



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

**2186**<sup>th</sup> MEETING: 5 JANUARY 1980

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2186) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Letter dated 3 January 1980 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Australia, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (S/13724 and Add.1 and 2) .....	1

UN LIBRARY  
MAY 19 1986  
UN/SA COLLECTION

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
LIBRARY  
100 ST. GEORGE STREET  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

## 2186th MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 5 January 1980, at 5 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Jacques LEPRETTE (France).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, China, France, German Democratic Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2186)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Letter dated 3 January 1980 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Australia, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (S/13724 and Add.1 and 2)

*The meeting was called to order at 5.30 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

Letter dated 3 January 1980 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Australia, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (S/13724 and Add.1 and 2)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its 2185th meeting, I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia and Singapore to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Dost (Afghanistan), Mr. Anderson (Australia), Mr. Yankov (Bulgaria), Mr. Kinsman (Canada), Mr. Liévano (Colombia), Mr. Thiounn Prasith (Democratic Kampuchea), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Nisibori (Japan), Mr. Zaiton (Malaysia), Mr. Martin (New Zealand), Mr. Naik (Pakistan), Mr. Jaroszek (Poland), Mr. Allagany (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. Koh (Singapore) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I wish to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Costa Rica, Liberia, Mongolia and Somalia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Piza Escalante (Costa Rica), Mr. Tubman (Liberia), Mr. Dashtseren (Mongolia) and Mr. Mohamud (Somalia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation, as it has already had occasion to state, is in principle against having the Security Council discuss the so-called question of the situation in Afghanistan, since we regard such a discussion as an attempt to carry out direct and completely unwarranted intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, a sovereign State Member of the United Nations.

4. However, since it has been decided to initiate this discussion, despite the clearly expressed position set forth by the Government of Afghanistan, we deem it necessary to utilize it in order to reveal the actual

intentions of those who have initiated the convening of today's meeting.

5. The victory of the National Democratic Revolution in Afghanistan in April 1978 offered the Afghan people broad and favourable prospects for the implementation of fundamental socio-economic and political reforms in that country in order to restructure their society on genuinely democratic and progressive bases. At the same time, that historic event struck a powerful blow against the feudal and reactionary forces in Afghanistan and affected the interests of world imperialism.

6. Breaking off with the old and creating the new is always a difficult and complex process, particularly in a country like Afghanistan, which, until quite recently, was one of the most backward States in central Asia. However, these objective difficulties which arose because of the age-old domination of feudalism in the country greatly increased when the resistance mounted against the progressive course of internal reaction was compounded by active and growing intervention from abroad, when outside imperialist forces and internal counter-revolutionary circles entered into a plot to put down the young Republic and to restore the positions which they had lost. It is no secret to anyone that immediately after the April 1978 revolution in Afghanistan, the United States and certain other Western Powers, and also the Chinese leadership, used various sophisticated means to intervene in the internal affairs of Afghanistan by fomenting internal counter-revolution by placing their agents there and by training and arming subversive groups and units and supplying them with various ways and means of waging war against the armed forces of the country.

7. Another fact is noteworthy: when we talk about the Africans who have taken up weapons in order to struggle for their freedom and independence, or when we speak about the Palestinians who are waging a struggle in order to liberate the lands occupied by Israel, the representatives of the United States and other Western Powers spare no words, including those uttered here in the Security Council, to declare how inadmissible it is to use force. But when bands of insurgents rise up against a legitimate Government which is pursuing a progressive policy, as is in fact taking place in Afghanistan, then the Western Powers take them under their wing and do everything to justify the use of force. Moreover, they supply them with weapons and even try, with the assistance of the United Nations, to legalize their activities.

8. The Western press has publicly stated that the territory of Pakistan not far from the Afghan border was used in order to set up centres for the training of thousands of guerrillas, who were then thrown into the territory of Afghanistan in order to carry out subversive activities against the Government of that country. Those diversionary groups then proceeded to

settle in and re-form their ranks after carrying out bandit-like raids against Afghan populated areas and other localities. One such centre, for example, was directly mentioned in *The Washington Post*, in its 2 February 1979 edition, in an article captioned: "Guerrillas trained in Pakistan to oust Afghan Government".\* The article goes on to say: "Afghan dissidents are undergoing guerrilla training at a base near here in a bid to intensify armed opposition to the Government in Kabul."\* In referring to the statements by the insurgents the article says that they: "are being trained at a former Pakistani military base north of here".\*

9. A former major in the Afghan army who was involved in training the insurgents said, in an interview given to the press which is also quoted in that article in *The Washington Post*: "We are training them to be familiar with all the weapons, and in guerrilla warfare."\*

10. In the same newspaper, on 16 July 1979, it was indicated that the counter-revolutionaries: "apparently obtained their arms in the tribal area, either on the black market or from one of the many Pakistani factories specializing in copying the weapons of other nations".\*

11. Referring to the support for the counter-revolutionary forces from outside, Joseph Harsch wrote in *The Christian Science Monitor* of 9 August 1979 that: "Pakistan has received the backing of China and the United States. The Afghan rebels have been trained and armed inside Pakistan, and no reprisals made by Moscow."\*

12. Those statements—and many more could be quoted—show quite clearly the direct participation in the training, arming and supplying of Afghan counter-revolutionaries by those employed by the American secret services, as well as by Chinese specialists in so-called guerrilla operations. As a rule, whenever the insurgents' leaders are visited by their patrons, there has been considerable stepping up of the activities of the counter-revolutionary forces in Afghanistan itself.

13. Thus the uprising in Herat in March last year, to which the Afghan reactionaries, the United States and China attached particular significance, occurred immediately after one of the leaders of the Afghan counter-revolutionaries had been received by the Department of State of the United States. It is also known that the leaders of the counter-revolutionary Afghan groups have also frequently met in London.

14. Such overt interference by external forces in the internal affairs of Afghanistan did not seem to disturb any of those who have initiated the present series of meetings of the Security Council, nor did they regard it as any violation of the principles of international

\* Quoted in English by the speaker.

co-operation, although the purposes of such subversive activities were abundantly clear, that is, to prevent the process of progressive reforms in Afghanistan, restore the régime that had been overthrown and bring about the creation in the country of new military bastions situated very close to the borders of the Soviet Union to replace previous ones that had been lost as a result of the revolution in Iran.

15. During 1978 and 1979, overt interference from outside in the internal affairs of Afghanistan increased continually and constant armed attacks and incursions created serious danger for the young Republic. In this connection, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan frequently turned to the Soviet Union and asked it for support, including the rendering of military assistance. The Soviet Union believed that the imperialist forces would, when they became convinced of the irreversibility of the changes that were occurring in Afghanistan, face up to the real facts and not go beyond a certain limit in their relations with that State. At the same time, the Government of the Soviet Union warned that it would not allow Afghanistan to be turned into a beach-head for preparations of imperialist aggression against the Soviet Union.

16. The President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, Mr. Brezhnev, stated on 11 June 1979:

“The situation in Asia is not improved by the constant covert and overt attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. We rigorously condemn the subversive activities undertaken against the Afghan revolution and we shall not leave our friend, the Afghan people, in need.”

17. However, those who are hostile to the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan have not ceased their armed struggle against it. Imperialist intervention has taken on even broader and more dangerous forms and dimensions for the Afghan people. In the present circumstances, the Afghan Government once again appealed urgently to the Soviet Union to render immediate assistance and aid in its struggle against external aggression. The Soviet Union responded positively to that request, taking into account the common interests of both countries in questions of security, as enshrined in the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan,<sup>1</sup> and also in an attempt to preserve peace and stability in that part of the world. In article 4 of the Treaty, it is stated that:

“The High Contracting Parties, acting in the spirit of the traditions of friendship and good-neighbourliness, and in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, shall consult with each other and shall, by agreement, take the necessary steps to ensure the security, independence and territorial integrity of the two countries.

“In the interests of strengthening their defensive capacity, the High Contracting Parties shall continue to develop their co-operation in the military field.”

18. Supporting and developing such co-operation falls squarely under the purview of bilateral agreements concluded between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union, and no one is entitled to interfere in these matters. In this connection, limited military contingents were sent to Afghanistan in order to fulfil those tasks, consisting exclusively in giving them assistance in repulsing armed intervention from outside.

19. The Soviet Union has not set itself any other task. It has not intended, nor does it intend, to intervene in matters relating to the State and social structures of Afghanistan and its domestic and foreign policies. The statement to the effect that the Soviet Union is somehow an accomplice in the internal affairs of that country is fiction and slander from beginning to end. The request of the Afghan leadership and the positive response given by the Soviet Union are in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations to the effect that States enjoy an inalienable right to individual and collective self-defence in order to repulse aggression and also to restore peace.

20. The Soviet Government has at the same time clearly and unambiguously stated that, after the causes which motivated this request made by Afghanistan to the Soviet Union—the request which led to the Soviet action—have been removed, the Soviet Union intends fully to withdraw its military contingents from the territory of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. It should be emphasized that allegations that the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan is creating a threat to the security of other States, and also the fact that the forum of the United Nations has been used in order to inflate this contrived issue, are simply aimed at distracting the attention of international public opinion from the real facts relating to foreign interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and at giving assistance to internal and external counter-revolutionary forces.

21. Soviet assistance to and support of Afghanistan are not aimed at any of its neighbouring countries, which are also neighbours of the Soviet Union. The Soviet delegation would like to emphasize clearly that the Soviet Union is concerned with maintaining normal friendly relations with them based on the principles of equality, mutual respect and non-intervention in internal affairs. We are also convinced that the peoples of the developing countries and of the Moslem States will correctly understand the policy of the Soviet Union, which has always been on the side of those peoples struggling for their national liberation and identity, and will not be misled by attempts to denigrate the nature of our relations with

Afghanistan and slanderously attribute to our country intentions it does not have—namely, to invade the internal life of that country and to intervene in the national and religious way of life it has chosen for itself.

22. When it took the decision to render assistance to Afghanistan—assistance which was requested—the Soviet Union took a step fully in keeping with the traditions underlying the many years of friendship existing between the peoples of the two countries. Since it was created in 1917, the Soviet State has constantly upheld the struggle of the Afghan people for independence and sovereignty and has given it comprehensive assistance and support, including assistance to help it to repel external aggression. There have always existed good and friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan, and the boundary between our countries has always been a boundary of good neighbourliness and co-operation.

23. The Soviet Union welcomed the April revolution in Afghanistan, and, at the request of the Government of the newly formed Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, gave it unselfish assistance in order to help it to establish itself, to be strengthened and to develop. The relationships of friendship and co-operation between the two countries were legally enshrined in the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation of 5 December 1978.<sup>1</sup>

24. Those who today have expressed their discontent with the state of relations existing between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union—and this is not difficult to understand—are doing this because they have seen that it is impossible for them to pursue their own designs, which are to undermine the revolution in Afghanistan. They would like to shake the foundations of the democratic structure of Afghanistan and destabilize the situation in that country, creating in it a state of chaos and disorder. Now, thanks to the steps which have been taken by the Afghan leadership, these anti-people plans have been definitely repulsed.

25. It is typical that the so-called Afghan question has been artificially encouraged by those circles which most constantly intervene in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and other States. Now this matter is being used by them as a pretext to camouflage the genuine and actual American military threat which hangs over Iran and its revolution, in order to distract attention from the attempts of imperialist forces in the United States to play the part of a world policeman in the Middle East, in Latin America, in Asia and in Africa. Recently, this has taken a very overt form—for example, the increased American military presence in the Indian Ocean basin, and particularly near the Persian Gulf.

26. The United States, despite the fact that frequent protests have been voiced and demands have been made by a number of States in the Indian Ocean basin,

has refused to demolish its military bases on the island of Diego García, and in fact has taken steps to expand and modernize them. As far as the Persian Gulf is concerned, the United States quite recently, as the Council knows, has been concentrating a whole armada of its naval forces—two multi-purpose aircraft carriers, two cruisers, three destroyers and other military vessels.

27. In order to carry out its police functions in the Near and Middle East, the United States is now creating special units which are called “rapid deployment force”.

28. The leaders of the United States are using any pretext in order to turn the development of international events from détente to tension. Quite recently, there was a campaign raised about the so-called Soviet brigade in Cuba. Everyone recalls the inglorious end of this fiction, which was invented by Washington and which simply turned out to be a soap bubble. Immediately thereafter, an attempt was made to heat up the international atmosphere in connection with the problem of refugees in South-East Asia. What has happened to that question now? Or to the question of food assistance to Kampuchea? We all remember the agitation raised at the time by the Western Powers, but now they even refuse to fulfil the obligations which they took upon themselves in connection with such assistance. All this has simply served the purpose of satisfying the interests of those who have laid a wager on a deterioration of the international situation and an increase in the arms race. Now the same circles have seized on the so-called Afghanistan question in order to justify, in the eyes of world public opinion, the attempts which have been made to prevent the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT II)<sup>2</sup> from coming into force and to justify a further increase in military budgets and the initiation of new military preparations.

29. The imperialism of Western Powers is met halfway by the Beijing hegemonists, who continue to hatch plans of expansion at the expense of their neighbouring States. The defeat in Viet Nam did not teach the Chinese leadership any sense. They continue to foster tension on the Chinese-Vietnamese border. Now hardly anyone can be surprised at the hypocrisy of what has been stated by Beijing.

30. In its recent statement, the Chinese Government tried to depict itself as a “friend” of the Afghan people and as a staunch supporter of peace. But if we refer to the facts, the picture seems quite different. In the last two decades, China has either openly or covertly resorted to military adventures against practically all its neighbouring countries. It has provoked conflicts and it has sowed discord among peoples. It is upon the conscience of the Chinese leaders that the blood of millions of Kampuchean was shed, and that Kampuchean were tortured and perished in the dark

years of the Maoist experiment carried out by the Pol Pot régime on Kampuchean soil. The Maoists need the false tirades about "Soviet aggression" in order to justify their policy of militarizing China and their considerable military expenditure inside the country, in order to mask the hegemonistic essence of Beijing's foreign policy doctrines.

31. One further fact should be pointed out. Among the countries which support the United States in its attempts artificially to inflate the question of the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan are 17 States on whose territories American troops are located. One may wonder why the Governments of those countries regard this as a completely normal situation. When, however, another State, in this particular case Afghanistan, invites the troops of a friendly country to render it assistance, then they consider that this is illegal and they regard it as a threat to international peace. It seems to us that those developing countries which have found themselves involved in the present campaigns surrounding the so-called Afghan question might give some thought about whose hands they are playing into when they object to assistance being rendered to the Government of such a developing country.

32. In conclusion, the Soviet delegation would once again like to declare that it categorically rejects any attempts to make use of the Security Council in order to interfere in the internal affairs of a sovereign country, namely Afghanistan, and an area covered by bilateral Soviet-Afghan relations.

33. The Soviet Union also strenuously condemns the attempts of the American politicians and Beijing leaders artificially to create the so-called Afghan problem in order to use this as camouflage, in order to turn the clock of world affairs back to the time of the cold war when hostility was rampant among peoples, and military hysteria prevailed. For its part, the Soviet Union intends firmly to pursue its unwavering policy of peaceful coexistence and world détente. We are convinced that this policy, responsive as it is to the vital interests of all peoples, will make its way through all barriers which have been created by those who oppose it and, in the final analysis, will triumph.

34. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Mr. President, first of all, on behalf of the Chinese delegation, I would like to express warm congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency for the month of January. At the same time, we wish to extend a warm welcome to the representatives of the newly elected member States of the Security Council, the German Democratic Republic, the Niger, the Philippines and Tunisia, which are participating in the work of the Council. The Chinese delegation is looking forward to developing good relations of co-operation with them in the lofty cause of maintaining world peace and security.

35. In the last week of December 1979, in defiance of world opinion and after meticulous planning and preparations, the Soviet Government dispatched several divisions of regular troops of its army and air force for a massive, flagrant military invasion of a non-aligned sovereign State, Afghanistan, by means of surprise attack. At present, the invading Soviet forces are continuing to enter the territory of Afghanistan in a steady flow, blatantly ravaging its soil and brutally repressing the large number of Afghan people and armed forces who are firmly resisting Soviet aggression. The undisguised Soviet armed aggression and intervention against Afghanistan has not only grossly encroached upon the sovereignty and independence of Afghanistan but also openly trampled upon the Charter of the United Nations and the norms guiding international relations, thus posing an extremely serious threat to peace and security in Asia and the whole world. The Soviet armed aggression and intervention also constitute a brazen provocation against people all over the world. It has evoked the utmost indignation and stern condemnation from various countries and from world opinion. On 30 December 1979, the Chinese Government issued a statement vigorously condemning the hegemonist action of the Soviet Union and firmly demanding the immediate cessation of this aggression and intervention in Afghanistan and the withdrawal of all Soviet armed forces.

36. The Soviet military aggression and intervention against Afghanistan is a most serious development and a grave step taken by the Soviet Union in furtherance of hegemonism. In quest of world hegemony, the Soviet Union, apart from stepping up its frontal military deployment in Europe in recent years, has accelerated its "southward drive", sparing no effort to extend its tentacles of military aggression to the south in an attempt to reach the Indian Ocean, control the sea lanes for oil transportation, seize oil-producing areas, outflank Europe, pose a direct menace to southern Asia and thus dominate the world. Almost on the same day, in December a year ago, the Soviet Union instigated the Vietnamese authorities to launch a large-scale armed aggression against Democratic Kampuchea in an attempt to control the whole of South-East Asia. At present, when the Vietnamese authorities are further expanding their aggression in Kampuchea with Soviet backing, the Soviet Union has wantonly initiated its armed aggression against Afghanistan. Obviously, both are important components of the Soviet global strategy for world domination.

37. In order to put a fig leaf over its naked acts of aggression, the Soviet Government has the cheek to concoct a number of clumsy pretexts, which are most absurd and beneath refutation. The Soviet Union claims that its aggression against Afghanistan was undertaken in fulfilment of treaty obligations at the request of the Afghan Government and that its action is in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations.

This is indeed a big mockery of, and provocation against, both the Charter and common sense. Could there be any Government in the world which would invite another country to send troops into its own territory to overthrow itself?

38. One may recall that a year ago, the same pretext was invoked by the Soviet Union to incite Viet Nam's aggression against Kampuchea. But this monstrous lie has long since been exploded. It has been pointed out that the occupation of the capital of the invaded country by foreign aggressor troops preceded the so-called invitation extended by the puppet Government fostered by the aggressor troops. Any difference between the Soviet instigation of the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea and its current armed aggression against Afghanistan consists in the change from using surrogates behind the scenes to openly and directly sending its own troops for armed occupation of a sovereign State to change its Government by violent means.

39. What calls for serious attention is that the action by the Soviet Union fully demonstrates its readiness to repeat the same exercise in the future and to invade and occupy any country it pleases by using the same pretext and logic. The Soviet Union has been so keen about concluding the "treaties of friendship and co-operation" simply because it wants to use them as one of the means to achieve the aforesaid aim. Looking back into the past, the occupation of Czechoslovakia by Soviet troops in 1968 was also carried out by the same logic. Now the Soviet Union has extended the use of its notorious "theory of limited sovereignty" from its "community of nations" to a non-aligned and Islamic country of the third world. It is an even greater mockery for the Soviet Union to claim that its armed invasion of Afghanistan is for the purpose of "repelling external threat". In fact, is it not the Soviet Union itself that has no scruples in interfering in the internal affairs of Afghanistan by the most brutal means? Is it not the large number of Soviet regular troops who have marched into Afghan territory and massacred Afghan people that constitutes the external aggression and threat against Afghanistan and its neighbouring countries?

40. At the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union made a big show of proposing the inadmissibility of hegemonism in international relations. However, scarcely had the ink on the General Assembly resolution against hegemonism [resolution 34/103] dried when the Soviet Union, shedding all disguise, launched a naked military aggression, enabling the people to see more clearly that the self-styled "natural ally" of the third world is, in fact, the most vicious enemy of the third world and all peoples.

41. In the short span of the past year, the series of grave events that have occurred have fully revealed the extreme insanity and recklessness of the policies

of aggression and expansion pursued by the Soviet Union, which has been shown to be the biggest aggressor and hegemonist of our time and which is in essence not different from the Hitlerites before the Second World War. Its behaviour cannot but elicit deep thought on the part of all countries and people who truly love peace and uphold justice: what attitude should one take *vis-à-vis* the real threat posed by intensified Soviet aggression and expansion all over the world? If the Soviet Union were condoned and allowed to have its way, then who would be its next victim? If the Soviet Union were allowed to succeed, its appetite for aggression and expansion would be whetted, and what would be left of international peace and security? Obviously, no peoples which have won their national independence through protracted, valiant struggle and which cherish the sovereignty and security of their countries would ever tolerate the wanton aggression by Soviet hegemonism and willingly see their countries lose their hard-won independence and sovereignty and reduced to being the vassal and colony of a super-Power.

42. There is only one way out: unity is strength. That is to say, all countries and peoples subjected to direct or indirect threats of Soviet aggression and expansion should unite and take practical actions to wage an unremitting struggle against Soviet hegemonism and firmly oppose and frustrate its aggression and expansion so as to make a positive contribution to the maintenance of world peace and the preservation of the independence and sovereignty of all peoples.

43. The Security Council must deal in all seriousness with the Soviet acts of frenzied aggression. The Chinese delegation holds that the Security Council should not only condemn the Soviet military aggression and intervention against Afghanistan in the strongest terms but should unequivocally call upon the Soviet authorities to cease immediately their aggression and intervention and firmly demand the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet armed forces from Afghanistan. The Council should also enjoin the Soviet authorities to put an end to their policies of aggression and expansion in various parts of the world, and call upon all Governments and peoples to take all effective measures to oppose categorically and frustrate the acts of aggression and expansion of the Soviet authorities.

44. As we are entering the 1980s, the people of the world are confronted with the stark reality of intensified Soviet aggression and expansion in one area after another in the world. This is an omen that the international situation in the 1980s will be more turbulent than that in the 1970s and that the 1980s will be a decade of fierce struggle between the forces of peace and war, aggression and anti-aggression, justice and evil. The people of the world are faced with the common struggle and lofty duty to combat hegemonism and defend world peace. We are fully



convinced that despite the fact that hegemonism may be temporarily on the rampage, the will of the people of the world is, after all, the perpetual and decisive factor. All aggressors in history who were formidable for a time could not escape the shameful end of being burnt by the fire which they themselves had lit. It is the people of all countries, and not the handful of hegemonists, who will finally decide the destiny of mankind. The Chinese Government and people will spare no effort to join all peace-loving and justice-upholding countries and peoples in unremitting struggle to combat and frustrate the hegemonist policies of aggression and expansion and to safeguard world peace.

45. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, your predecessor as President of the Security Council, my colleague from China, was faced with a particularly heavy and complicated workload during the month of December. We are all grateful to him for the infallible wisdom with which he guided our proceedings, and my country for one was delighted with the outcome of the debate on Rhodesia.

46. The month of January looks to be just as busy, and given the nature of some of the problems which confront us, it is a particular pleasure for my delegation to have you, as representative of a close and respected ally, in the Chair.

47. It would also be appropriate, on this our first series of meetings of the new year, for me to join with others of my colleagues in welcoming the new members of the Council, and assuring them of our desire to work in close co-operation. Whilst welcoming them, I should also like to pay a word of tribute to the departing members, whose familiar faces will be much missed by all of us.

48. There is a feature of the landscape of the United Nations which has become only too familiar to all of us. That is the annual presentation to the General Assembly by the Soviet Union of an elaborate proposal on some subject concerning relations between nations. These proposals are invariably deployed in high-sounding and pious language, pregnant with sentiments which are, I presume, fashioned with the object of convincing the membership of the pacific intentions of the Soviet Union and of its profound attachment to the purposes and principles of the Organization. In the last four years these initiatives have included, in chronological order: a proposition aimed at concluding a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations; a draft declaration concerning the deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war; a proposal that the Committee on Disarmament consider appropriate international arrangements for the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States; and, this year, a particularly curious item entitled "Inadmissibility of the

policy of hegemonism in international relations". Hegemonism, we were told, means striving for world domination, for domination over other countries and peoples. And that is why we are here today.

49. Over the years we, the British, have detected a feeling amongst eastern European delegations that my delegation is less than enthusiastic about these grandiose gestures. The fact is that my country is disposed to judge other States by their actions rather than by their words. We remain unimpressed by high-flown rhetoric: the higher-flown the rhetoric, the more suspicious we are of the motives that lie behind it. And should we not be suspicious? We forget at our peril what has been done outside this building by the proponents of these initiatives even as they have been disseminating unexceptionable phrases such as "non-interference" and "peaceful co-operation" to all of us here.

50. The subject of today's debate is a stark case in point. In this year of anti-hegemonism, under the cloak—albeit the *ex post facto* cloak—of a treaty of friendship and co-operation, the Soviet Union has mounted a massive armed intervention into a neighbouring State, an Asian State, a non-aligned State, a State Member of the United Nations, and, for the first time, a State not directly within the Soviet Union's own sphere of influence.

51. It now seems to be universally established that there are the best part of 50,000 Soviet troops in Afghanistan. We are asked to believe that this is a "limited" military response to an appeal from a Government of Afghanistan in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation signed in 1978.<sup>1</sup> We are all familiar with the events in Afghanistan since April 1978 when, after a brief but bloody convulsion, Mr. Taraki emerged as the President of Afghanistan. Some four months ago he, in turn, was overthrown in similar circumstances by Mr. Hafizullah Amin. He, we are given to understand, like his predecessor, made repeated appeals for military assistance from his northern ally in accordance yet again with the provisions of the Treaty of Friendship. The Soviet invasion was in response to that call—frequently repeated, we are asked to believe. Is it not strange and puzzling that the next development was the overthrow and death of Mr. Amin and his replacement by Mr. Karmal, who appears to have arrived in the country only after Soviet forces had made it safe for him to do so? Mr. Amin, it seems, would have been wise not to have invoked the Treaty of Friendship, but he did not live long enough to correct that mistake. It would take a credulous person to believe that Mr. Karmal's Government came to power in response to the freely expressed wishes of the people of Afghanistan as a whole. If that is the case, why has the military invasion been necessary? Why has the massive Soviet military buildup continued even since the "election" of Mr. Karmal? Why has it been necessary

to dispatch Soviet troops to all parts of Afghanistan to quell a rebellious people? The facts as they appear to the world justify to my Government the view that the Soviet Union has ruthlessly acted with military force against a small and defenceless neighbour. The talk of a response to other outside intervention, including the statement we have just heard from the representative of the Soviet Union, strains our credulity well beyond breaking point. And then we are told that we, the Security Council, should not be discussing the situation in Afghanistan. Such discussion, we are told, constitutes an unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. How many foreign-assisted *coups* must there be in Afghanistan before we, the international community, are allowed the privilege of even suggesting that all might not be well there and that events in that country have wider repercussions? What price these treaties of friendship and co-operation? The growing awareness that Moscow abides only by those treaty provisions which suit its ends has already resulted in two countries revoking such agreements with the Soviet Union.

52. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan is a direct and flagrant violation not only of the mass of resolutions brought by the Soviet Union to the General Assembly, but also of the more sober and compelling language of the Charter of the United Nations, to which all of us subscribe. As I said earlier, representatives of the Soviet Union lose no opportunity in this and other places to remind us of their devotion to the principles of non-intervention, respect for sovereignty, non-use of force and non-aggression. I would ask them to reread, and reread closely, Chapter I of the Charter that binds us all.

53. It is no wonder that the actions of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan have created ever-widening ripples of deep concern throughout the world. Those feelings must clearly be held most strongly in those countries neighbouring Afghanistan and the Soviet Union. Condemnations from China, Pakistan and Iran have been forthright. Many other countries in the region, including several outside the long list of today's petitioners to the Council, have denounced the Soviet invasion. They must perceive that if the Soviet Union, without an internationally acceptable pretext, can march into a neighbouring country, they themselves are in danger. It is tempting to speculate about what concept of its national interests has motivated the Soviet Union to act as it has. Students of history will recall, not without irony, the aims of nineteenth century Tsarist Russia and the fate of the then independent States of central Asia.

54. The present situation, in the view of my delegation, undoubtedly constitutes a threat to international peace and security, and as such it is entirely appropriate that the Security Council should be in urgent session. The Soviet Union must withdraw its invading troops from Afghanistan and allow the people of that beleaguered country democratically and freely

to choose their own leadership and to determine their own future. I urge the Soviet Union to stick by the principles stated only three months ago in the General Assembly by the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko,<sup>3</sup> namely that the Soviet Union, in its approach to all continents and countries, does not apply different yardsticks when it comes to the sovereignty of States, the freedom of peoples and genuine human rights. Mr. Gromyko told us then, and rightly, that one cannot hold aloft the Charter of the United Nations in one situation and hide it under the table in another.

55. In conclusion, I say this. We live in a dangerous world, riven by conflicts of view, divergent interests, deep-seated disputes and widely differing political systems. It is not a world which can or will be controlled by the threat or use of force by Powers great or small. That way lies destruction, death and human misery. Our only hope is to resolve our differences peacefully, to subordinate naked national interest to the wider imperatives of peace and security amongst nations and peoples. We must abide by the precepts of the Charter, of which the Security Council is the ultimate guardian. The Council must express itself in this grave crisis which we are considering today. It must do so in plain language, clearly and without equivocation. Only if the Soviet Union is ready to right the wrong which it has committed can all of us feel a sense of confidence and renewed security. The Soviet Union is a great Power and great Powers should suffer no complexes or inhibitions when it comes to the reversal of actions which are unacceptable to the international community.

56. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Colombia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

57. Mr. LIÉVANO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am pleased that on this occasion the representative of France has the honour of being President of the Security Council. His intellectual and human qualities, his long diplomatic experience and great knowledge of the United Nations guarantee that the Council will enjoy impartial and effective guidance.

58. I should like also to thank all the members of the Council for this opportunity to speak to this important United Nations organ on the subject that is at present before us. I plan to make a very brief statement.

59. No sooner had the international community, the peoples of the third world and the developing nations begun to believe that the time had passed when imperialism would send in its soldiers and tanks to run over smaller countries and take control of defenceless peoples militarily, economically and monetarily, than suddenly the same international community found itself, as during the past few days, confronted with the resurgence of the worst abuses of the powerful against

the weak. Armed divisions, equipped with the most modern instruments of destruction, invaded the territory of a small country; the governmental authorities in power were brutally eliminated and the defenceless inhabitants overrun by the lightning offensive of the invaders' tanks. How many victims have resulted from this armed onslaught? What kind of treatment is being meted out to the people who live in the zones occupied by the military forces of a foreign nation? How do the people of Afghanistan feel about the satellite authorities forced on them by the invaders? It is hard to find out very much about the situation because a new iron curtain has fallen over the victim of aggression which hides from view the ordeal of the people who are completely subject to the arbitrary will of those now in command of the occupying forces.

60. Those developments bear eloquent testimony to the fact that this is a case of flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the standards which should govern the proper conduct of nations in international life; in addition, they have also had the effect of dashing the hopes—only temporarily, we trust—of people all over the world that their rights and sovereignty will be respected by the major Powers.

61. My country has always upheld the principles of the legal equality of States and of non-intervention, and we can hardly remain silent in the face of the tragedy unfolding at the present time in that small country; nor can we fail to express in the Council the deep concern that we feel at this *fait accompli* in Afghanistan. We wish to join our voice of protest as a developing country with others against this attempt—which is unwarranted in 1980—to replace the rules of civilized international conduct and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations by this lightning strike by armoured divisions. The peoples of the third world, the non-aligned countries, the Arab and Moslem nations, the Palestinians and the countries recently freed from colonialism and *apartheid* are alarmed at the potentially serious consequences of this effort to go back to the time when the barefaced use of force was condoned and regarded as legitimate practice in international life.

62. The United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, would be ill-advised to sit idly by while once again the world is ominously threatened by an attempt to replace the rule of law with aggressive actions of tanks and expose the freedom and independence of defenceless peoples to the savage onslaught of new and old forms of imperialism. That would be a return to the law of the jungle in this nuclear age, and the least that is expected from the supreme international Organization is that it deal—and deal seriously—with the tragic plight of the people of Afghanistan, whose land has been trampled underfoot these past few days. Because, if this act of aggression does not meet with a suitable response from the

international community—and it is an act of aggression which has thus far gone unpunished—it will surely spread to other States in the region and open the door to colonial adventurism, threatening once again the independence and sovereignty of small nations.

63. My country wishes to express solidarity with the people of Afghanistan, a people which has fought heroically against all forms of barbarism; a people which is heir to and bearer of values of a very old culture—a culture proudly shared by their blood brothers and those who share their religious beliefs. It is our fervent hope that the men and women of Afghanistan will keep their political, economic and monetary independence and emerge free from the test to which they have been put today by the crass materialism which leads those who profess it to the arrogant abuse of power.

64. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Bulgaria, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

65. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): Sir, may I first express to you my sincerest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I am particularly pleased to be able, through you, to congratulate your country, France, with which the People's Republic of Bulgaria entertains relations which are constantly broadening, to the mutual advantage of both our peoples.

66. May I also take this opportunity to extend our congratulations and best wishes to the newly elected non-permanent members of the Security Council, although it is to be regretted that the Council is now meeting with a membership which is not in accordance with the relevant rules laid down in the Charter.

[*The speaker continued in English.*]

67. I should like at the outset to put on record my Government's strong disagreement with the attempts to involve the Security Council in a matter which falls within the domestic jurisdiction of a State Member of the United Nations. As we see it, there is no justification whatsoever to compel the Council to embark on a debate of the internal situation of a Member State over the categorical objections of its legitimate Government, communicated to the United Nations. We fully share the views on this matter expressed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, Mr. Shah Mohammad Dost [2185th meeting].

68. Attempts to involve the United Nations in a consideration of the internal situation of Afghanistan and its relations with a friendly country are in contradiction with the provisions of the Charter and the very basic principles on which the Organization functions. I shall limit myself to explicitly emphasizing

that, according to the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter:

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

69. Experience has shown that whenever the United Nations has been involved in similar interference the results have invariably been negative, not only in regard to the Organization's prestige, but also in regard to the very problems themselves. Indeed, these are difficult times for the Afghan nation, and we listened with great attention to the statement made this morning by the Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. But it is up to the Government of Afghanistan to take the necessary measures to solve the problems which that country is facing. And it is the Afghanistan Government's right to defend the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the country through individual or collective actions.

70. What is it that has led to the latest events in Afghanistan? As is well known, in April 1978 a popular revolution took place in Afghanistan—a revolution which set in motion far-reaching political, social, economic and cultural transformations. It is a fact of political life that sweeping changes of such a nature may kindle both domestic and foreign reactions. In this case, the deep revolutionary changes which have taken place in Afghanistan and which have been aimed at the elimination of feudal backwardness and the political and social injustice forced upon the people of that country—the workers and peasant masses in particular—have not met with the approval of some outside quarters which are interested in the preservation of the old order and the turning of Afghanistan into another hotbed of tension in Asia.

71. Subsequently, for nearly two years, Afghanistan has been subjected to systematic actions fomenting social strife, and to armed incursions instigated and supported by the reactionary and imperialist forces. The aim of these provocations has been to destabilize the country by all means. Resort has also been had to armed provocations and incitement to insurrection.

72. It is well established that a neighbour of Afghanistan has allowed its territory along its border to be placed at the disposal of anti-Government groups that were trained, supplied with weaponry and sent back into Afghan territory to perpetrate systematic undermining of the Afghan revolution, and thus to become a springboard for aggression against Afghanistan.

73. Such actions constitute in themselves acts of aggression, as defined in article 3 of the Definition of Aggression, contained in the annex to resolution

3314 (XXIX), adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1974. Those continuous armed incursions have acquired dimensions which have violently disturbed normal life in the country, endangering its independence and territorial integrity.

74. That is the background of events leading to the current situation in which the Afghan Government, in the face of increasing undermining and destabilization, has had to appeal repeatedly to a friendly neighbouring country to offer its political, economic and military assistance in order to repel the armed attacks and provocations on its territory, instigated and perpetrated from outside.

75. The Government of Afghanistan has thus exercised a legitimate right inherent in its sovereign power—a right that is recognized by international law and enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Moreover, the legal foundations of this appeal were laid in the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation signed on 5 December 1978.<sup>1</sup>

76. They have acted in the spirit and under the explicit provisions of that Treaty. In the interest of reinforcing its defence capabilities, the Afghan Government had to appeal for help—political, economic and military. Who can deny a sovereign State and its legitimate Government in a situation of distress the right to rely on and to ask for help from its friends on the basis of a bilateral Treaty in force? Some other cases involving such an appeal are legitimized as a so-called right of reasonable expectation. But a call for assistance from the Afghan Government and its acceptance are now being qualified as an invasion. I think that there is no need for more evidence to substantiate such hypocrisy and double standard.

77. Now that the Security Council has been asked to consider the situation in Afghanistan, a legitimate question comes to the fore. Where were those who now so dramatically raise their voices against actions taken in legitimate self-defence by the Afghan Government to protect its sovereignty and territorial integrity against systematic encroachments from outside, perpetrated by forces hostile to the new régime in Afghanistan, when the situation in that country was deteriorating daily under those massive attacks?

78. There are well-known imperialist forces, reactionary and hegemonistic circles which are interested in stepping up the confrontation with the new régime in Afghanistan. They have undertaken intensive measures to beef up the military posture of those who allow their territory to be used as a starting-point for incursions into Afghanistan. Now it is being openly declared that there are no more constraints to proceeding with the large-scale supply of weapons to rebel groups fighting inside Afghanistan.

79. What all this means is that certain imperialist, reactionary and hegemonistic circles and those who

help them are deliberately taking a course to escalate tensions in that area, a course fraught with dangers for peace and security. That is the danger to peace and security.

80. It should be recognized that the current situation would not have been created had the enemies of the Afghan revolution not resorted to systematic encroachments on the sovereignty and independence of that country. However, they have misjudged the readiness of Afghanistan's true friends to come to its rescue at such a crucial moment for the country's destiny.

81. Today Afghanistan has become the target of a well-orchestrated campaign to undermine the achievements of the April 1978 revolution and to unleash slanderous attacks against the countries which express their solidarity with Afghanistan and lend their assistance to repel acts of aggression. Is it not appalling that this is taking place at a time when the Government has come out with a constructive programme through which, as clearly stated by the President of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of Afghanistan, Babrak Karmal, on 30 December 1979, and reiterated today by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Shah Mohammad Dost [*ibid.*], the new democratic Government considers as its own national historic mission the strengthening and fostering of the progressive social and political foundations of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan—that great achievement of the April revolution—leading to the final victory of the democratic anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution?

82. This constructive programme provides for the implementation of a series of democratic reforms, including respect for civil and political liberties, freedom of conscience, faith and religious observance, respect for the inviolability of citizens and their property, freedom to set up political, public and labour organizations and the right to work and to education. It is also a blueprint for the reconstruction of the national economy for the benefit of the working people and the Afghan people as a whole and the establishment of democratic institutions in the country.

83. In these days of trial and enormous efforts for normalization, the people of Afghanistan need peace and stability in order to carry out their programme for national reconstruction and the setting up of conditions propitious to the democratic development of the country. In our view, the proper role of the United Nations is to assist the people of Afghanistan in their endeavours and not to become a party to a hostile campaign orchestrated by those who would like to divert the attention of the world from a crisis they are facing in the same area and justify new measures in the arms race and a return to the course of the cold war.

84. The attempts made through this campaign to involve the United Nations in a return to the cold-war

atmosphere not only are damaging to the prestige of the Organization but may also contribute to inflaming further the already volatile situation in that area.

85. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has traditionally had friendly relations with the people of Afghanistan. At this crucial moment for the Afghan nation and its future, the Bulgarian people express their total solidarity with the genuine efforts being exerted by the Revolutionary Government to secure a democratic future for its country and for peace and security. My Government resolutely opposes any attempt to embroil the United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, in moves prolonging the difficult situation in Afghanistan.

86. I should like to conclude by quoting from the message addressed by the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party to the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan on 1 January 1980:

“The Bulgarian people reiterate their firm conviction that the relations of friendship, fruitful co-operation and solidarity will be further strengthened for the benefit of our two nations and in the interests of democracy and socialism and international peace and security.”

87. I wish here to assure the representatives of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan that we stand firmly by their noble endeavours.

88. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Democratic Kampuchea. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

89. Mr. THIOUNN PRASITH (Democratic Kampuchea) (*interpretation from French*): Before making my statement, I would like to make one comment. If the representatives of the expansionists had the courage and the honesty to leave Afghanistan and Kampuchea as hastily as they have just left the dock here, the new decade would be off to a much better start.

90. Mr. President, I should like first of all to thank you for authorizing me to speak on the vital problem at present before the Council. I should like also to address to you our warm, sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. It is fortunate that the Council, in this first month of the year, which it would appear will be filled with increasingly serious threats to international peace and security, has a man of your remarkable intelligence and your long experience presiding over its difficult proceedings. We are convinced that your wisdom and your recognized talent will be an important contribution towards enabling the Council to fulfil successfully the task of maintaining international peace and security.

91. As this new year 1980 begins, ushering in a new decade, it is now, more than ever before, necessary to express, for all peoples and countries, for all mankind, our sincerest wishes for peace, justice and prosperity.

92. The problem at present before the Security Council is, in its manifestation and in its essence, similar to the problem which it had before it almost exactly a year ago, when, on 25 December 1978, the regional expansionists in Hanoi had sent on their mission of aggression and invasion into Kampuchea more than 120,000 élite troops, supported by a large number of Soviet heavy artillery and tanks, and assisted by several thousand Soviet and Cuban advisers and experts.

93. The fact is that after three days of intense preparations on 24, 25 and 26 December 1979, when 200 Soviet planes unloaded 5,000 soldiers and more than 300 armoured cars and tanks at the airport of Kabul, bringing the Soviet military strength to a division, the Soviet Union overthrew the Government of Afghanistan on 27 December in a bloody *coup*, and invaded Afghanistan by land. This is another case of Soviet military intervention, flagrantly violating the territorial integrity of Afghanistan, stamping out its independence and sovereignty, brazenly trampling underfoot the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of non-alignment and the laws which govern international relations.

94. The pretexts put forward by Soviet international expansionism to justify their evil deeds are the same ones put forward by Vietnamese regional expansionism when it committed aggression against and invaded Kampuchea.

95. The first pretext put forward is that the Soviet troops invaded Afghanistan at the invitation of the Government in Kabul under a "treaty of friendship, good neighbourliness and co-operation". That excuse is a particularly flimsy one inasmuch as the Soviet troops had invaded the country, overthrown the Amin Government and murdered Amin even before the new Government had been set up, and while the new "Prime Minister" was still being sheltered in the Soviet Union. These irrefutable facts are reminiscent of the invasion of Kampuchea on 25 December 1978 by more than 120,000 Vietnamese troops, on the pretext that they had been invited by a so-called Front for National Salvation, created three weeks earlier by Vietnamese expansionists, on Vietnamese territory, because it suited them, and then had been invited by a so-called Government set up two months after the invasion of Kampuchea under the terms of a "treaty of friendship and co-operation", signed also two months after the invasion. Civilized people who respect the laws which govern international relations regard such arguments as a kind of gangster logic.

96. The second pretext advanced by Soviet international expansionists is that the purpose of the Soviet forces of invasion invited into Afghanistan is to help the "Afghan Government" to combat the "activities of the reactionaries and imperialists". I invite the Council to remember that exactly a year ago, in this very Council, the Vietnamese regional expansionists sought to justify their invasion of Kampuchea by saying that there was a need to foil the "activities of the reactionaries and imperialists who were threatening the security of Viet Nam". The fact of the matter is that at the present time the only foreign troops in Afghanistan are the more than 50,000 Soviet soldiers who are occupying and devastating the country, massacring the Afghan people, threatening the peace and stability of neighbouring countries, of the Middle East and the South Asian subcontinent, and world peace; in Kampuchea there are more than 220,000 Vietnamese soldiers who are continuing to devastate the country, perpetrating their crimes of genocide after having already massacred more than 2 million Kampucheans by the use of weapons, famine and toxic chemical products, and threatening the security and stability of neighbouring countries, of the region of South-East Asia, and world peace.

97. Just as the puppet of the Vietnamese, Heng Samrin, was brought into Phnom Penh in Vietnamese tanks, the new Soviet puppet was brought into Kabul in Russian tanks a week after the Soviet invasion.

98. In spite of these irrefutable facts, we actually heard the Soviet representative and his colleagues preach in the Council the same kind of sermon. They state that this is a purely internal affair of Afghanistan and a bilateral issue between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan. Nearly a year ago to the day, in this same chamber, the Council heard the representative of the Soviet Union and his colleagues, and the representative of the Vietnamese regional expansionists, brazenly assert that the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea was an internal affair of Kampuchea; and subsequently, as the presence of Vietnamese troops could no longer be concealed, they claimed that it was a bilateral affair between the Vietnamese aggressors and their puppets. The same expansionists who today say there is no "Afghanistan problem" last year said there was no "Kampuchean problem".

99. If I have ventured to draw this parallel between, on the one hand, the aggression and invasion by Vietnamese troops against my country, Kampuchea, and, on the other hand, the aggression and invasion by Soviet troops against Afghanistan, it is to emphasize two points.

100. The first point is that the invasion of Afghanistan and the invasion of Kampuchea are part of the same strategic plan: to wit, world domination by international hegemonism, and regional domination by Vietnamese hegemonism. Putting Kampuchea in the "Indo-Chinese federation" under Vietnamese control

has always been the strategic dream of Vietnamese regional hegemonism; just as gaining control of South-East Asia, South Asia, and the oil-producing Middle East with its strategic lines of communication linking Asia to Europe and Africa has always been the strategic dream of the Soviet international expansionists.

101. The second point I should like to make is this. To implement their strategic plans, the regional and international hegemonists and expansionists have with unprecedented cunning been using the art of distorting the truth. Lies, calumny, sophistry—all wrapped up in unmatched cynicism with progressive slogans—have become their code of conduct in their international relations. They pay lip-service to peace, security and international détente, all the while engaging in aggression, annexation, expansionism and genocide. Worse, they accuse their victims of the very crimes they themselves have committed. It should now be clear to everyone that the major Power that took the initiative of placing before the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemony in international relations, the self-styled “natural ally” of the non-aligned countries, is precisely the Power that has for the past year been spending \$3 million a day to help Vietnamese regional hegemonism annex non-aligned Kampuchea and massacre Kampuchean people. It is the self-same Power that has been spending \$8 million a day in Cuba, to help spread its regional hegemonistic tentacles throughout Latin America and Africa. It is the same Power that is now directly conducting a hegemonistic war against non-aligned Afghanistan and with napalm and missiles killing Afghan people who are fighting for their independence and the fundamental right to choose the kind of society in which they wish to live with honour and national dignity.

102. The 1970s saw nearly all the peoples and countries of the world that had been dominated regain their freedom, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity after long and bitter struggles for national liberation. But those years also saw the emergence of a new world-wide peril: expansionism or global hegemonism, which, by hypocritical manoeuvring, and especially through the use of brute force, has been striving to destroy the fruits of this national liberation struggle and to place the newly liberated peoples and countries under a new form of servitude that is if anything even more perilous than the earlier form.

103. Recent events relating to the aggression against and the invasion of Kampuchea by the Vietnamese expansionists and the aggression against and the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet international expansionists are in many ways reminiscent of the events that led to the Second World War—namely, the invasion and annexation of the territories of Czechoslovakia and Poland by Hitler’s hordes. The 1980s have dawned with dark clouds hanging over world peace and security.

104. Nevertheless, history never repeats itself exactly. The global and regional expansionists must deal with the staunch resistance of the peoples of the world, and in particular the peoples of Kampuchea and Afghanistan, which are determined to defend their freedom, independence and national identities and to live in honour and national dignity. In the end there can be no doubt that all these global and regional expansionists will be swept away by the struggling peoples of the world.

105. In order to help the peoples in their just struggle and to alleviate their suffering and maintain international peace and security, it is undeniable that the United Nations, and in particular its supreme body the Security Council, has an obligation to condemn the Soviet aggression and invasion in Afghanistan, to demand its immediate cessation and the withdrawal of all invading forces from Afghanistan to allow the people of Afghanistan to determine their own future without any foreign interference. This should be done in just the same way that, on 14 November 1979, the General Assembly adopted resolution 34/22 demanding an end to the Vietnamese aggression against and invasion of Kampuchea and the withdrawal of all armed Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea, laying stress on the right of the people of Kampuchea to determine their own future without any foreign interference. Aggression must not be allowed to pay; it must not be encouraged. On 25 December 1978, it was Vietnamese aggression against Kampuchea. Exactly a year later it is Soviet aggression against Afghanistan. If the international community and its world Organization fail in their efforts to combat and deter these acts of aggression and these invasions, then it will be the law of the jungle in international relations, and that will be a threat to the existence of all countries and peoples great and small.

106. It is in that spirit that my delegation wishes to express its sincere hope that the United Nations and all the countries that cherish independence, peace and justice, having learned from the bitter experience of the League of Nations and the Munich accords, will join forces and spare mankind a third world conflagration and see to it that the new decade is one of peace, security and progress.

107. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Saudi Arabia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

108. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, I thank you and the other members of the Council for allowing me to participate in these proceedings. On behalf of my Government I wish to extend to you warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the current month.

109. The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia joined the many countries that, in the letter

addressed to the President of the Security Council dated 3 January 1980, requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security. It did so because of its deep concern regarding the grave developments that have taken place and continue to take place in a sister country in clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 2625 (XXV) on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, contained in Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV), resolution 31/92, on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, resolution 32/153, on non-interference in the internal affairs of States, resolution 34/101, on the same subject, and resolution 34/103, on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations.

110. The basic principles underlying all those declarations and resolutions can be summarized to include the following: the sovereign equality of all States; the principle that States shall in their international relations refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State; the duty not to intervene in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of any State; the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples free of outside coercion; rejection of any acts seeking to establish zones of influence and domination; rejection of any form of domination, subjugation, interference or intervention and all forms of pressure, whether political, ideological, economic, military or cultural, in international relations; and resolute condemnation of policies of pressure and the use or threat of use of force, direct or indirect aggression, occupation, interference and intervention, overt or covert, in the internal affairs of States.

111. Those and other principles have been fully endorsed and reiterated in regional conferences, including the meetings of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the conferences of the non-aligned movement.

112. My Government wishes to make its position on this issue quite clear. In condemning the latest developments in Afghanistan, we are not taking sides on political ideologies or in power conflicts. Our view is based entirely and exclusively on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the necessity of ensuring the freedom of countries in the choice of their Governments, free from coercion or outside interference. We are also deeply concerned to see any Power, especially any of the big Powers, resorting to pressure and coercing another country in the exercise of its right to choose its own Government, thereby violating the provisions of the Charter and all the principles of international law.

113. The duty of observing the rule of law must be sacred to all countries, of whatever size or system of government. That is most basic for the preservation of the United Nations and the elimination of armed conflicts among nations. When the United Nations was established, the big Powers conceived of themselves as the guardians of world peace and security and gave themselves a more important role in the Security Council by installing themselves as permanent members and by arrogating to themselves the veto power. It is therefore incumbent on us to remind those big Powers that they bear a heavier responsibility towards the world community to protect and preserve the rule of law in international relations and avoid any action which might endanger world peace and security. It is also necessary for the big Powers to avoid the temptation of using their war machinery directly or indirectly to impose their will on other countries, to interfere in the right of self-determination by the peoples of those countries or to coerce any of those countries into adhering to certain principles or ideologies.

114. According to all the reports received concerning the events in Afghanistan, large contingents of troops of the Soviet Union have invaded the country with heavy armaments and considerable fire-power in order to subdue opposition to an existing Government and to install another authority subservient to the Soviet Union. Those Soviet troops continue to be deployed in order to quell all resistance to the authority which was installed against the will of the Moslem Afghan people, in whom alone lies the right to self-determination, free from any outside interference. My Government considers this military action on the part of the Soviet Union to be a brazen, heavy-handed and totally unjustified interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign independent State, which involves a grave threat to the peace and security of the country, the region and the world at large.

115. My Government, and indeed the whole Moslem world, cannot but condemn that invasion in the strongest possible terms, and we request the Security Council to take such measures as may be deemed appropriate in order to ensure the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan, and to leave to the people of Afghanistan the right freely to choose their own Government in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

116. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Poland. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

117. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): Mr. President, in thanking the Security Council for affording my delegation the opportunity of speaking on the subject under consideration, I also wish—in the good tradition of Polish-French relations—to express my delegation's hope that your able and experienced presidency of



the Security Council will contribute to the effective, and indeed objective, exercise of both its functions and its powers.

118. It is on exceptional occasions that the Polish Delegation requests to be heard in the Council. We are doing so today in the face of a most disquieting situation, whereby this principal organ of the Organization has entered into an open conflict with one of the cornerstone provisions of Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations. Article 2, paragraph 7, reads:

“Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State...”

By having decided to inscribe on its agenda the subject of the situation in Afghanistan, the Council failed to live up to the Charter requirement of non-intervention. A number of speakers before me have given ample argumentation to that effect. It has also been most convincingly reaffirmed in the position of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, notably in its statement of 31 December 1979 and the telegram addressed to the President of the Security Council from Afghanistan's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Shah Mohammad Dost [S/13725].

119. In the view of the Government of Poland, consideration by the Council of the situation in Afghanistan, as seen by the sponsors of the motion contained in document S/13724 and Add.1 and 2, is legally unfounded, politically wrong and counter-productive as well as ineffective on its merits. It is legally unfounded because it is in violation of at least three important principles of the Charter. First, it is in clear contravention of Article 2, paragraph 7, constituting as it does an inadmissible intervention in the domestic affairs of a State. Secondly, the circumstances which led to the convening of the Council constituted a total disregard of Article 51 of the Charter, which vests every State Member of the Organization with “the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence”. Thirdly, it undermines the letter and spirit of Article 24, which stipulates, *inter alia*, that, in carrying out its duties, the Security Council acts on behalf of Members of the United Nations. My delegation is not in a position to subscribe to such a role of the Council in the case before us. We are glad to note that our approach coincides fully with that of the party directly concerned: the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

120. On the same legal grounds, we cannot accept charges questioning Afghanistan's right to request help from a State with which it has a legally binding Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation. Also, in the light of the Treaty, the claim that the temporary presence in Afghanistan of a limited Soviet military contingent represents a threat to international peace and security has no validity whatsoever.

Article 4 of the Treaty, already quoted in the debate [see para. 17, above], makes it abundantly clear that its parties shall take, in consultation with each other, appropriate measures to ensure their mutual security, independence and territorial integrity. It is not without dismay that we have noted among the sponsors of the motion to convene the Council a number of countries which, for many years and not temporarily, under the terms of their own agreements with other States, have had foreign troops on their respective territories. But after all, double standards and political convenience are unfortunately not new to the premises of the United Nations.

121. Last but not least, Afghanistan's request for limited Soviet military assistance has come within its exercise of the sovereign right of every State to judge a situation covered by article 3, point (g) of the Definition of Aggression, as annexed to General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX).

122. The present debate is politically wrong and counter-productive because its sponsors chose to address themselves to the effects instead of proceeding to the causes of the situation; thus they would want the Council to undertake an unfriendly action *vis-à-vis* a non-aligned country which, like many other States, in order to overcome its age-old backwardness, had entered the road of progressive transformations. It should be borne in mind, however, that it was precisely the hostile actions against Afghanistan, steadily increasing military incursions from the outside, mounting provocations and attempts at destabilizing the internal situation that forced the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan to address repeated requests to the Government of the USSR for its general assistance, including military aid, as based on their mutual Treaty of 5 December 1978.

123. But, in addition to the internal aspects of the situation in Afghanistan and the present debate in the Council, there is yet another dimension to the circumstances surrounding the matter. For some time now we have been witnessing collusion in world affairs by the most reactionary quarters of imperialism and hegemonism, which resort to all available methods, both overt and covert, to destabilize the situation in different parts of the globe, spread tensions on which they actually thrive, impede processes of détente and seek spheres of influence, including new sites for military bases to be used against all the progressive forces, not necessarily of socialist orientation. Their attitude towards Afghanistan following the April revolution was an exact illustration of such destructive policies. Last year's brutal aggression against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, deliberate delays in bringing independence to Namibia and eradicating the most degrading mass manifestations of racism and violation of human rights and the recent decision by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to further increase its armaments and place hundreds of medium-range rockets in most densely populated

countries of Europe seemingly look like different phenomena of the international reality, but their ominous origin rests squarely with the same allied forces of evil.

124. Finally, the present debate cannot but be ineffective on its merits because in no way does it give reason to describe the internal situation in Afghanistan as one affecting international peace and security. On the contrary, it is actions like the ones which necessitated resort to military means and the tactics which brought this Council together that aggravate the international situation and vitiate its atmosphere. Neither this debate nor any other machinations will ever be able to stop the progressive transformations, be they in Afghanistan or in the world at large.

125. It is the considered view of the Government of Poland that the way to securing the unity and progressive development of the people of Afghanistan can be achieved neither by inciting and assisting the forces of feudal rebels in that country nor by groundless consideration in the United Nations of matters within the exclusive sovereign jurisdiction of the Member State concerned; it can be achieved, however, by a posture of understanding for and co-operation with the Government whose programme is consonant with both the vital interests of the Afghan people and good-neighbourly relations and stabilization in the region.

126. Except for some instigators of the debate, the statements by the Government of Afghanistan, including the convincing arguments advanced in this Council by the Foreign Minister of that country [2185th meeting], as well as the discussion in the Council, have confirmed that we are dealing here with a premeditated attempt to engage the United Nations in an intervention in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Let us not put the authority and prestige of the Council, which indeed suffer greatly because of provocative ventures like these, to a further test. The Security Council should be the first to see to it that nations have their exclusive right to decide their destinies and to enter into relations with other States according to their wishes and best interests. The sooner the Council ceases to act to the contrary, the better it will be for the United Nations and its image among the world community.

127. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of New Zealand. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

128. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): I thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council for allowing my delegation to take part in this discussion. It is very good to have you, Sir, guiding the Security Council at this critical time.

129. New Zealand was one of the countries which asked the Council to meet to consider the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security. We did so because we were profoundly concerned at the developments in that country.

130. The situation that the Council is considering is complex. There are many elements that are not clear; but what is beyond doubt is that the Soviet Union has violated the territorial integrity of Afghanistan and has occupied that country by force of arms. It has been instrumental in forcibly removing one Government and installing another in its place. The Soviet Union has clearly and blatantly interfered in the internal affairs of a neighbouring sovereign State. It is denying the people of Afghanistan their freedom and their right to decide their own future.

131. The Soviet Union has sought to justify its invasion of Afghanistan. In the view of my Government, its explanations do not carry conviction. The Soviet Union and others have alleged that there has been interference by outside Powers in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, even including the direct use of armed forces. Those allegations have not been substantiated. No convincing evidence of outside involvement, apart from that of the Soviet Union, has been brought to the attention of the Council.

132. Military action by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan is yet another instance in the recent history of Asia where external intervention not only has violated the rights of one people but has also posed a wider threat to peace and stability. New Zealand deplores the direct military involvement of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. It is an act of aggression; it violates the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The Soviet Union, as a permanent member of the Council, has a special and solemn responsibility in relation to the maintenance of international peace and security. Its use of force in Afghanistan brings into question the degree of the Soviet Union's commitment to the principles it is sworn to uphold.

133. Afghanistan has had more than its share of armed conflict. The problems of that strife-torn country cannot be resolved by force. They can only be made worse by military intervention by a super-Power which seems to be determined to deny the people of a small and weaker neighbour their right to decide their own future. The Council must surely condemn such action. Not until aggression ceases and foreign forces are withdrawn can the process of bringing peace, reconciliation and unity to Afghanistan begin again. The first step is to get foreign troops out of Afghanistan now; then the forces of reconciliation can begin to work.

134. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Turkey in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion. In accordance with the

usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Eralp (Turkey) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.*

135. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Turkey. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

136. Mr. ERALP (Turkey): Please allow me in the first instance to express to you, Mr. President, the congratulations and, in these critical days of the world order, our best wishes for your successful leadership in inspiring a sense of responsibility and consciousness of calamity in this august organ of the United Nations. I have no doubt, from previous personal experience, that your qualities as a distinguished diplomat and able leader are amply sufficient to rise to this crucial occasion.

137. I should also like to associate my delegation with the words of welcome and good wishes expressed by other speakers to those countries which have just joined the Security Council. I have no doubt that they will contribute ably and in good faith to the important tasks with which this Council is entrusted.

138. I am sure that you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council will readily recognize that as a country adjacent to the sources of turmoil in our area, we are deeply and closely concerned at the events in which countries which are our neighbours and long-standing friends are directly involved. I wish to refer now specifically to the events in Afghanistan, which constitute the item on our agenda.

139. Barely 24 hours after the *coup* staged in Afghanistan followed by and in co-operation with foreign troops there, the Turkish Government met and issued the following statement on 29 December 1979:

“The Council of Ministers examined the situation created by the *coup* staged in Afghanistan on the night of 27/28 December 1979 and concluded that the *coup* carried out with the participation of a great number of Soviet military units constitutes a grave intervention in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan, an independent and sovereign country.

“This intervention, which is in no way admissible, is considered as dangerous and alarming because of its effects on peace and stability in the region and in the world.

“This situation faced by the Moslem Afghan nation with which we have historical and traditional

relations of friendship and brotherhood is followed with grief.”

140. It is with deep distress that my delegation has had to make this point and stress this unequivocal attitude. This distress is caused by the fact that the two countries involved are both nations with which Turkey has maintained, maintains and hopes to maintain the best of relations on all levels. With Afghanistan we have a history and tradition of friendship and brotherly relations over the centuries. Although Turkey is constitutionally a secular State, 99 per cent of the Turks are devout Moslems and cannot be indifferent to the fate of our Moslem brothers in any part of the world. Many such nations have had and may continue to have their internal difficulties, and it is our belief that they should be allowed to tackle their troubles in their own way, without outside interference. We would have hoped this could happen in Afghanistan, and we hope that it will happen.

141. As for our great neighbour to the north, the Soviet Union, we have established and continue to aspire to excellent good-neighbourly relations based on mutual trust and confidence and non-interference in internal affairs. It is therefore doubly distressing for my delegation to point the finger of strong disapproval at the action of Soviet military intervention in the affairs of a small, neighbouring, independent and non-aligned country which has followed a policy of friendship with the Soviet Union. But if law and order are to prevail in the international community, and if the solemn principles enshrined in the Charter are to continue to be the basis of international conduct, any deviation from such sacrosanct principles should immediately and without mincing words be blamed and the restoration of the status of peace and security be demanded in no uncertain words. It is in that spirit that my delegation has asked to be allowed to speak to demand that the Soviet military units which are now operating in the sovereign, independent State of Afghanistan should be promptly and graciously withdrawn from that country and that the call of the Security Council, which is responsible for the maintenance of peace and security in the international community, be heeded.

142. Turkey has served faithfully the cause of détente, which we hope will become the prevailing status of order in the world, and we view with alarm any action which is calculated to deviate from that course and, wittingly or unwittingly, bring us all to the brink of the age of the cold war which we all abhor.

*The meeting rose at 7.50 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> To be printed in “United Nations, *Treaty Series*”, under No. 17976.

<sup>2</sup> See CD/53/Appendix III, Vol. I, document CD/28.

<sup>3</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings, 7th meeting.*

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

#### 如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经销商均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

#### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

#### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

#### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

#### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.