of Mogadiscio has chosen to identify itself and confirm its expansionist ambitions.

208. To reply to the statement of the representative of Mogadiscio point by point would be to give undue credence to its characteristic slander and calumny. I shall therefore simply ignore it as not worthy of being cited by my delegation.

209. If I referred to the Somali aggression against Ethiopia this morning, it was to underline one basic fact: the issue involved in the present debate, namely, the role played by imperialism and international reaction to suffocate progressive Governments wherever they may be. It was not to exacerbate the international climate already fraught with dangerous consequences. That we leave to the Somali delegation.

210. It is their role to encourage brinkmanship and contribute to the escalation of tensions, as the Mogadiscio régime is doing by its well-publicized intention to offer base facilities in Berbera to the highest bidder.

211. Mr. DOST (Afghanistan): Since I have explained the basic position of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan during this session of the General Assembly, it was not my intention to speak again. However, having listened to a number of statements which demonstrated attempts to distort the facts about the recent developments in Afghanistan, I feel compelled to speak again in order to set the record straight and to remove the confusion which might have been created by those statements.

212. I take this opportunity to express my delegation's deep appreciation and gratitude to the representatives of the socialist countries and those non-aligned countries who have expressed their unreserved support of and solidarity with my delegation, my Government and the Afghan people and condemned and disclosed the blatant interference of American imperialism and its allies in the internal affairs of my country.

213. Referring to the stay in Afghanistan of the limited contingents of Soviet troops, Babrak Karmal, President of the Revolutionary Council, emphasized in his statement on 10 January that:

“This contingent will be withdrawn from the country's territory as soon as the United States, which is acting at one with Peking and reactionary circles of Pakistan and Egypt, puts an end to its aggressive policy with regard to the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.”

214. As to the change of government on 27 December 1979 in Afghanistan, I should like to reiterate that it is entirely an internal matter of Afghanistan. I should like to emphasize that, had these limited contingents of the Soviet army not been in Afghanistan, the change would still have taken place in Afghanistan for the simple reason that Hafizullah Amin, having perpetrated crimes of unbelievable magnitude against the people of Afghanistan, the country and the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, was rejected by the people and had to meet his destiny. The present Government, headed by Babrak Karmal, enjoys the full support of the party, the armed forces and the people of Afghanistan at large. Such support by the Afghan people for Babrak Karmal was even in the past clearly demonstrated by his election twice to the then National Assembly of Afghanistan.

215. Afghanistan's relations with its great neighbour the Soviet Union have stood the test of time and turned into a formidable factor for the cause of peace and stability in the region. Those relations are characterized by mutual trust, mutual respect for each other's independence and sovereignty and sincere co-operation. The policy of the USSR remains one of peace and friendship towards Afghanistan. The Soviet Union has never had an expansionist policy towards Afghanistan and never attempted to teach lessons to small neighbouring countries.

216. The presence of a small contingent of the Soviet Union sent at the repeated requests of the Afghan Government has done nothing but stabilize peace in the region, which was threatened by warmongering circles.

217. On the basis of its policy of peace and peaceful coexistence, Afghanistan will never pose any threat to its neighbours. It is Afghanistan that has been subjected to armed aggression and intervention from abroad. As I stated earlier in the Security Council,<sup>15</sup> Pakistan, in total disregard of the Afghans' love and friendship towards the Pakistani people, has provided bases for counter-revolutionaries and enemies of Afghanistan, from where armed attacks and subversive activities are being carried out against Afghanistan, causing enormous loss of life and property. Those counter-revolutionaries are getting guerrilla training, receiving arms from various countries, enjoying publicity through the mass media of the imperialist countries and receiving large amounts of financial and material assistance from the imperialist and reactionary countries and circles. They have been provided with radio transmitters somewhere some 30 kilometres north of Peshawar. The so-called leaders of these insurgents and anti-revolutionaries frequently travel to the United States, Britain and some Middle Eastern reactionary countries for the purpose of receiving financial and material support, including military support, from them.

218. Those are the facts testified to by foreign and mainly Western correspondents, the Pakistani mass media and public figures. Furthermore, we have captured a large quantity of arms from these intruders, which are on display in Kabul. Those arms are mainly of American, British, Egyptian and Chinese origin.

219. I shall not take up the time of this Assembly by citing reports by correspondents on this matter, since a number of representatives have already done so. But I shall only refer to the latest evidence of *The New York Times* correspondent William Borders, who, in his dispatch from Peshawar published on 11 January, said that:

“Mr Gailani and the others operate with relative impunity on Pakistani territory, holding news conferences to denounce the Soviet Union and its Afghan sympathizers, and flying from Pakistan to other parts of the world in their campaign for international support.

“Although the rebels will not concede it publicly, it is also widely believed that they get some of their arms here, either from Pakistani sources or from Middle Eastern contacts who ship them through Pakistan into Afghanistan across a mountainous border that is untamed, unpatrolled and largely unrecognized by the people who live along it.”

220. The imperialist circles and their allies wantonly distort the facts in order to further their nefarious designs in the region. As every Member of this body is aware, at present the United States has concentrated in the Arabian Sea and the Persian Gulf 16 combat ships, including 2 multipurpose aircraft carriers carrying 160 aircraft altogether, 2 cruisers, 3 destroyers and 3 frigates. In addition, 1 command ship and 7 auxiliary vessels are also located in this area. In addition to the already existing military bases, the United States has acquired new bases in the region, including one in Egypt that covers a radius that includes Afghanistan and Iran.

221. According to American sources, President Carter has ordered the speedy supply of arms to Pakistan. The United States Secretary of Defense recently visited China where, according to American sources, both sides agreed to provide Pakistan with arms.

222. In the view of my delegation, these factors are the real threat to the security and stability of the region. They are all meant by the United States to allow it to exert pressure and impose its will on some Governments in the region, forcing them to act in accordance with the dictates of the United States. This state of affairs has to be ended and the people of the countries of the region must be left freely to choose their own way of life.

223. The developments in Pakistan are particularly disturbing to the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in view of the past record of Pakistan, which has not been very good. Pakistan had four wars with its neighbour and has willingly offered a military base in Badabir, Peshawar, to the United States. The existence of the Karakoram highway, built with Chinese assistance for strategic purposes and military use, adds still more to Afghanistan's anxiety.

224. The aforementioned facts represent clear interference in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, and such behaviour on the part of the ruling circles of Pakistan runs counter to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 31/91 which, in paragraph 5:

“Calls upon all States, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, to

<sup>15</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year*, 2185th meeting.

undertake necessary measures in order to prevent any hostile act or activity taking place within their territory and directed against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of another State.”

225. That resolution was adopted with 99 votes in favour, including the vote of Pakistan. It is worth while noting that the solitary vote cast against it was that of the United States, with China deliberately absent. Now we can understand why those last two countries behaved in such a manner.

226. The representative of Pakistan in his statement here on 11 January [2nd meeting] distorted some facts about the so-called refugee problem. I should like to say in this connexion that in July 1979, in the capacity of Deputy Foreign Minister, I visited Pakistan and held talks with Pakistani authorities. I also called on the President of Pakistan. During my talks I made amply clear Afghanistan's view on the activities of counter-revolutionaries and the refugee problem, but unfortunately Pakistan, for some reasons better known to its officials, has not met even the minimum requirements for the return of the refugees or for halting their hostile activities against Afghanistan.

227. My Government's stand on the refugee problem and its relations with Pakistan as a whole are very clear, as stated in the policy statement addressed to the nation by Babrak Karmal, President of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister. He said:

“That is why I declare on the basis of the iron will of the people of Afghanistan that all my compatriots who have, as a result of tyranny and despotism under the bloodthirsty Hafizullah Amin, taken refuge abroad or have engaged inside the country in fratricide, whether unwittingly or vindictively at the instigation of the oppressors and local or foreign enemies, are honestly and sincerely invited to return to the independent and peaceful land of their mothers and fathers, the beloved Afghanistan, in full freedom and confidence. The new Revolutionary National Government of Afghanistan will exert as many efforts as humanly possible to ensure conditions that may make up for the moral and material losses suffered by all compatriots at the hands of Amin and his clique.

“The peoples of Afghanistan and Pakistan also share strong fraternal relations. The Government of Afghanistan will make efforts, honestly and fraternally, to remove any kind of differences or misunderstanding through peaceful negotiations with Pakistani authorities.”

228. Therefore the refugees, if they are real refugees and not politically motivated, can return to their homes. The conditions for their return have never been as favourable as they are now. I should like to remind this Assembly that if assistance through international channels and from other sources is rendered in the name of refugee aid in the present circumstances, it will be used mainly for acquiring armaments which might thus add to the existing tension and encourage armed attacks in Afghanistan.

229. The Pakistani representative also asserted that the Afghan forces have been disarmed by the Soviet con-

tingents. That assertion is a complete distortion of the situation among the Afghan armed forces. Those forces are fighting the invaders everywhere, and this is even recognized by the United States Department of Defense.

230. In concluding my statement, I should like to emphasize once again that the Government of Afghanistan, relying on the solidarity and support of friendly countries, will continue to fight for its independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty against imperialist provocation and aggression.

231. Afghanistan will continue its policy of active non-alignment, good-neighbourly relations and co-operation with all countries and will struggle for peace and security in the region and in the whole world.

232. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): The speaker who has just preceded me raised several points in his statement, most of which are incorrect, baseless and irrelevant to the central issue to which the General Assembly at its sixth emergency special session has been addressing itself for the last two or three days. I wish to reject categorically the insinuations made by the previous speaker to the effect that in some quarters there has been encouragement of the so-called subversive activities against the Government of Afghanistan. That is an insinuation which belies the truth. Only a few minutes ago the General Assembly, by adopting the draft resolution by an overwhelming majority, gave a very clear and eloquent verdict on the real and correct situation in Afghanistan.

233. My Government has firmly and categorically reiterated on numerous occasions Pakistan's strict adherence to the policy of non-interference and neutrality in the affairs of Afghanistan. Our decision to accept the Afghan refugees, whose number now exceeds 410,000, and to provide them with shelter and the basic necessities of life has been entirely motivated by humanitarian considerations. It is also in keeping with recognized international conventions and practices. The officials of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees have inspected many of the more than 30 refugee camps which have been set up in Pakistan to shelter such large numbers of refugees. Their presence has placed a heavy burden on our very limited resources, but the Government of Pakistan has not and will not shirk its international and Islamic responsibility of providing humanitarian assistance to these refugees.

234. Our position in regard to our policy towards Afghanistan and towards the uprooted Afghan refugees who have sought asylum in Pakistan has been made amply clear in my statement in the Security Council,<sup>16</sup> as well as in the statement by the head of my delegation, the Adviser for Foreign Affairs of the Government of Pakistan in this Assembly last Friday [*ibid.*]. Without taking too much of the Assembly's time, I should like once again firmly and categorically to reject any allegations of interference in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan. As the leader of my delegation said:

“The sustained uprising of the people of Afghanistan is an entirely internal phenomenon. It is an expression of

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*



their rejection of an alien ideology to which they do not wish to submit. Their resistance is rooted in their devotion to Islam and their deep-rooted national tradition of uncompromising struggle against imperialism and colonialism, their tradition of never submitting or yielding to foreign conquerors.” [*Ibid.*, para. 143]

235. In conclusion, let me reiterate that the problem of the Afghan refugees is not of our making. Our concern for them is entirely humanitarian and we earnestly look forward to the day when tranquil and stable conditions will be created in Afghanistan that will allow these refugees voluntarily to return to their homeland.

236. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in exercise of the right of reply, and have thus concluded consideration of the item entitled “Question considered by the Security Council at its 2185th to 2190th meetings, from 5 to 9 January 1980”.

#### *Statement by the President*

237. The PRESIDENT: After four days of extensive discussion and debate, this sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly is about to conclude. In my opening statement on Thursday, 10 January [*1st meeting*], I pointed out that the session was convened at a time of disquieting developments on the international scene whose repercussions are, and should be, the concern of all States. At the same time, I underscored the responsibility of this Assembly, the most representative organ of the nations and peoples of the world, to make a positive contribution to the de-escalation of tension and the maintenance of international peace and security. I also stressed that such a contribution can only be made in the context of the observance of the principles enunciated in the Charter of our Organization and respect for those decisions and resolutions repeatedly affirmed by the General Assembly. For there can be no escaping the fact that unless such principles are adhered to there is bound to be a further deterioration in international relations, with unforeseen repercussions.

238. The extensive debate which has taken place during the past four days clearly demonstrates the keen awareness of Member States of the imperative need to preserve an international order based on justice and on respect for the principles and decisions collectively agreed upon. The discussion has also eloquently reflected the consciousness among States of the heavy responsibility prescribed for the General Assembly in the maintenance of international peace and security. It also represents a clear manifestation of the concern of the international community about the situation regarding developments in Afghanistan and symbolizes its collective desire to ensure the elimination of the crisis in the area as a whole, as well as to put an end to the ominous escalation of tension among the great Powers.

239. The proceedings of the Assembly during this emergency special session have once again underscored the fact that, notwithstanding the divergent interpretations of the developments and the differing points of view on the positions taken by Members thereon, there has emerged a definitive expression of an overriding consideration that interrelationships of nations of the world must at all times

be conducted in keeping with established norms and standards of international relations and through strict adherence to the fundamental principles embodied in the Charter and many relevant decisions and resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

240. Equally clear is the urgent need, above all, for all nations to do their utmost to prevent further deterioration of the present situation. We live in a tumultuous time when an amicable and smooth transformation of the world of disequilibrium is being urgently sought after in all aspects of interrelationships of the world community. It is therefore all the more imperative that the irrevocable respect for the principles which we uphold and the cause we espouse should prevail over any and all other considerations. The Charter of the United Nations must continue to be our guide. The defence of its purposes and principles must continue to be the unretractable responsibility and resolve of us all—the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor.

241. The convening of this session in the context of the developments which have clearly reflected the deterioration in the international atmosphere, as well as the intensity and controversial nature of our debate, clearly indicates that the world has not ushered in the decade of the 1980s in the spirit of peace, concord and understanding for which we had hoped and of which I had spoken in my statement at the last meeting of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. On the contrary, we now see a dangerous escalation of tension with serious potential consequences in many areas. It is therefore incumbent on us all as we leave this session to make whatever contribution we can, as Members of an Organization dedicated to the preservation of international peace and security, to reversing this trend. It is vital that the international community should strive for the de-escalation of tension, for it is self-evident that the path towards confrontation is a road fraught with imponderable consequences.

242. I wish to express my sincere hope that members will continue to bear all these considerations in mind as we approach the conclusion of our session.

243. Finally, I wish to thank you all for your co-operation and assistance. I wish also to thank the Secretary-General, the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs and all the members of the Secretariat for all their input, which helped to ensure the smooth running of this session.

## AGENDA ITEM 2

### Minute of silent prayer or meditation

244. The PRESIDENT: I invite representatives to stand and observe one minute of silent prayer or meditation.

*The representatives, standing, observed a minute's silence.*

### *Closure of the session*

245. The PRESIDENT: I now declare closed the sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly.

*The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.*